

Date Received _____

**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. **Send the completed report form via e-mail to Larry Osborne.**

1. Program Information:

Division	Behavioral Sciences
Program	Criminology & Criminal Justice
Level	Undergraduate
Academic Year	2011-2012
Submitted by	Joe Allen
Phone/email	x4879; joseph.allen@chaminade.edu
Date Submitted	10/05/12

2. Outcomes Assessed and Program Evaluation.

Outcomes assessed for this AY	Assessment Process	Access to/Archive of Results
All Program Learning Outcomes (N=79 students)	Comprehensive/Exit Exam (75 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=79 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=79 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=79): During the most recent assessment cycle, students achieved a correct response rate of 75.8%, slightly improving on last year's results (75.5%) and, in turn, the best results since direct assessment activities commenced in Fall 2005. Overall scores for students have increased each assessment for the past 5 assessment periods.				
2. Specific Comprehensive/Exit Exam Results (N=79): Most Recent Assessment Cycle				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students scored above 80% in the following courses: CJ 201, CJ 223, CJ 291, CJ 432, and CJ/PSY 315. • Students scored below 60% in the following courses: None. • Student performance improvement of >+5% was seen in the following courses: CJ 151, CJ 270, CJ 423, and CJ 451. • Student performance decreases of >-5% were seen in the following courses: none. 				
3. Feedback on CCJ Program (N=79): During the most recent assessment, the mean student rating of faculty/administration on all assessed items was 4.54 (on a scale of 1-5). The range of mean scores for the assessed items was between a low of 4.42 ('Academic advising for CCJ students was readily available and useful') to 4.79 ('CCJ faculty were well-qualified and knowledgeable in their subject areas').				
4. Feedback on CCJ Program & Marianist Values (N=79): During the most recent assessment, the mean student rating of the program's expression/support of the Marianist values of all items was 4.56 (on a scale of 1-5).				
5. This is the second assessment cycle where data have been collected and analyzed by program type (e.g., DUG, AUP, and Online). The table below compares the percentages of correct responses by course and overall for DUG, AUP, and Online students.				
	Course	DUG (N=60)	AUP (N=14)	Online (N=5)
	151	65.8%	68.3%	70.0%
	201	87.7%	78.0%	68.5%
	220	76.2%	84.4%	77.0%
	223	89.0%	91.1%	86.0%
	270	62.9%	67.5%	71.0%
	291	90.1%	79.9%	80.5%
	315	77.7%	68.3%	64.5%
	375	71.6%	68.0%	66.5%
	423	69.2%	71.4%	71.0%
	424	60.0%	63.9%	72.5%
	432	79.2%	83.8%	80.0%
	451	76.7%	80.1%	78.0%
	470	75.4%	66.2%	66.0%
	491	72.6%	71.0%	73.5%
	OVERALL	76.20%	74.32%	73.50%

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 151, CJ 270, and CJ 424. These courses are holdovers from the last AY assessment.
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/AUP/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: Courses that have shown to be weak in terms of exam results have shown improvement. No changes to the instrument were done and it is unknown if curriculum was changed to emphasize these learning outcomes. Given the overall positive and relatively linear improvement of the courses with historically lower scoring results, it is suggested that the emphasis on the SLOs continue.
2. Student evaluation of the CCJ Program & integration of the Marianist values: no program changes deemed necessary.
3. Assessment of PLOs up-and-beyond comprehensive/exit examination: additional direct assessment items have been used for the undergraduate assessment activities; these items have been collected for five terms. These scoring of these items, in assessment terms, is being examined using a sample of items from each term and delivery method (on-ground vs. online). Once this sampling is done and the scoring methodologies have shown to be reliable and instructive, reporting of these results for future terms will ensue.
4. Assessment of AS: After not receiving any referrals to the exit materials by the AEOP for AS students since 2009, the AEOP was reminded to do this. For the 2011-2012 AY, there were 11 individuals who completed the exit materials. Unfortunately, the referrals ceased again once the 2012 CY began. The AEOP needs to consistently 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 significant breaks in the data occur.
5. Continued assessment of AEOP: In Winter 2010, teaching duties for the AEOP's CJ 490 was turned over to Joe Allen (the instructor for CJ 490 in the DUG program). This has helped to ensure that the exit materials delivered in the capstone course are consistently presented and that data collection is reliable.

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.