

CRIMINOLOGY & CRIMINAL JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Report Brief on Assessment Activities, Results & Findings, & Recommendations AY 2015-2016

Program: Bachelors in Criminology & Criminal Justice (CCJ)

Submitted: February 2017

Prepared by: Joe Allen

Summary of Assessment Findings & Recommendations

The CCJ Department has continued to advance its assessment activities; moreover, general consistency (and improvement) has been seen in assessment results. To date, the department has employed direct and indirect assessment instruments to assess program effectiveness in terms of program and student learning outcomes. Direct assessment has been conducted in the forms of exit examinations for both undergraduate and graduate students. Indirect assessment has been conducted in the forms of student feedback instruments for students – faculty/ administration and Marianist values for undergraduates and program effectiveness and student knowledge self-assessment and faculty/administration for graduates.

The undergraduate direct assessment instrument has undergone several revisions since its inception, the most ardent occurring in 2010. Changes were necessary due to poorly-worded questions; thus, the questions were revised. After that assessment cycle, several questions with wide variances were examined. It was decided that in some cases, these questions needed to be revised. In a couple of other instances, the instructor of the course(s) acknowledged that they needed to further emphasize this material in their course(s). Problematic course-related scores have generally improved or stabilized. The department feels that this is due to more stability among adjuncts teaching select courses (i.e., continued carryover and instruction toward course and program learning outcome ends). For courses where students scored less than 70% overall, the department will continue to further examine if: (1) items need to be revised to better reflect student learning outcomes, (2) course delivery/instruction in these areas needs to be improved, and/or (3) student learning outcomes as measured by the current assessment items are in fact reflective of desired student learning programmatic outcomes.

**CUH Program
Annual Assessment Report
Summary**

Directions: Please complete this form for your Program. Each box that is attached to each of the sections is designed to adjust to varying lengths.

1. Program Information:

Division	Behavioral Sciences
Program	Criminology & Criminal Justice
Level	Undergraduate
Academic Year	2015-2016
Submitted by	Joe Allen
Phone/email	x4879; joseph.allen@chaminade.edu
Date Submitted	12/12/16

2. Outcomes Assessed and Program Evaluation.

Outcomes assessed for this AY	Assessment Process	Access to/Archive of Results
All Program Learning Outcomes (N=63 students)	Comprehensive/Exit Exam (79 items; multiple choice & true-false format)	Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site; raw data on Joe Allen's computer
Student Evaluation of CCJ Program (N=63 students)	Exit Survey (8 items; Likert scale format)	Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site; raw data on Joe Allen's computer
Student Evaluation of CCJ Program & Integration of Marianist Values (N=63 students)	Exit Survey (5 items; Likert scale format)	Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site; raw data on Joe Allen's computer

3. Results, concerns and discoveries. Make sure appropriate statistical notations are utilized (N size, mean, standard deviation, frequency distribution, etc). What conclusions or discoveries were made from these results?

Results & Discoveries																																	
1. Overall Comprehensive/Exit Exam Results (N=63): During the most recent assessment cycle, students achieved a correct response rate of 73.0%, a 1% decrease from last year's results (74.0%). This average aligns with the 6 assessment periods prior to the most recent.																																	
2. Specific Comprehensive/Exit Exam Results (N=63): Most Recent Assessment Cycle																																	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students scored above 80% in the following courses: CJ 201, CJ 223, and CJ 291. • Students scored below 60% in the following courses: CJ 270, CJ 424, and CJ 470. • Student performance improvement of >+5% was seen in the following course: CJ 201. • Student performance decreases of >-5% were seen in the following courses: CJ 151, CJ 220, CJ 270, CJ 315, CJ 423, CJ 424, CJ 432, and CJ 451. 																																	
3. Feedback on CCJ Program (N=63): During the most recent assessment, the mean student rating of faculty/administration on all assessed items was 4.56 (on a scale of 1-5). The range of mean scores for the assessed items was between a low of 4.39 ('Academic advising for CCJ students was readily available and useful') to 4.80 ('CCJ faculty were well-qualified and knowledgeable in their subject areas').																																	
4. Feedback on CCJ Program & Marianist Values (N=63): During the most recent assessment, the mean student rating of the program's expression/support of the Marianist values of all items was 4.55 (on a scale of 1-5).																																	
5. This is the fourth assessment cycle where data have been collected and analyzed by program type (e.g., DUG, PACE). The PACE sections of the course during this cycle were online only. The table below shows the percentages of correct responses by course for all DUG and PACE students. When comparing overall results between the DUG and PACE students, the DUG students outperformed the PACE students (74.0% to 70.9%).																																	
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Course</th> <th>Overall (N=63)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>151</td><td>76.8%</td></tr> <tr><td>201</td><td>83.9%</td></tr> <tr><td>220</td><td>73.3%</td></tr> <tr><td>223</td><td>90.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>270</td><td>54.4%</td></tr> <tr><td>291</td><td>88.5%</td></tr> <tr><td>315</td><td>65.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>375</td><td>71.1%</td></tr> <tr><td>423</td><td>63.3%</td></tr> <tr><td>424</td><td>55.6%</td></tr> <tr><td>432</td><td>72.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>451</td><td>70.7%</td></tr> <tr><td>470</td><td>30.9%</td></tr> <tr><td>491</td><td>65.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>OVERALL</td><td>73.0%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Course	Overall (N=63)	151	76.8%	201	83.9%	220	73.3%	223	90.0%	270	54.4%	291	88.5%	315	65.2%	375	71.1%	423	63.3%	424	55.6%	432	72.2%	451	70.7%	470	30.9%	491	65.2%	OVERALL	73.0%
Course	Overall (N=63)																																
151	76.8%																																
201	83.9%																																
220	73.3%																																
223	90.0%																																
270	54.4%																																
291	88.5%																																
315	65.2%																																
375	71.1%																																
423	63.3%																																
424	55.6%																																
432	72.2%																																
451	70.7%																																
470	30.9%																																
491	65.2%																																
OVERALL	73.0%																																

Conclusions & Concerns
1. Assessment of PLOs via comprehensive/exit exam show that the target rate of 70% was not met in the most recent cycle for the following courses: CJ 270, CJ 315, CJ 423, CJ 424, and CJ 470.
2. Student evaluation of the CCJ Program is solid as are their assessment of the program and its integration of the Marianist values.
3. Across program type (DUG/Online), student results are similar, including: performance on the exit exam, feedback on the program and faculty, and assessment of the program in terms of Marianist values.
4. Assessment of PLOs continues to be limited to the comprehensive/exit examination and student feedback/assessment instruments.

4. Use of Results. Did the results lead to program changes? If so, describe the changes made. If not, describe why changes were not needed.

1. Assessment of PLOs via comprehensive/exit exam: Overall, exam results have shown an increased level of performance over the past academic year. This is in line with assessment cycles prior to last year's. It is suggested that faculty re-emphasize the SLOs for their courses, in particular CJ 470, and to a lesser extent, CJ 270 and CJ 424.
2. Student evaluation of the CCJ Program & integration of the Marianist values: no program changes deemed necessary.
3. Assessment of AS: For the last assessment cycle, referrals to the exit materials continued to not be conducted. The AEOP needs to remind students to take the exit materials. Analysis of the results for the AEOP AS students is in a holding pattern until this is accomplished; trends cannot be established when continued breaks in the data occur.

5. Dissemination of results, conclusions, and discoveries. How and with whom were the results shared?

All assessment activities have been disseminated to CCJ faculty, CCJ Program Coordinator, Division Chair and the Provost via e-mail. Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site.
