A showcase spotlighting faculty research, scholarship, and artistry.
SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

**Poster Session**
9 a.m.–noon
Grand Ballroom
Featuring more than 60 posters & exhibits.

**Authors & Artists Reception**
11 a.m.–noon
Grand Ballroom
Honoring faculty who published scholarly work or held creative exhibitions and/or performances in 2016.

**LinkedIn & Social Media Booth**
9 a.m.–noon
Grand Ballroom
Faculty, staff, and students can receive a free professional headshot along with social media and networking tips and tools.

**Awards Presentation**
Noon
Honoring the symposium’s Spotlight Presenters and ORSP’s grant award recipients.

**ORSP Grants Panel**
1:30–3 p.m.
Regents Suite A
Join SFA faculty and staff who have conquered the grant mountain and learn their secrets.
Today we come together as an institution to celebrate the research, scholarship, and artistry of SFA faculty. The Symposium on Arts & Research provides faculty the opportunity to present their research to the university and local communities.

It is essential that the faculty of a teaching institution such as SFA remain active in research and creative work. Many of our faculty members have an extraordinary record of achievement in these areas, and it is important to provide an opportunity to showcase these achievements so that, at the very least, we can become aware of the very impressive scholarly work of our colleagues and the ways in which this work informs and strengthens our teaching.

Today’s conference not only showcases discipline-specific research but also research on the scholarship of teaching and learning. SFA’s Center for Teaching and Learning actively promotes this variety of scholarship. As almost every faculty member’s duties involve interacting with students in the physical and/or virtual classroom, I encourage you to take time to visit with these exhibitors and exchange ideas about how their scholarship can impact teaching at SFA.

For many of our faculty, the dedication to the pursuit of research and creative work has resulted in publications, exhibitions, or performances. Selections of these works will be on display during the Authors and Artists Reception.

Thank you for attending today to support our faculty and recognize their contributions to their individual fields of study and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Steve Bullard
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Traditionally, if teacher preparation programs choose to incorporate co-teaching into its curriculum, a final internship experience is selected as the means of facilitating a co-teaching experience. In these circumstances, teaching partners include a Pre-service Teacher Candidate (PSTC) and their mentor teacher. An area of research that has largely been untapped involves providing a co-teaching experience to PSTC’s in which they are paired with another PSTC, rather than relying on mentor teacher to serve as a co-teacher. By providing co-teaching experiences with peers, under the supervision of trained and knowledgeable faculty, teacher preparation programs may be able to off-set the unknowns that accompany finding appropriate placements for PSTC’s in field experience settings. Noticing this gap in the research, two field experience supervisors set out to explore how co-teaching could be facilitated through a university field experience.

This proposed presentation will share the process we, as field experience supervisors, embarked on in creating a co-teaching experience for our PSTC’s. To create a co-teaching experience for field experience students, we began by collaborating ways to embed the components of co-teaching into our current field experience course. After diligent planning, through collaboration, we implemented co-teaching into our coursework. We taught about co-teaching by acting as co-teachers. In doing so, our goal was to model for students how co-teachers move from planning content to implementation.

As part of our field experience requirements, PSTCs are required to teach lessons related to mathematics and science. Participants are currently paired with a peer to collaboratively plan, practice, observe, provide feedback and teach using the various models of co-teaching. We represent two of four field experience sections. The other two field experience sections are not utilizing co-teaching. We are currently collecting data related to perceptions in collaborating with others. Our goal is to analyze the data related to collaboration to compare the perceptions of those in the co-teaching placements versus those in a traditional field experience setting, where co-teaching is not used. Depending on the results of our study, co-teaching could be integrated in other areas of our department’s field experience and coursework.

Co-Teaching: Idea to Implementation

The idea of co-teaching dates back to the 1960’s and 1970’s and was thought by many to be an example of progressive education. Today, co-teaching is viewed as a model of planning and instruction to reach all learners. Approaches to co-teaching can vary. Cook & Friend (1995; 2014) have identified six different approaches to collaborative teaching (a) station teaching, (b) parallel teaching, (c) alternative teaching, (d) teaming, (e) one-teach, one-assist, and (f) one teach, one observe. While each of the six approaches may look slightly different, at the core is a model of collaboration amongst educators.
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The focus of this study is on students’ engagement in three types of dissent when they are emotionally exhausted at the end of semester. Since its inception, scholars have examined instructor behaviors and student characteristics that contribute to three types of instructional dissent, or class-related complaints. According to Goodboy (2011), students engage in expressive dissent when they complain to friends, family, and peers, whereas vengeful dissent occurs when students spread negative messages about instructors to sabotage their reputations. Rhetorical dissent occurs when students voice their complaints directly to their instructor. Research has yet to examine the role of emotional exhaustion as a contributor to dissent. The model tested also includes student anger, emotion work, and emotional support as contributors to expressive, vengeful, and rhetorical dissent.

