

## Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

**Program(s): Bachelor of Arts in Criminology & Criminal Justice (BACCJ)**

**Department: Criminology & Criminal Justice Programs, School of Social Work**

**College/School: College for Public Health & Social Justice**

**Date: June 27, 2018**

**Primary Assessment Contact: Noelle Fearn, PhD, CCJ Programs Director**

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Although we identified differently in our initial AY 2017/2018 CCJ Program Assessment Plan, we have assessed BACCJ learning outcomes (LOs) 2a and 2b during the 2017/2018 academic year. Per our 2017/2018 BACCJ Assessment plan: LO 2a: ***Students will apply CCJ theory***; LO 2b: ***Students will conduct CCJ research***.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

Individual student data was collected from two CCJ courses, CCJ 2150 (The Nature of Crime: Criminological Theory) and CCJ 4960 (CCJ Capstone). Final exams from CCJ 2150 were examined for evidence of mastery of **application of CCJ theory** (LO 2a) and capstone papers from CCJ 4960 were examined for assessment of our graduating seniors' ability to **conduct CCJ research**.

A total of 19 graduating seniors completed our CCJ Senior Exit Survey wherein they self-reported on a variety of Program-related areas, including, unfortunately, our prior BACCJ program competencies/learning outcomes. It should be noted though that our BACCJ learning objectives were only recently revised (11/2017) so it makes sense that our graduating students would respond regarding our "old" competencies/learning objectives as they pursued almost the entirety of their undergraduate careers with us under the earlier/prior learning outcomes.

No Madrid student artifacts were included in our assessment activities.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

***NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.***

At least one CCJ faculty member and the CCJ Programs Director reviewed each student paper/test to identify how well, overall, our graduating BACCJ students met LOs 2a and 2b. More specifically, Professor Hotfelder reviewed each CCJ 2150 final exam for that course. Dr. Fearn (CCJ Programs Director) then also reviewed each student artifact from CCJ 2150 as well to ensure multiple examinations of students' performances on LO 2a from the course. Drs. McGuire and Fearn also reviewed (and scored) the theoretical section of each graduating senior's capstone paper for additional evidence of students' performances on LO 2a. Regarding evaluation of LO 2b, both Drs. McGuire and Fearn also reviewed/scored the entirety of all graduating seniors' capstone projects. (Note for future: inconsistent/non-existent use of rubrics from assessment plan...steps have already been taken to reduce this.)

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

**NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.**

As noted above, caution must be taken with our assessment “results” as this was the first year of implementing our new assessment plan (which wasn’t finished/approved until almost the end of the fall semester – leaving us a bit more than one semester to “see” the plan in action). Thus, none of our fall 2017 courses/assessment activities were fully examined according to the new plan (e.g., we did not have completed assessment rubrics for the fall courses). That being noted, below are the bulleted summary findings for both of the BACCJ LOs examined for this annual assessment report:

**LO 2a: Students will apply CCJ theory**

Direct Measures

**CCJ 2150 Final Exam** (as indicator of theoretical comprehension and appropriate application)

- 80% of students (24/30) met/exceeded the benchmark for this learning outcome
- 20% of students (6/30) failed to meet the benchmark for this learning outcome

**CCJ 4960 Capstone Paper** (theory section)

- 18% of graduating seniors (4/22 who submitted capstone papers) exceeded the capstone criteria for this learning outcome
- 64% of graduating seniors (14/22 who submitted capstone papers) met the capstone criteria for this learning outcome
- 18% of graduating seniors (4/22 who submitted capstone papers) did not meet the capstone criteria for this learning outcome (two were at the second milestone and two at the third; see rubric)
- Overall, then, 82% of graduating seniors met/exceeded the capstone criteria for the ability to appropriately apply CCJ theory

