

ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY



Annual Report Year 1: 2011-2012

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

INTRODUCTION

After successful review by the SACSCOC visiting committee, *Pursuit* began its initial year of implementation in Fall 2011. After the formation of working teams, a variety of tasks were completed, including the first cycle of *Pursuit* Grant applications. The *Pursuit* Institute was conducted in May in the Adams Center Classroom and CORE 110 artifacts and SAILS were assessed. Other information was collected in an effort to archive data for benchmark comparisons in later years. *Pursuit* Goals and Learning Outcomes for each year can be found in Appendix A.

FORMATION OF WORKING TEAMS

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

- Phyllis Bolin (Director of *Pursuit*, Chair),
- Jeff Arrington (Staff),
- Timothy Head (CAS, Physics),
- David Kneip (CBS, Biblical Text),
- Alan Lipps (CEHS, Social Work),
- Mark McCallon (Library),
- Alfa Nyandoro (COBA, SITC),
- Rick Piersall (CAS, Music),
- Kay Price-Hawkins (Alumnus).
- Ex Officio: Greg Powell (Office of Undergraduate Research), Scott Hamm (Adams Center), Nancy Shankle (General Education).

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

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

Assessment Team I: The team will remain together for the duration of the QEP in order to have a consistency of assessment. Faculty members include the following:

- Laura Carroll (Chair, CAS, English),
- Stephen Baldrige (CEHS, Social Work),
- Houston Heflin (CBS, Bible, Missions, and Ministry, General Education),
- Susan Lewis (Provost Office, CAS, Journalism and Mass Communications), and
- Dawne Swearingen-Meeks (CAS, Theater).

TASKS COMPLETED

PIT Tasks for 2011-2012: The PIT group met regularly in the Adams Center and completed the following tasks:

- Developed a working knowledge of *Pursuit* and its purposes, including *Pursuit* Grants and *Pursuit* Institutes;
- Revised and wrote a common grant application for *Pursuit* and all ACU internal grants, providing for a broad spectrum of research and creative endeavors;
- Examined all grant requests and, using the criteria for *Pursuit* Grants, selected recipients;
- Composed reports for assessment of *Pursuit* Grants, including Faculty Assessment of Project Report, Final Expense Report, Student Self-Assessment of Project Report, and Student Reflective Journal.

IL Team Tasks for 2011-2012: The IL Team planned and implemented the *Pursuit* Institute, including the focus for the institute, choice of consultant, and agenda.

Pursuit Grants

Reorganization of ACU Internal Grants: The *Pursuit* Director worked with the Director of Cullen and Math/Science (Ken Cukrowski), Director of Undergraduate Research (Greg Powell), Director of Mobile Learning (Scott Hamm), and Director of Gerontology (C.D. Pruett) to focus and coordinate internal grants across campus. The months' work culminated in November in an Adams Center informational presentation to faculty. The group crafted a common application and selected a common date for submission of all internal grants. Information for each grant and an application form are centrally located on the ACU website. All grants have a common submission date in late January so that grant selection and notification of acceptance can occur by the week after spring break. Grant cycles coincide with the fiscal calendar.

2012-2013 Pursuit Grant Fellows: The first cycle of *Pursuit* Grants funded \$40,000 for six grant projects:

- Josh Brokaw \$8,000 (Biology),
- Mikee Delony \$8,000 (English),
- Sheila Delony \$5,500 (Education),
- Jennifer Huddleston \$3,500 (Biology),
- Rick Piersall \$8,000 (Music), and
- Josh Willis \$7,000 (Physics).

Ten undergraduate students will work with the faculty on the projects during the grant cycle for Academic Year 2012-2013. Interim assessment reports for the projects are due January 22, 2013; final assessment reports are due May 17, 2013.

Pursuit Institute

Michelle Millet, Information Literacy Consultant from UTSA, facilitated the first *Pursuit* Institute focusing on information literacy. CORE and Brown Library faculty were invited to attend; eleven CORE faculty and eight library faculty attended the 1½ day institute.