Participants were 196 (n = 81 males, n = 114 females, n = 1 unidentified) undergraduate students who reported on their general levels of emotional exhaustion before completing measures of anger, emotion work, emotional support, and instructional dissent in a specific class. Results of a SEM with maximum likelihood estimation yielded a good model fit, $\chi^2 (179) = 296.03$, $p < .001$, RMSEA = .06 [90% CI = .05: .07], SRMR = .06, and CFI = .95, that accounted for a moderate amount of variance in each outcome (.20 to .46). Ultimately, emotional exhaustion was a significant (p < .05) positive predictor of anger ($\beta = .26$), whereas emotional support was a significant negative predictor ($\beta = -.36$). In turn, anger was a significant positive predictor of emotion work ($\beta = .46$), and expressive dissent ($\beta = .28$), but a negative predictor of rhetorical dissent ($\beta = -.27$). Emotion work was a significant ($p < .05$) positive predictor ($\beta = .34$) and emotional support was a significant negative predictor ($\beta = -.18$) of expressive dissent. Expressive dissent was a significant positive predictor of vengeful ($\beta = .63$) and rhetorical dissent ($\beta = .36$). Finally, vengeful dissent was a significant positive predictor of rhetorical dissent ($\beta = .47$).

Interpreted from a conservation of resources theoretical perspective, this study’s results suggest student anger is a protective reaction to losing additional emotional resources or attempting to restore resources. Thus, emotionally exhausted students are not likely to invest additional resources by dissenting unless they are provoked. When they are angry, the results imply students are more likely to vent their emotions to family, friends, and/or classmates (expressive) to develop their support networks. However, emotional exhaustion, anger, and emotion work alone do not prompt students to approach the professor directly (rhetorical) or to seek revenge (vengeful). Additionally, emotional exhaustion and anger did not directly contribute to vengeful dissent. Rather, emotional exhaustion and anger predicted expressive dissent, which in turn predicted vengeful dissent. This begs the question of whether students strategically rally together before seeking revenge or approaching the teacher for fear of retribution (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2013). These findings are important for future research and yield meaningful implications for students, instructors, and administrators.
Design of a Robust Undergraduate Biochemistry Laboratory Course Based on a Modified and Expanded Bovine Serum Albumin Purification Scheme.

The ASBMB curriculum for an undergraduate degree recommends a set of skills that can be acquired only through laboratory courses and research experience. Based on a modified and expanded purification scheme for BSA, we designed a robust, reproducible, budget-friendly, safe and enquiry-based undergraduate biochemistry laboratory course that encompasses a lot of the skill-sets recommended in the ASBMB curriculum. The purification scheme employed in this work has been reported in a research paper. This work not only modifies certain steps in the scheme, it includes additional steps to enhance student learning and skill acquisition. Salt precipitation, ion exchange and size exclusion chromatography were employed by students to purify BSA from cow plasma. Presence of major contaminants of BSA purification, IgGs and nucleases, were tested in the purified sample by western blotting and DNase I assay respectively. The DNase assay step provides an opportunity for students to learn basic molecular biology techniques such as plasmid isolation and enzyme-catalyzed digestion. One major addition to the purification process is the bromocresol green-BSA complex assay to precisely quantitate BSA at each step and generate a purification table. Comparison of sequences and other parameters of albumin proteins from common animals provides a bioinformatics twist to student experience. Abundance of albumin from the plasmas of common animals, cow, pig and chicken, allows for variation in the design of the course, and students can work in groups or individually. The course could be designed as a half-semester or full-semester biochemistry laboratory module.
EXHIBITS

EXHIBITS

Using Technology for Evaluations in the Culinary Cafe
Runnels, C., Strahl, J., Hererra, E., Barrios, T.

PSTs’ Collaborative Experiences Implementing Physical Activity Breaks in Elementary Classrooms
Sinclair, Christina, Thornton, L., Xu, T.

______________________________

REPRESENTING THE ARTHUR TEMPLE COLLEGE OF FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE

Getting the Greatest Benefit from LED Lighting Systems in Commercial Broiler Production
Bray, J., Glassock, J.

Accuracy Assessment on Drone Measured Heights at Different Height Levels
Hung, I.

SFA Gardens Visualization Using a UAS DJI Phantom 3
Kulhavy, D.

Service-Learning By SFASU Agricultural Engineering Technology Students
Morton, C.

