# **CJS - 2018-2019 Annual Program Assessment Report Guide**

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College, and to [james.solomon@csun.edu](mailto:james.solomon@csun.edu), Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by **September 30, 2019**. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. **Please include this form with your report in the same file and identify your department/program in the file name.**

**College: S and BS**

**Department: CJS**

**Assessment liaison: James David Ballard**

### **1. Please check off whichever is applicable:**

A. \_\_\_\_\_X\_\_ Measured student work within program major/options.

B. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Analyzed results of measurement within program major/options.

C. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision major/options.

D. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Focused exclusively on the direct assessment measurement of General Education Arts and Humanities student learning outcomes

**2. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** On a separate sheet,provide a brief overview of this year’s assessment activities, including:

* an explanation for why your department chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, application, or GE assessment) that it enacted
* if your department implemented assessment **option A**, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year’s measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include)
* if your department implemented assessment **option B**, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year’s analyses and past and future assessment activities
* if your department implemented **option C**, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities
* if your program implemented **option D**, exclusively or simultaneously with **options** **A, B, and/or C**, identify the basic skill(s) assessed and the precise learning outcomes assessed, the assessment instruments and methodology employed, and the resulting scores
* in what way(s) your assessment activities may reflect the university’s commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups
* any other assessment-related information you wish to include, including SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes), and/or the creation and modification of new assessment instruments

## **Overview:**

The Criminology and Justice Studies department is fairly new (just over 2 years old) and we wanted to use the first year assessment (2017-2018) to develop instruments, procedures and to pretest them (see last year’s report). The second year assessment (2018-2019) found us using those instruments and procedures to assess one of our PLO/SLO’s (communication - writing – see below). We conducted assessment of student work (81 class papers), conducted analysis of the results and are awaiting decisions on any application of this data since we have outstanding a yet to be conducted Fall 2019 faculty meeting to discuss these results and how they could impact the curriculum and help modify SLO’s (see recommendation below).

The Assessment was focused on:

**CJS Program Learning Objective #1**: Criminology and Justice Studies students will demonstrate essential qualifications for employment in criminology, criminal justice, and related occupations that include the mastery of core criminology and justice principles and the ability to think critically and to speak and write effectively within the field.

***Student Learning Outcome 1B****:  Students will effectively communicate in writing and speaking in the presentation of ideas and their application to issues and situations related to criminology and criminal justice.*

## **Results of the assessment analysis include:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Freshman**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | Total respondents - 49 | | Response rate - 39% | | Followed directions on title page - 96% | | Followed directions on running headers - 92% | | Used required format for paper - 41% | | Grammar, spelling etc. - Zero mistake = 35%, Few mistakes = 19%, Multiple mistakes = 46% | | Length of paper per directions - 8% done correctly, 22% done near directions, 70% short of required  length. | | Content assessment - Deemed active engaged with materials = 6%, Deemed superficial/average engagement  = 75%, Deemed not engaged = 19% | | Grade level writing style - Above grade level = 8%, At grade level = 78%, Below Level = 14% | | |

### **Senior**

Design classes and assignments to build off of freshman skills and abilities.

Address the skills atrophy that was observed in senior students

Total respondents = 32.

Response rate = 80 %.

Followed directions on title page = 97%

Followed directions on running headers = 100%

Used required format for paper = 28%

Grammar, spelling etc. = Zero mistake = 22%, Few mistakes = 28%, Multiple mistakes = 50%

Length of paper per directions = 25% done correctly, 40% done near directions, 35% short of required length

Content assessment = Deemed active engaged with materials = 25%, Deemed superficial engagement = 69%, deemed not

engaged = 6%

Grade level writing style = Above grade level = 12%, At grade level = 44%, Below Level = 44%

### **The assessment signature assignment we used yielded some surprising results. Data showed:**

Some of our seniors are writing at level (56%) while our freshman come to university with skills that are appropriate to their status (86%).

Following writing and format directions for both groups is problematic – freshman 30% and Seniors 65% do not follow directions.

Engagement with the materials found 81% of freshman and 94% of seniors engaged with assignment.

Grammar, spelling, etc. shows almost no difference from levels for freshman (54%) verses for seniors (50%).

Overall the impact of senior status nearing the end of their academic career might explain these differences. Some of these advanced students came from community college and that pattern for this department seems to be changing (more first time freshman arriving). One additional observation is that freshman come to the university as better prepared (or at least able to follow directions somewhat better) than those who have been on campus for several years.

### **Recommendations to faculty (to be discussed):**

Design classes and assignments to build off of freshman skills and abilities.

Address the skills atrophy that was observed in senior students.

Usefulness of a “Writing Week” emphasis in Fall term and a “Stats Week” emphasis in Spring terms.

Next year as we address quantitative skills, sample all four levels of students to see when atrophy starts/is observable.

Review instrument, SLO’s and PLO’s as needed based on data. Adjust as needed (see above items).

**3. Preview of planned assessment activities for 2019-20.** Include a brief description as reflective of a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

The program is so new we are still trying to assess our baseline skills, knowledge and content absorption by students. We plan on taking these results to faculty and asking for advice on how best to address shortfalls, program changes and revisiting assessment procedures. The next year we will conduct analysis of the student’s quantitative reasoning. Exact details will be provided in the yearly report for September 2020.

One area not asked about in this report summary is data on our students – so we have decided to track demographic data on students as a means to help us understand and address student success. The following data are from the Spring 2019 census.

### **Ethnicity:**

### DescriptionNumberPercentage of Total

Sample Size 1026100%

American Indian/Alaska Native2 0.02%

Asian 37 3.61%

Black/African American 42 4.10%

Hispanic / Latino 799 77.90%

White 70 6.82%

Two or more Ethnicities/Races 27 2.63%

Not Specified 49 4.78%

## **Gender:**

### **GenderNumberPercentage of Total**

Sample Size 1026 100%

Female 637 62.11%

Male 389 37.89%

Non-Binary 0 0.00%

## **Academic Levels:**

### Level Number Total = 1,026Percentage of Total

Freshmen 355 34.60%

Sophomore 177 17.25%

Junior 315 30.70%

Senior 179 17.44%
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