Fourteen faculty submitted assessments of the Institute. When asked to rate the overall quality of the sessions, on a scale of 1-5, with one being the highest, the average ranking was 2.1. Attendees rated the clarity and effectiveness of the presentations as 2.6. All faculty responding to the survey stated they would recommend the session to others. Responders described six different benefits they received by attending the institute. The most frequent benefits listed included the following:

- Useful knowledge,
- Specific approaches, skills, or attitudes, and
- New exposure to problems and solutions from colleagues.

A focus for the institute was the creation of Information Literacy assignments for usage by Cornerstone Faculty. Five assignments were crafted, discussed, and adapted. Faculty finalized the rough draft composed during the institute and submitted assignments to the *Pursuit* Office during the summer. One of the assignments, an annotated bibliography assignment, was adapted over the summer to serve as the Information Literacy assessment for CORE 110. Several faculty produced Information Literacy videos during the summer to post for student-use. The *Pursuit* Institute Report for 2011-2012 is included in Appendix D

FIRST-YEAR ASSESSMENTS

During the first year of implementation, *Pursuit* focused on collecting data and assessments from CORE 110 (Cornerstone) classes, including an artifact from the course and SAILS benchmark data. See Appendix B for a listing of results and targets for Year 1.

CORE 110 (Cornerstone)



SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills developed by Kent State University): All students enrolled in CORE 110 completed SAILS early in Fall 2011. In the total enrollment of 875 students, 431 freshman

and 8 sophomores (50%) took the assessment. 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 E.

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.

Acceptable Target: All freshmen in CORE 110 will take the SAILS instrument before week three. These data serve as the pretest for information literacy. SAILS is readministered in CORE 320 [revised

to be given in Capstone] (junior/senior year) and it is anticipated that section scores will increase to match or exceed institutional type scores.

Ideal Target: The increase in the SAILS pre to post scores for these sections will exceed institutional type scores.

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

Measurement: SAILS sections FIVE and SIX.

Acceptable Target: All freshmen in CORE 110 will take the SAILS instrument before week three. These data serve as the pretest for information literacy. SAILS is readministered in CORE 320 [revised to be given in Capstone] (junior/senior year) and it is anticipated that section scores will increase to match or exceed institutional type scores.

Ideal Target: The increase in the SAILS pre to post scores for these sections will exceed institutional type scores.

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

Measurement: SAILS sections SEVEN and EIGHT.

Acceptable Target: All freshmen in CORE 110 will take the SAILS instrument before week three. These data serve as the pretest for information literacy. SAILS is readministered in CORE 320 [revised to be given in Capstone] (junior/senior year) and it is anticipated that section scores will increase to match or exceed institutional type scores.

Ideal Target: The increase in the SAILS pre to post scores for these sections will exceed institutional type scores.

Results: Preliminary results show that students scored about the same as the Institution-type benchmark on 4 of the 8 skills tests and worse than the institution-type benchmark on the other 4 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. 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 in a written artifact. SAILS will assist in the assessment for this objective.

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 write an evaluative essay meeting specific requirements. This essay is scored using the *EXPLORE 110 Rubric*.



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

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

Results: In 2011-2012, 61% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; the average score of all samples was 2.48.

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

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

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

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

Results: Outcome 1.1.B is taught through classroom instruction and librarian support and is difficult to assess in a written artifact. SAILS *data* will be utilized in the assessment for this objective.

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

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

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

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

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

Summary results for CORE 110 Evaluative Essay Artifact

The Cornerstone research artifact was collected from a set of 892 students, 689 papers were collected (77%). Dr. Mark Riggs, Chair of Department of Mathematics and Statistical Consultant, created a simple random sample, and 100 papers were assessed. The CORE 110 Assessment Report for 2011-2012 is included in Appendix C.

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)

Overall, students scored below the **acceptable target** on each item.