Integrating Research into a Hands-On Forestry Undergraduate Spatial Science Course
Unger, D., Henley, R., Kulhavy, D., Hung, I.

Incorporating Applied Undergraduate Research in a Senior Level Forestry Remote Sensing Course
Unger, D., Henley, R., Kulhavy, D., Hung, I.

DRASTIC Analysis for Groundwater Vulnerability to Contamination
Unger, D., Brown, M., Creech, D., Kenneth, F.

______________________________

REPRESENTING THE COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS

Costume Design for Lady Bracknell in Act III of THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING EARNEST
Bacarisse, A.

Building a Mentoring Network from Alumni Input
Conn, C.

Super String Theory: Perpetual Motion, a Locked Room Mystery
Hicks, C.

Tackling Medea
Houston, T.

Leading the Field of Music through Three Premieres at SFA
Meyer, B.

Virtual Reality Uses in the Fine Arts
Midgley, H.

Adonis
Mitchell, E.

Plastic
Nieberding, W.

The State of the Union: Combining Creative Research with Professional Practices
Selden, L.
EXHIBITS

REPRESENTING THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL AND APPLIED ARTS

The Escalation of Trump: Stormfront and the 2016 Election
Dentice, D.

Values Reflected in Environmental Activism by Email
Forbes, W.

An Investigation of Low-Stakes Versus High-Stakes Testing Using Immediate Feedback
Hutchens, S., Jenkins, D.

Preliminary Analysis of Asymmetry in Caddo Ceramics: A Case Study from the Washington Square Mound Site
Selden, R.

Conflict Framing to Image Restoration to Renewal: A Case Study of Mars Hill Church and its Leadership
Spradley, E., Spradley, R.

STEM, STEAM, and German Language Acquisition
Stoehr, L.

Towns Grief Model
Towns, J.

Flipping the Classroom With Screencasts
Wagnon, A.

EXHIBITS

REPRESENTING THE RALPH W. STEEN LIBRARY

New Outcomes from the Texas Runaway Slave Project
Ainsworth, K.

VR: Another Option in Educational Presentation
Iglesias, E.

The BIO 437 Herpetology LibGuide: A Creative Use of the LibGuides Platform
Lopez, E., Mullin, S.

Considerations Before Implementing SirsiDynix’ MobileCirc for a Deselection Project
Pappas, J.

Research

is to see what everybody else has seen,
& to think what nobody else has thought.

- Albert Szent-Gyorgyi
**AWARD RECIPIENTS**

**Office of Research and Sponsored Programs**

**Faculty Research – Senior Faculty:** Dr. Kevin Stafford, Geology

**Staff Research:** Dr. Shiyou Li, National Center for Pharmaceutical Crops

**University Impact:**
- Cyndra Krogen-Morton, Health Science Program, Department of Kinesiology and Health
- Kenneth Morton, Campus Recreation
- Jessica Waguespack, Campus Recreation

**Million Dollar Club**
For Faculty/staff receiving as combined total of $1,000,000 in competitive funding since 2013.

- Dr. Lesa Beverly, Mathematics & Statistics

**Silver Level ($500,000 to $999,999):**
- Dr. Sara Bishop, School of Nursing
- Dr. Christopher Comer, Forestry
- Dr. Keith Hubbard, Mathematics & Statistics
- Dr. Emmerentie Oliphant, School of Social Work
- Dr. Kevin Stafford, Geology

**Bronze Level ($250,000 to $499,999):**
- Dr. David Creech, SFASU Gardens
- Dr. Jeremy Stovall, Forestry

**Honorable Mention**

**First Applications over $100,000**
- Dr. Erin Bailey, School of Nursing
- Dr. Hyunsook Kang, School of Human Sciences
- Dr. Courtney Wooten, English
- Dr. Jenny Gumm, Biology

**First Awards**
- Dr. Christopher Aul, Physics & Astronomy
- Dr. Daniel Bennett, Biology

**EXHIBITS**

**REPRESENTING THE COLLEGE OF SCIENCES & MATHEMATICS**

_Inhibition of Eurygaster Integriceps Puton Prolyl Endoprotease (spPEP) and Human Prolyl Endopeptidase (hPEP) using αS1 - Casein Peptide Inhibitors_
Clack, B., Kadakova, P., Lovett, J., Anderson, M.

_The Effect of Compound L19 on Human Colorectal Cells (DLD-1)_
Clack, B., Mammadhoseinpour S., Mallet, E.

_SMASHing it at SFASU_
Frantzen, A.

