

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO
ANNUAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT: 2015-2016

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

1. Name and Contact Information of Program Assessment Coordinator:

Darin Haerle, Assistant Professor, CJ Program Coordinator, x6154, dhaerle@csuchico.edu

2. Student Learning Outcomes

- SLO 1: CJ majors critically evaluate theories, policies, and CJ professionals' actions based on empirical evidence.
- SLO 2: CJ majors demonstrate effective oral communication skills, meaning they communicate and express themselves in a clear and professional manner.
- SLO 3: CJ majors demonstrate effective written communication skills.
- SLO 4: CJ majors demonstrate knowledge of policing, courts, corrections, and theories of crime and justice.
- SLO 5: CJ majors demonstrate an understanding of the social dynamics of human diversity in the administration of justice.
- SLO 6: CJ majors can demonstrate the ethical decision-making processes in CJ professions and understand the individual, organizational, and societal implications of these decisions.

3. Course Alignment Matrix:

Criminal Justice Course	Outcome 1 Critical Thinking	Outcome 2 Oral Communication	Outcome 3 Effective Writing	Outcome 4 Content Knowledge	Outcome 5 Understand Diversity	Outcome 6 Understand Ethics
POLS 250	Introduce (I)	I	I	I	I	I
POLS 257	Practice (P)		P	P		
POLS 259A	P		P	P		
POLS 352	P	P	P	P	Demonstrate (D)	I
POLS 353	P	P	P	P		I
POLS 459D	P, D	P, D	P, D	P, D	I, P, D	P, D
SOCI 384	P			P, D	P	
Electives	P		P	P		
POLS 331			P			
PHIL 332	P				P	P, D
CJ & the Individual	P		P		I	
CJ & Society	P		P		P	
Theoretical Foundations	D		P			
Courts & CJ System	D		D			

4. Learning Outcome Assessed in AY 2014-2015:

- SLO 5: CJ majors demonstrate an understanding of the social dynamics of human diversity in the administration of justice.

5. Assessment Methodology Used

SLO 5

In an attempt to assess Criminal Justice students' understanding of human diversity in the administration of justice, written work in a super jumbo section of the Introduction to Criminal Justice (POLS 250) course from Spring 2016 was assessed. This section was selected because it had ongoing individual writing assignments, two of which focused on issues of diversity and potential racial disparities within the criminal justice system (please see Appendix A). A total of 293 students were enrolled in this section of POLS 250, 137 of whom are Criminal Justice majors. All students were required to submit their work as part of their required coursework, and then I conducted an independent assessment scoring that did not impact their course grade.

Of the 137 writing samples submitted by Criminal Justice majors, I scored a subset (N=10) for assessment purposes. I identified this sample of 10 using a systematic random sampling technique so that each paper submitted by a Criminal Justice major had an equal chance of being selected for assessment. I selected the first writing sample from a random start point in the roster, and then identified every next writing sample at every eighth position on the roster following that start point. I repeated this pattern 10 times to identify 10 randomly sampled writing samples for assessment. Based on expectations of the University approved, General Education writing assessment rubric, I designed a rubric to assess three areas related to a students' understanding of diversity in the administration of justice: 1) articulation of argument, 2) content of argument, meaning the use of course readings to support the argument, and 3) organization of response paper based on the assignment expectations. This rubric was used for this assessment process and contains these three substantive areas of assessment, as well as three possible ratings: superior, adequate, and poor (please see Appendix B). To achieve an overall, acceptable score, the sample from this POLS 250 class would need to average a score of 2.0 out of a possible 3.0.

6. Assessment Results

Student Learning Outcome	Sample and Sample Size	Measure	Percent of Students Achieving
#5: CJ majors demonstrate an understanding of the social dynamics of human diversity in the administration of justice	Systematic random sample (N=10) from POLS 250 (Spring 2016)	Examination of individual writing assignment #3	Argumentation 2.45; Content 1.80; Organization 2.25. (see Appendix C)
	Systematic random sample (N=10) from POLS 250 (Spring 2016)	Examination of individual writing assignment #4	Argumentation 2.40; Content 1.65; Organization 2.10. (see Appendix C)
			Average scores across both: Argumentation 2.43; Content 1.73; Organization 2.18; Overall 2.11 60% of students scored at or above a 2.0 overall.