Recommendations:

1. Collect a larger percentage of student papers from CORE 110. 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.
3. Update the *Explore* rubric to integrate more specific language and mirror the ENGL 112 rubric for research writing.

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 teaching information literacy skills in general education classes (CORE 110, CORE 220, BCOR 310, ENGL 112, 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: Because this is the first year of grant implementation, journals will not be available for assessment until the end of the current grant cycle. Journals are due in May 2013.

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.

Results: Because this is the first year of grant implementation, reports will not be available for assessment until the end of the current grant cycle. Reports are due May 2013.

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 will 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 3 departments reported data. Results will be utilized in subsequent years for comparison.

In AY 2011-2012, on the annual outcomes assessment report, faculty reported the following percentages of student participation:

- 4.5% completed an independent research project submitted for selection and review beyond a course requirement;
- 4.5% conducted research with a department faculty mentor;
- 1.9% presented a research paper or project or poster at a conference or professional meeting, either state or national;
- 1.7% submitted an original work for a juried show;
- .7% performed for a jury outside a department requirement;
- .3% published an article, chapter, or book related to their discipline;
- 2.0% participated in the spring ACU Research Festival; and
- .3% conducted or participated in a research activity not mentioned in the list above.

Note: enrollment figures for fall 2011 show 3771 undergraduates.

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.

Ideal target: 80% of abstracts will have a 3.3 or higher on each item.

Results: Because no data was collected from the rubric, it is not known whether the target was met. Discussions are underway for improvement to the system for the next Undergraduate Research Festival. During March 2012, the committee selected 96 abstracts of the 112 submitted without using the rubric specifically. The rubric “was simply used for guidance in discussion about some of the more problematic submissions.”

- **Measurement:** Students who received grants from the Office of Undergraduate Research, Honors College, 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: Because this is the first year of grant implementation, papers or creative works will not be available for assessment until the end of the current grant cycle. The Honors College chose to discontinue the grants this academic year but will focus on travel funds for students to attend conferences. Papers or reports are due May 2013.

- **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: Because this is the first year of grant implementation, papers or creative works will not be available for assessment until the end of the current grant cycle. The Honors College chose to discontinue the grants this academic year but will focus on travel funds for students to attend conferences. *Research Project: Student Self-Assessment Reports* are due May 2013

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 rubric.]

Ideal target: 80% of products/presentations will score 65 or higher out of a total score of 90 on the rubric. [Adapted to 5.6 out of a total score of 70 on the rubric.]

Results:

Verbal Presentations: Fifty-six verbal presentations were made at the 2011 Undergraduate Research Festival. Of the verbal presentations, 34 presentations scored a total of 38.9 or higher. Overall or **61% of presentations scored within the Acceptable Target** on the *Papers/Verbal Presentations Rubric*. Eight presentations or **14% scored with the Ideal Target**.

Poster Presentations: Thirty-five poster presentations were made. Of the 35 poster presentations, 23 presentations scored a total of 38.9 or higher or **66% of presentations scored within the Acceptable Target** on the *Posters/Presentations Rubric*. Two poster presentations or **6% scored with the Ideal Target**.

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.

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.

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.

Results:

In AY 2011-2012, on the annual outcomes assessment report, faculty reported the following percentages of student participation:

- 4.5% completed an independent research project submitted for selection and review beyond a course requirement;
- 4.5% conducted research with a department faculty mentor;
- 1.9% resented a research paper or project or poster at a conference or professional meeting, either state or national;
- 1.7% submitted an original work for a juried show;
- .7% performed for a jury outside a department requirement;
- .3% published an article, chapter, or book related to their discipline;
- 2.0% participated in the spring ACU Research Festival; and
- .3% conducted or participated in a research activity not mentioned above.