_The Evolution of Color Signals in Stomatopod Crustaceans_
Gumm, J., Chan, A., Steck, M., Porter, M.

_It is Cool to Be Kind: Promoting a Culture of Civility in BSN Students_
Harris, T., Jones, A.

_The Visual Ecology of a New World Cichlid_
Imhoff, V., Gumm, J., Clotfelter, E., Anderson, C.

_Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Soil Samples from Diboll, East Texas (USA)_
Onchoke, K., Janusa, M.

_A Time Course Study of the Effects of Arachidin 1 and 3 on the Host Ultrastructure and Viral Populations of Rotavirus-infected Cells_
Parr, R.

_Microbial Aspects of the Moody Garden Project_
Wagner, S.
The following faculty are being recognized at the Authors & Artists Reception for the publication of scholarly works or held creative exhibitions/performances in 2016:

Adam Akerson, Elementary Education
Ali Hachem, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Alyx Frantzen, Chemistry
Amanda Rudolph, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Andrew Lannen, History
Andrew Parr, Music
Andrew Thornley, Business Communication & Legal Studies
Angela Jones, Nursing
Ann Wilder, Social Work
Ann Wilson, Business Communication & Legal Studies
Anne Smith, Multidisciplinary Programs
Aryendra Chakravartty, History
Ashley Hall, Business Communication & Legal Studies
Barbara Qualls, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Benjamin Dixon, Multidisciplinary Programs
Bradley Meyer, Music
Brandon Fox, Elementary Education
Brian Beavers, Mathematics & Statistics
Brian Oswald, Forestry
Brook Poston, History
Cala Coats, Art
Candace Hicks, Art
Carol Wright, Business Communication & Legal Studies
C.C. Conn, Theatre
Carrie Kennedy-Lightsey, Languages, Cultures, and Communication
Catherine Pearte, Psychology
Cathy Henderson, Management, Marketing, & International Business
Charles Abel, Government
Charles Gregory, Government
Charlotte Allen, Management, Marketing, & International Business
Chay Runnels, Human Sciences
Christopher Sams, English & Creative Writing
Chris Barker, Geology
Chrsissy Cross, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Christina Guenther, Music
Christina Sinclair, Kinesiology & Health Science
Christopher Ayer, Music
Christopher Comer, Forestry
Christopher McKenna, Business Communication & Legal Studies
Cindy Pressley, Government
Claudia Whitley, Elementary Education
Courtney Carney, History
Courtney Wooten, English & Creative Writing
Craig Morton, Agriculture
Dale Perritt, Agriculture
Dana Cooper, History
Daniel McIver, Human Services
Daniel Scognamillo, Forestry
Daniel Unger, Forestry
Darrel McDonald, Anthropology, Geography, & Sociology
David Kulhavy, Forestry
Deborah Williams, Elementary Education
Debra Scott, Music
Dennis Gravatt, Biology
Dianne Dentice, Anthropology, Geography, & Sociology
Donald Gooch, Government
Edward Iglesias, Library
Edward Michaels, Physics & Astronomy
Elizabeth Tasker Davis, English & Creative Writing
Elton Scifres, Management, Marketing, & International Business
Emily Payne, Agriculture
Emmerentie Oliphant, Social Work
Eric Jones, Kinesiology & Health Science
Ericka Hoagland, English & Creative Writing
Erin Brown, Agriculture
Esther Bunn, Accounting
Frank Brister, Human Services
Frank Mullins, Human Services
Freddie Avant, Social Work
Gabriela Miranda-Recinos, Languages, Cultures, and Communication
Garland Simmons, Economics & Finance
George Willey, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Gina Harden, Management, Marketing, & International Business
Gina Fe Causin, Human Sciences
Ginger Kelso, Human Services
Gloria Gresham, Elementary Education
Gregory Miller, Mathematics & Statistics
Hans Williams, Forestry
Harry Downing, Physics & Astronomy
Heather Olson Beal, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Henry Dunn, Business Communication & Legal Studies
Herbert Midgley, Music
Hyunsook Kang, Human Sciences
I-Kuai Hung, Forestry
J.B. Watson, Anthropology, Geography, & Sociology
J.D. Salas, Music
Jacqueline Cowan, English & Creative Writing
James Rowe, Kinesiology & Health Science
James Towns, Languages, Cultures, and Communication
James VanKley, Biology
Jane Long, Mathematics and Statistics
Janet Tareilo, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Jared Barnes, Agriculture
Jason Reese, Management, Marketing, & International Business
Jay Thornton, Kinesiology & Health Science
Jeffery Roth, Anthropology, Geography, & Sociology
Jennifer Newquist, Human Sciences
Jeremy Becnel, Mathematics & Statistics
Jerry Williams, Anthropology, Geography, & Sociology
Jessica Sams, English & Creative Writing
Jill Carrington, Art
Jim Ewing, Elementary Education
Joe Ballenger, Management, Marketing, & International Business
Joey Bray, Agriculture
John Hendricks, Mass Communication
John McDermott, English & Creative Writing
John Moore, Chemistry
Joyce Johnston, Languages, Cultures, and Communication
Judith Biss, Business Communication & Legal Studies
Judy Abbott, Elementary Education
Justin Blount, Business Communication & Legal Studies
Karen Jenlink, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Kathy Sheriff, Human Services
Kefa Onchoke, Chemistry
Keith Hubbard, Mathematics & Statistics
AUTHORS & ARTISTS HONOREES