7. Analysis / Interpretation of Results

SLO 5

The results suggest that students are meeting our expectations for SLO 5, especially considering that the sample assessed was drawn from our introductory course, Introduction to Criminal Justice (POLS 250). Keeping in mind that the majority of students assessed in this sample are freshmen, their collective ability to articulate, support, and discuss arguments related to diversity issues in the administration of justice is slightly better than adequate.

Using the substantive areas of Argumentation, Content, and Organization as described in the rubric, this sample of students scored an average of 2.17 on Reading Assignment #3, and scored an average of 2.05 on Reading Assignment #4. Of the three areas assessed, students on average scored highest across both assignments in the area of Argumentation (2.43), second highest in the area of Organization (2.18), and scored the lowest in the area of Content (1.73).

Of this student sample, 60% (6 out of 10) scored an average of at least 2.0 on their writing assignments. The average scores for writing assignment #3 were slightly higher than those for writing assignment #4. The prompt for assignment #3 specifically asks the students to discuss racial profiling in their responses, whereas assignment #4 prompts them to generally discuss dispassionate judicial decision-making. While this prompt did not specifically ask for the students to include a discussion of race and/or class in their answers, the students were to support their claims using a reading that focuses on race, class, and gender. While the difference between the students' scores on these two assignments is not large, it is worth noting.

Students did a better than adequate job of articulating an argument in response to both assignments, but struggled to organize this argument into a coherent discussion. Students appeared to be even more challenged by the requirement to support their arguments with examples from the course readings, as indicated by their lowest overall score in the Content area of assessment, which landed above the level of "poor," but below the level of "adequate."

The average scores were below "superior," and this may be attributed to the fact that these are freshmen/underclassmen students who may have had limited exposure to articles and texts that discuss issues of diversity prior to this course. Additionally, these individual writing assignments are *not* iterative in nature, which means that the writing samples assessed were the only version submitted by these students. The super jumbo enrollment of this class makes it difficult, if not impossible, to provide consistent and ongoing feedback to students on iterative writing assignments throughout the semester. Additionally, students will move on from this introductory course into other courses that teach them how to better incorporate course materials, cite external sources, and organize their writing assignments. It is clear, however, that students were able to articulate an argument related to issues of diversity based on the material presented in class and in the assigned readings.

8. Planned Program Improvement Actions Resulting from Outcomes

SLO 5

Empirically, this assessment of these student writing assignments demonstrated slightly better than adequate proficiency in understanding the social dynamics of diversity in the administration of justice. I would expect students in upper division criminal justice courses (i.e. senior seminar) to score well above adequate and to approach the level of superior. Future assessments of diversity should include a standardized survey instrument or writing assignment that can be administered to students in the introductory course of POLS 250 and to seniors enrolled in the capstone course of POLS 459D. Based on the University's commitment to providing an inclusive environment that acknowledges and appreciates a diverse population, perhaps a larger, a more uniform approach to including writing assignments related to diversity in all core classes of the Criminal Justice program should be considered.

9. Planned Revision of Measures or Metrics

SLO 5

As other programs within the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice consider inclusion of a SLO related to diversity, it is my hope that we can develop a standardized measure to assess our students' understanding of diversity as it relates to curriculum offered by each program.

10. Planned Revisions to Program Objectives or Learning Outcomes

None.

11. Changes to Assessment Schedule

For AY 16-17, the Criminal Justice Program should consider the assessment of SLO 1 and SLO 2. While SLO 6 is next in line to be assessed, the POLS 332 (Criminal Justice Ethics) course is currently transitioning from being taught by the Philosophy department back to being taught by the Criminal Justice faculty. It would be best to wait on assessment of this SLO #6 that is related to ethics until this transition is complete.