Additional information is listed below from special programs and groups within the university:

- 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 2011, 17 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 2012, 56 students made oral presentations and 35 made poster presentations. That is roughly 2% of ACU's enrollment total. Note: there is a slight disparity in data from the outcomes assessment report from above.
- The Honors College involves students in research with faculty mentors to develop research skills and encourages the students to present their research at conferences. During the fall of 2011 and spring of 2012, 68 students worked with a faculty mentor.
- Alpha Chi is a national college honor society that admits students from all academic disciplines. Membership is limited to the top 10 percent of an institution's juniors, seniors, and graduate students. In 2012, the following students presented their undergraduate research at the National Convention in Baltimore: Kaleigh Wyrick, Jennifer Binkley, Hillary Eichelburger, Monica Parodi. These 4 represent 1.7% of the 236 members of ACU's chapter,

Note: Currently data found in the descriptions of student involvement in research projects are not mutually exclusive. Some categories include students counted multiple times for the same research project. Recommendations call for the revision of data categories including more detailed explanations of data categories in subsequent reports. Enrollment figures for Fall 2011 indicate 4,558 undergraduates.

MAJOR CHANGES FOR YEAR 1 AND JUSTIFICATIONS

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, but the need for two major changes emerged during analysis of first-year assessments.

Change 1: During Fall 2011 and Spring 2012, conversations across campus were held in discussion of revisions to the 2007 General Education Revision Steering Committee (GERSC) plan for the structure of a new core curriculum. Faculty approved a revision to General Education plan that included the following:

- Consolidation of CORE 120 and CORE 220 into a single 3-hour course entitled CORE 210, combining the curriculum from both courses.
- Combination of CORE 320 and BIBL 440 into a single 3-hour course entitled BCOR 310, including team-teaching the course with 2 or 3 professors, one from Bible, Missions, and Ministry.

Justification for Change 1:

- Review of student learning outcomes from CORE classes showed the program outcomes could be met with 9 hours of integrated courses instead of the original 12 hours and not undermine the fundamental understandings and objectives.
- Budget reductions in FY11 and FY12, as well as those proposed for FY13 and beyond, significantly impacted the ambitious and comprehensive new curriculum. Implementation of the original 12-hour program was not feasible but a 9-hour integrated core was.

Change 2: The original QEP called for a research paper to be taught and assessed in CORE 110. During review of student learning outcomes and curriculum, the CORE 110 Advisory Committee discovered a gap in learning. Students were asked to write a research paper before they received instruction in writing from sources in required English classes. To fix the gap, students will work on an annotated bibliography in CORE 110, then write a research paper in English 112 (Composition and Literature). The next general education course-CORE 210-will require a research paper to be assessed for QEP student learning outcomes.

Justification for Change 2: An advisory committee composed of CORE 110 faculty worked during the summer of 2012 to modify the focus and to adapt the final assessment document from an evaluative essay to a annotated bibliography. Because most students take ENGL 112 (Composition and Literature) during the second semester they are enrolled, providing instruction for writing an annotated bibliography in CORE 110, practicing those skills while writing a research paper in ENGL 112, and reinforcing the skills while working on a research paper in CORE 210 provides a more successful sequencing of instruction.

The tables below depict the changes effective for Fall 2013.

Original Plan:

| Practice | Introduce | Reinforce |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| CORE 110—Research Paper | ENGL 112—Research Paper | CORE 210—Research Paper |

Adjusted Plan:

| Introduce | Practice | Reinforce |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| CORE 110—Annotated Bibliography | ENGL 112—Research Paper | CORE 210—Research Paper |

