Capstone Assessment
2014–15 Report

Dr. Phyllis Bolin
Dr. David Hendricks

Background

This report communicates the results from the first assessment of capstone papers. The assessment outcomes are those

The assessment team consisted of six faculty members. Dr. David Hendricks (Mathematics), Rodney Ashlock (Bible, Missions and Ministry), Brad Crisp (School of Information Technology and Computing), Shelly Sanders (Language and Literature), Tracy Shilcutt (History and Global Studies), and Sam Stewart (Teacher Education) assessed the capstone papers.

During the fall and spring semesters, the university had 38 sections of courses that departments had designated as a capstone experience and 37 of these sections submitted capstone papers. There were a total of 667 students enrolled and 619 papers were submitted to the Pursuit Office. A simple random sample of 60 papers was assessed from the 619 papers submitted.

Two members of the assessment team rated each paper. The scores from the first and second raters were averaged for each paper in the sample. These scores were used to calculate the average score for each Student Learn Outcome (SLO) objective, the number of papers meeting the acceptable and ideal targets for each SLO objective, and the composite score for each SLO.

Student Learn Outcomes Assessed

2.1.A Students will demonstrate effective use of information literacy skills through writing.
2.1.B Students will apply information to planning and creation of a product or performance.
2.1.C Students will demonstrate critical thinking as they develop, produce, and evaluate product or performance.

The assessment team used a rubric with six categories to assess these learning outcomes with two categories for each learning outcome:
- Use of Sources to Answer Question (2.1.A)
- Ethical and Appropriate Use of Sources (2.1.A)
- Organization or Structure (2.1.B)
- Mechanics (2.1.B)
- Purpose of Project (2.1.C)
- Integrative Learning (2.1.C)

Results

SLO Objective 2.1.A – Students will demonstrate effective use of information literacy skills through writing.

Use of Sources to Answer Question

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2014–2015 assessment, 43.3% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was good for this objective with 53.3% of the papers receiving the same score, 43.3% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 3.3% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015
Use of Sources to Answer Question	Score ≥ 2.5	43.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Not met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Not met
	Average of Samples	2.1

Ethical and Appropriate Use of Sources

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2014–2015 assessment, 50.0% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was good for this objective with 58.3% of the papers receiving the same score, 33.3% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 8.3% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015
Ethical and Appropriate Use of Sources	Score ≥ 2.5	50.0%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Not met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Not met
	Average of Samples	2.1

SLO Objective 2.1.B – Students will apply information to planning and creation of a product or performance.

Organization or Structure

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2014–2015 assessment, 83.3% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was relative good for this objective with 44.2% of the papers receiving the same score, 49.2% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 6.7% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015
Organization or Structure	Score ≥ 2.5	83.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Approaching
	Average of Samples	2.7

Mechanics

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2014–2015 assessment, 83.3% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was OK for this objective with 48.3% of the papers receiving the same score, 45.0% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 6.7% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015
Mechanics	Score ≥ 2.5	83.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Approaching
	Average of Samples	2.7

SLO Objective 2.1.C – Students will demonstrate critical thinking as they develop, produce, and evaluate product or performance.

Purpose of Project

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2014–2015 assessment, 80% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was relatively good for this objective with 55.0% of the papers receiving the same score, 41.7% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 3.3% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015
Purpose of Project	Score ≥ 2.5	80%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Approaching
	Average of Samples	2.7

Integrative Learning

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2014–2015 assessment, 46.7% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was not good for this objective with 35.0% of the papers receiving the same score, 43.3% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 21.7% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015
Integrative Learning	Score ≥ 2.5	46.7%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Not met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Not met
	Average of Samples	2.3

Commendations and Recommendations

1. Departments and Capstone faculty are to be commended for their high rate of participation and submission of students' Capstone papers this first year.

2. Dan Brannan, Stephen Baldridge, Suzie Macaluso, Sarah Lee, Nancy Jordan, Rodney Ashlock, Brenda Bender, and Denise Barnett are to be commended for developing a rubric that the committee could use to assess the first round of Capstone papers.

3. The committee recommends that the rubric be tweaked. It is not clear who would make the decision on changing the rubric. Items mentioned by the committee to consider are the following:
   - Improve consistency in the levels of the rubric. For example, adequate is used at the effective level in purpose of project and is used at the emergent level for organization or structure.
   - Provide explicit quantitative expectations. The emergent level for integrative learning states "few connections." This is too ambiguous—is it one, two, three or fewer.
   - Possibly consider collapsing the rubric into three levels from the four. Having four levels does require the committee members to divide the papers into above average and below average. Having only three levels would

4. The committee recommends that someone oversee the Senior-Year Integrative Capstone. Although discussions about eliminating some CORE classes are under way, CORE 120, CORE 210, and BCOR 310 each have a course director that coordinates with CORE instructors about required syllabus components and course outcomes. A Capstone director would, similarly, coordinate with Capstone faculty about required assignments in a Capstone course.