**LO 2b: Students will conduct CCJ research (CCJ Research Rubric)**

Direct Measures

**CCJ 4960 Capstone Paper & Presentation** (in its entirety)

- 86% of graduating seniors (19/22 who submitted capstone papers) met the capstone criteria for this learning outcome
- 4% of graduating seniors (3/22 who submitted capstone papers) did not meet the capstone criteria for this learning outcome (all of which fell between the second and third milestone)
- 96% of graduating seniors (22/23 who professionally presented their capstone paper) met the capstone criteria for oral presentation (although we did not formally evaluate this learning outcome this year, it is part of the capstone course and experience and thus we have general data on how well students presented orally as well as responded to audience questions)

**Overall Results from BACCJ Senior Exit Survey (regarding prior program competencies)**

Indirect Measures (self-reported)

19 total graduating seniors self-reported their comfort level in their ability to do the following/being competent at:

- Demonstrating a practical knowledge of the theoretical foundations, structure, and operation of the criminal justice system (8 = very comfortable, 10 = somewhat comfortable, and 1 = somewhat uncomfortable)

- Demonstrating knowledge of the nature of crime, including theoretical foundations and the causes and correlates of crime (9 = very comfortable, 9 = somewhat comfortable, 1 = very uncomfortable)
- Effectively communicating in a professional manner [both orally and in writing] (13 = very comfortable, 4 = somewhat comfortable, 1 = neither comfortable/uncomfortable, 1 = very uncomfortable)
- Understanding CCJ research, including how we measure crime (8 = very comfortable, 7 = somewhat comfortable, 3 = neither comfortable/uncomfortable, 1 = somewhat uncomfortable)
- Understanding diverse populations and explaining the need for ethical and human treatment of all people (13 = very comfortable, 5 = somewhat comfortable, 1 = very uncomfortable)
- Understanding social and human justice and their roles in criminological research and criminal justice practice and policy (12 = very comfortable, 4 = somewhat comfortable, 2 = neither comfortable/uncomfortable, 1 = somewhat uncomfortable)

Respondents were generally quite positive about and confident in their abilities to be competent in areas identified as critical in the CCJ discipline. "Very comfortable" was, by far, the most common response in five of the six areas and only a single respondent identified as "very uncomfortable" or "somewhat uncomfortable" in each of the six areas.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

First, and perhaps most importantly, our CCJ Senior Exit Survey will be revised so that graduating students will be asked to self-reflect on our newly revised learning objectives (see plan). Second, and also critically important, we will do a much, much better collective job at utilizing the assessment rubrics we have included as part of our BACCJ Assessment Plan. Numerous emails have already gone out and discussions planned/held to better support faculty/adjuncts in completing the rubrics for the 2018/2019 academic year, where and in our CCJ as appropriate.

Our CCJ faculty meet monthly during the regular academic year and, as such, the assessment findings and further discussion surrounding our assessment plan and this year's report will be on our September meeting agenda. Any discussion regarding recommendations for change/revision in any program area (or in our assessment activities), will take place, initially, at our first meeting (and continue for as long as we need to discuss). As part of our ongoing assessment work we will add "assessment tasks" as a standing item on our monthly meeting agenda and pay careful attention to soliciting feedback from faculty who apply the assessment rubrics to their courses/course activities. All BACCJ Program areas are appropriate foci for our assessment activities and we will make a concerted ongoing effort to discuss assessment, including our plan, its implementation, and the tools (e.g., assignments, rubrics, etc.) used to engage in this important endeavor.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? (*For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?*)

Throughout AY 2017/2018 the CCJ faculty engaged in assessment-related discussions. Unfortunately, we have not yet had a chance to "close the loop" on any particular decision, as our revised plan was submitted/approved in November of 2017. We anticipate much more discussion during the next academic year as we reflect on what is working well (and, perhaps, not so well) with our assessment activities – especially regarding our use of rubrics and the degree to which consistent use of rubrics increases our confidence in our assessment results/supports the feedback solicited from students. Note: the 2017/2018 BACCJ Assessment Plan was updated to reflect a change in which learning objectives were assessed this first year.

***IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.***