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Pursuit* Grant Applications—Work with faculty to improve quality of grant applications. Schedule an Adams Center luncheon to provide examples of well-written purposes, goals, and objectives.
2. Marketing—Work with Online Marketing and Creative Services to find ways to showcase faculty and student research from *Pursuit* Grants. Add information about the funded grants to website. Reorganize research information on ACU website.
3. *Pursuit* Institute—Work with PIT and IL Teams to consider best focus for next year's institute. Faculty Teams must decide what type of institute will best provide assistance to faculty to improve and promote research within departments.
4. Assessments
 - CORE 110—Work with Assistant Provost of General Education to ensure *Pursuit* objectives are a part of student learning outcomes and assignments are developmentally appropriate for entering students. During Summer 2012, faculty teaching CORE 110 wrote a new assignment to serve as the assessment for *Pursuit*.
 - SAILS—Increase the percentage of students taking SAILS. The syllabus needs to prescribe a portion of the student's grade for completion of the SAILS assessment. In Fall 2012, students completing the assessment will receive a weekly quiz grade for their efforts.
 - Undergraduate Research—Methods for reporting the number of faculty-guided research and creative projects are insufficient. Protocol for collection of data needs refinement.

CONCLUDING SUMMARY

Year 1 started well but had a bit of a rocky start during this initial year of our *Pursuit* dreams. Year 2 starts 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) were formed and began their tasks for implementation.
- Goals and tasks for each team were discussed, delineated and begun with fervor and enthusiasm.
- Funding for six *Pursuit* Grants grant projects was awarded to 10 students and their 6 faculty mentors. Preliminary results and anecdotal responses indicate a successful and productive group of researchers. Because this is the first year of grant implementation, reports will not be available for assessment until the end of the current grant cycle.
- The *Pursuit Institute* was conducted in May. The institute was an overwhelming success with 19 faculty participants, many of which have made improvements within their teaching and classroom behaviors and assignments.
- Assessments for the first year were implemented.
 - SAILS was given to CORE 110 students in the early fall;
 - Evaluative essays were assigned, collected, and assessed from CORE 110 students.

- 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 2012.
- As of Fall 2012, Year 2 begins with the following improvements:
 - Expectations for CORE 110 (Cornerstone) have been revised, including a clearer vision of ways to provide assistance to faculty and students;
 - Percentages for students taking SAILS at the beginning of Year 2 have increased from 50% to 72.3%.

In summary, we have made an excellent start. Faculty and students are enthusiastic and excited about *Pursuit*. We begin anew and refine and revise our strategies to meet the goals described for the *Pursuit* of Research Literacy.

Appendices

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.



| EXPLORE | Specific Learning Outcomes for All Students | Expected Outcome--The student will: | Courses or Components | Assessment | Evidence—collection of Artifacts |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| | Objective 1.1: Students understand and appropriately use scholarly resources. (Def 1) | 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 | AY '13-14 |
| | Objective 1.2: Students integrate knowledge to frame researchable questions and to develop strategies to seek answers. (Def 2) | 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 II rubric--Items 6 & 7 | AY '12-13 |
| | | | BCOR 310-R ENGL 112 - P | Explore II Rubric | AY '13-14 |
| | | | Objective 1.3: Students analyze, interpret, and/or evaluate information and make and implement research-informed decisions. (Def 3) | 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 |
| | BCOR 310-R | Explore II Rubric | | | AY '13-14 |
| Capstone Experience-P | SAILS --(Posttest) | AY '14-15 | | | |
| ENGL 112 - P | | | | | |

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. (Def 4) | 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 | Writing Intensive or Capstone Experience-P | Artifact from Writing Intensive or Capstone Experience – <i>Create</i> Rubric | |
| | | | | | | 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. (Def 5) | 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 | Departmental Outcomes Assessment | 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

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. <i>(Def 6)</i> | 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

Pursuit: Year 1—Academic Year 2011-2012 –Goals, Outcomes, and Assessments

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.