12. Information for Next Year

The Criminal Justice program will be electing a new assessment coordinator for AY 2016 – 2017 following the successful search for three new assistant professors. When the new curriculum is close to full implementation, assessment activity should include redeveloping the course alignment matrix. Additionally, SLO 4 was not assessed this year, given the need for the new curriculum to become more fully implemented. Dr. Jon Caudill advised our program to hold off on assessing this outcome until such implementation is near completion. Additionally, the Associate Dean of the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences will be implementing exciting new changes in assessment next year, at which point our Criminal Justice Program will implement these changes.

II. Appendices

A. Measurement Standards

Appendix A POLS 250 Reading Assignments

Blackboard Reading Schedule and Questions

Reading #	Date	R	Question(s)
3	3/3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Katheryn K. Russell, "Driving While Black: Corollary Phenomenon and Collateral Consequences," from <i>Race, Class, Gender, and Justice in the United States</i>.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">How serious an issue is racial profiling?Why should we be concerned with it?
4	3/24	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Justin M. Johnson, "Flotsam on the Sea of Humanity: A View from the Bench on Class, Race, and Gender," from <i>Race, Class, Gender, and Justice in the United States</i>.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">Can judges make dispassionate decisions about convicted defendants?Should they?

Appendix B
Assessment Rubric for the Criminal Justice Program Student Learning Outcome of Diversity

Scoring	Argumentation	Content	Organization
3 - Superior	In addition to meeting the requirements for a “2,” any arguments are clearly articulated and the reader can easily follow the claims.	In addition to meeting the requirements for a “2,” the writing shows evidence of deep engagement with intellectual material of course/discipline, and provides clear examples used to support the ideas expressed. The content included could be used as a model of how to fulfill the assignment. Few or no errors of fact or interpretation.	In addition to meeting the requirements for a “2,” the writing flows smoothly from one idea to another. The writer’s decisions about focus and organization facilitate reading.
2 - Adequate	Claims are adequately developed. The purpose and focus of the writing are clear to the reader.	Content of text fulfills the assignment and demonstrates engagement with intellectual and/or creative material of the course/discipline. Examples are supported in most cases. Few errors of fact or interpretation.	Sequencing of ideas and transitions makes the writer’s points accessible. Additionally, the organization and tone achieve the purpose of the assignment and communicate effectively.
1 - Poor	Claims are weak or missing in many cases. Lack of a clearly articulated argument.	Requirements of the assignment have not been fulfilled. Little/no evidence of engagement with material of the course/discipline. Lack of examples to support claims. The paper reveals numerous errors of fact or interpretation.	Writing lacks transitions and/or sequencing of ideas, making reading and understanding difficult. The writer’s decisions about focus and organization interfere with communication.

B. Assessment Data Summaries (Details that elaborate on item 6, above.)

**Appendix C
Assessment Scores**

Student Last Name (N = 10)	Reading Assignment Number	Argumentation	Content	Organization	Average	Avg per student
Lomeli	3	2	2.5	1.5	2.00	
Lomeli	4	2	1.5	1	1.50	1.75
Medrano	3	3	2	2.5	2.50	
McGill*	4	3	2.5	3	2.83	2.67
Morales	3	1.5	1	1	1.17	
Morales	4	2	1	1.5	1.50	1.33
Patterson	3	3	2.5	3	2.83	
Patterson	4	3	2	3	2.67	2.75
Ramirez	3	3	1	2	2.00	
Ramirez	4	2	1	1.5	1.50	1.75
Rodriguez	3	2.5	2	3	2.50	
Rodriguez	4	3	1	2	2.00	2.25
Saenz	3	3	1	2	2.00	
Saenz	4	3	2.5	3	2.83	2.42
Smart	3	2.5	1	3	2.17	
Sommer*	4	1.5	1	1	1.17	1.67
Woodel	3	2	2	3	2.33	
Woodel	4	2	1	2	1.67	2.00
Alcala	3	2	3	1.5	2.17	
Alcala	4	2.5	3	3	2.83	2.50
Averages		2.43	1.73	2.18	2.11	

*If the first systematically randomly sampled student to be assessed for Reading Assignment #3 did not complete Reading Assignment #4, the next Criminal Justice student on the list was selected for that assessment.