Kelly Noe, Accounting
Kelly Salsbery, Multidisciplinary Programs
Kenneth Austin, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Kenneth Collier, Government
Kenneth Farrish, Environmental Science
Kenneth Untiedt, English & Creative Writing
Kent Riggs, Mathematics & Statistics
Kevin Langford, Biology
Kevin Stafford, Geology
Kyle Ainsworth, Library
LaRell Nielson, Geology
Leah Kahn, Elementary Education
LeAnn Solmonson, Human Services
Lee Payne, Government
Lesa Beverley, Mathematics & Statistics
Leslie Cecil, Anthropology, Geography, & Sociology
Linda Black, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Linda Levitt, Languages, Cultures, and Communication
Lindsey Kennon, Human Services
Louise Stoehr, Languages, Cultures, and Communication
Luis Aguerrerevere, Human Services
Lynda Martin, Human Sciences
Malcolm Whitehead, Kinesiology & Health Science
Marc Guidry, English & Creative Writing
Marcus Webb, Mathematics & Statistics
Marie Kelly, Accounting
Mario Ajero, Music
Mark Faries, Kinesiology & Health Science
Mark Ludorf, Psychology
Mark Sanders, English & Creative Writing
Mark Schaub, Economics & Finance
Marsha Bayless, Business Communication & Legal Studies
Mary Catherine Breen, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Matibur Zamadar, Chemistry
Matthew Beauregard, Mathematics & Statistics
Matthew Kwiatkowski, Biology
Matthew Lindsey, Management, Marketing, & International Business
Matthew McBroom, Forestry
Megan Condis, English & Creative Writing
Michael Maurer, Agriculture
Michael Munro, Human Services
Michael Sheehan, English & Creative Writing
Michele Harris, Chemistry
Michelle Williams, Elementary Education
Milton Hill, Government
Mitch Crocker, Management, Marketing, & International Business
Nathan Fleschner, Music
Neill Armstrong Jr, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Nikki Shoemaker, Accounting
Nina Ellis-Hervey, Human Services
Odutayo Odunuga, Chemistry
Owen Smith, Multidisciplinary Programs
Paige Mask, Human Services
Parker Ballinger, Economics & Finance
Pat Stephens Williams, Forestry
Patrick Jenlink, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Paul Blackwell, Columbia Center
Paul Sandul, History
Paula Hopeck, Languages, Cultures, and Communication

AUTHORS & ARTISTS HONOREES

Pauline Sampson, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Paulo Dutra, Languages, Cultures, and Communication
Perry Moon, Languages, Cultures, and Communication
Phil Stetz, Management, Marketing, & International Business
Phillip Catton, History
Richard & Herzog, Government
Richard Langley, Chemistry
Robbie Steward, Human Services
Robert Friedfeld, Physics & Astronomy
Robert Henderson, Mathematics & Statistics
Robert Szafran, Anthropology, Geography, & Sociology
Robert Wiggers, Biology
Ronald Havner, Biology
Roy Harris, Mathematics & Statistics
Sam Copeland, Social Work
Sarah Stovall, Mathematics & Statistics
Scott Bailey, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Scott Sosebee, History
Sharon Eaves, Psychology
Shelby Laird, Forestry
Shirley Dickerson, Library
Spencer Acadia, Library
Stacy Hendricks, Secondary Education & Educational Leadership
Stephen Cooper, Multidisciplinary Programs
Stephen Kosovich, Economics & Finance
Stephen Lias, Music
Stephen Mullin, Biology
Stephen Wagner, Biology
Steven Marsden, English & Creative Writing
Sudeshna Roy, Languages, Cultures, and Communication
Sue Whatley, English & Creative Writing
Susan Case, Elementary Education
Susan Jennings, Business Communication & Legal Studies
Susan Reilly, Elementary Education
Tammy Angley, Music
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