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

| | Specific Learning Outcomes for All Students | Expected Outcome-- The student will: | Courses or Components | Assessment | Assessment Results | Target |
|---------|--|--|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| EXPLORE | <p>Objective 1.1: Students understand and appropriately use scholarly resources.</p> <p>(Def 1)</p> | <p>1.1.A. Determine the nature and extent of the information needed.</p> <p>1.1.B. Access needed information effectively and efficiently.</p> <p>1.1.C, Use information ethically and legally.</p> | CORE 110—*I | <p>1. SAILS in CORE 110 (Pretest for baseline information)</p> <p>2. Explore I Rubric items 1, 2</p> | <p>1. 50% of students enrolled took assessment</p> <p>1.1.A. Students scored about the same as institution-type benchmarks on 2 of 4 skill sets and worse on the other 2 skill sets.</p> <p>1.1.B. Students scored about the same as institution-type benchmarks on 1 of 2 skill sets and worse on the other skill set.</p> <p>1.1.C Students scored about the same as institution-type benchmarks on 1 of 2 skill sets and worse on the other skill set.</p> <p>2. 77% of students enrolled submitted digital papers.</p> <p>1.1.A. 61% of samples scored 2.5 or higher. The average score of all samples was 2.48.</p> <p>1.1.B. was not assessed on this document.</p> <p>1.1.C. 40% of samples scored 2.5 or higher. Average score of all samples was 2.01.</p> | <p>1. Acceptable target: students will score about the same or exceed institution-type benchmark.</p> <p>Ideal target: scores will exceed institution-type benchmarks.</p> <p>2. 1.1.A. Acceptable target: 70% of samples will score 2.5 or higher. Ideal target: 80% of samples score 2.5 or higher.</p> <p>1.1.C. Acceptable target: 70% of samples will score 2.5 or higher. Ideal target: 80% of samples score 2.5 or higher.</p> |

QEP Pursuit Research Components Initiated during Year 1: 2011-2012

- *CORE 110* (Cornerstone)—Fall 2012
 - Artifacts collected—December 2011
 - Research papers assessed by Assessment Team I—May 2012
 - Analysis of results and report written—June 2012
 - Revisions of research artifact from CORE 110—Summer 2012
- *SAILS*—given in Cornerstone—Fall 2012
- *Pursuit Grants*—Initial grant cycle—Faculty-Student-Mentored Research Funding
 - Grant Directors work to craft a common application--August-November
 - Grant Applications due January 27, 2012.
 - Applications evaluated and ranked—February 6, 2012
 - Grants selected and recommendations sent to Research Council for final approval—March 2012
 - Grant recipients notified for funding—March 2012
 - Grant contracts signed, FOAPS originated, funding distributed—April-June
 - Grant assessment documents written and posted—spring and fall 2012
- *Pursuit Institutes*—May 14-15, 2012
 - *Pursuit* Implementation Team—provided initial planning for May Institute
 - *Pursuit* Information Literacy Team—planned, organized, and implemented Institute
- Undergraduate Research Festival—planned and implemented by Undergraduate Research Council—chaired by Greg Powell

CORE 110 Assessment – 2011-12 Report

Dr. Phyllis Bolin
Dr. Laura Carroll

Background

In order to assess outcomes 1.1A¹ and 1.1C² 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 Baldrige (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)

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

² Students will use information ethically and legally.

Appendix C

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:
 - a. Discuss strategies for cohesion, ranging from typeface, verb tense, intro/conclusion, and transitions.
 - b. 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.
 - c. Consider adding scholarly sources to the requirement.
 - d. 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:
 - a. Exemplary should say “controlling idea and excellent supporting detail, original insights on the part of the writer.”
 - b. Competent should say “good response to the topic, adequately supported by detail.”
 - c. Emerging should say “routine response, perhaps too generally stated, but more of less held to in token fashion.
 - d. Unacceptable should say “there may be a stated controlling idea, but the relation of details is unclear.”

Pursuit Institute – 2011-2012 Report

Dr. Phyllis Bolin

Participants (19):

Deb Williams (120)--English Department
 Karen Cukrowski (110, 120)--General Education and English
 Trevor Thompson (220)--Bible
 Chris Willerton (220)--Honors and English
 Cliff Barbarick (110)--Bible
 Jeanene Reese (110)--Bible
 Eric Gumm (110)--First-Year Program
 Scott Self (110)--University Access Programs
 Wendell Willis--Bible
 Nancy Shankle--Asst Provost for General Education (formerly English)
 Mark McCallon (library)
 Karen Hendrick (library)
 Shan Martinez (library)
 Laura Baker (library)
 John Weaver (library)
 Carisse Berryhill (Library)
 Melissa Atkinson (Library)
 Craig Churchill (Library)
 Kyle Dickson (110)—English

Products:

Product 1—Sample Class Assignment: Each group worked together to create an assignment that could be used in CORE 110, 210, or BCOR 310. Assignments will be posted to CORE Blog page.

Product 2—Video Product: Each person was encouraged to produce a video product by the end of the summer. An incentive will be given for each product.

Budget and costs:

- Total budgeted: \$10,000 for Institute expenses/stipends for participants and \$3,000 for the consultant fee.
- Pursuit Expenses: \$10,707.02
 - Michelle Millet consulting fee: \$3,000 (\$2,000 per day)
 - Residence Inn for consultant: \$227.70
 - Planning Meal for IL Team and Consultant--\$123.48
 - Travel for consultant--\$270.84
 - Office supplies--\$85
 - Stipends to participants--\$7,000
- Cost Sharing--Adams Center—classroom space and lunches, snacks, and drinks.

Appendix D

Evaluation of Workshop: Fourteen of faculty submitted assessments of the Institute. When asked to rate the overall quality of the sessions, on a scale of 1-5, with one being the highest, the average ranking was 2.1. Attendees rated the clarity and effectiveness of the presentations as 2.6. All faculty responding to the survey stated they would recommend the session to others. Responders described six different benefits they received by attending the institute. The most frequent responses were the following:

- Useful knowledge,
- Specific approaches, skills, or attitudes, and
- New exposure to problems and solutions from colleagues.

One of the focus areas of the institute was the production of assignments that could be posted on the Cornerstone Faculty blog for use in Cornerstone classes. Five assignments were crafted and discussed. Faculty were asked to finalize the rough draft composed during the institute and submit it to the Pursuit Office during the summer. Faculty were also asked to produce videos during the summer break for student-use.

Recommendations:

1. Comments from participants were positive. One participant wished to have a better idea of the focus and outcomes planned for the institute. In subsequent institutes, planning committees will work closer with the facilitator to provide an agenda that include purposes for the institute and expected outcomes. These will be sent to the faculty the week before the institute and will be provided in hardcopy the first day of the institute to all faculty in attendance.
2. Adams Center staff have planned a workshop for faculty during the entire week after the school semester is completed. Consideration of conducting the Pursuit Institute at a different time should be considered.

Appendix E

Detailed results from the 2011-2012 SAILS Skills Sets and alignment with *Pursuit* objectives are found below:

| Fall 2011 Administration | | Abilene Christian University | Institution Type: Masters |
|---------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Pursuit</i> Objective | SAILS Skill Sets* | | |
| 1.1.A | 1. Developing a Research Strategy | 487 ± 12 (475, 499) | 501 ±2 (499, 503) |
| | 2. Selecting Finding Tools | 510 ± 16 (494, 526) | 524 ± 2 (522, 526) |
| | 3. Searching | 465 ±12 (453, 477) | 482 ±2 (480, 484) |
| | 4. Using Finding Tool Features | 528 ± 17 (511, 545) | 546 ±2 (544, 548) |
| 1.1.B | 5. Retrieving Sources | 525 ± 18 (507, 543) | 560 ±2 (558, 562) |
| | 6. Evaluating Sources | 472 ± 13 (459, 485) | 486 ±2 (484, 488) |
| 1.1.C | 7. Documenting Sources | 438 ± 17 (421, 455) | 461 ±2 (459, 463) |
| | 8. Understanding Economic, Legal, and Social Issues | 443 ± 14 (429, 457) | 453 ±2 (451, 455) |

* 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.

