

## Program Assessment Plan

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

**Department:** School of Social Work

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

**Date:** August 5, 2021

**Primary Assessment Contact:** Shannon Cooper-Sadlo, PhD

**Note:** Each cell in the table below will expand as needed to accommodate your responses.

#	<b>Program Learning Outcomes</b> What do the program faculty expect all students to know, or be able to do, as a result of completing this program? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Note: These should be measurable, and manageable in number (typically 4-6 are sufficient).</i></li> </ul>	<b>Assessment Mapping</b> From what specific courses (or other educational/professional experiences) will artifacts of student learning be analyzed to demonstrate achievement of the outcome? Include courses taught at the Madrid campus and/or online as applicable.	<b>Assessment Methods</b> What specific artifacts of student learning will be analyzed? How, and by whom, will they be analyzed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Note: the majority should provide direct, rather than indirect, evidence of achievement.</i></li> </ul> Please note if a rubric is used and, if so, include it as an appendix to this plan.	<b>Use of Assessment Data</b> How and when will analyzed data be used by faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment work? How and when will the program evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes <i>made in previous years</i> ?
1	Students will apply CCJ theory.	Learning outcome will be assessed for students in <i>CCJ 4960: CCJ Capstone</i>	Capstone project: CCJ 4960	Assessment artifacts, rubrics, and examined data will be shared with all CCJ faculty and discussed each fall (early in the semester). Decisions, if appropriate, may be made then to improve/revise program learning outcomes (those assessed in a given year), the CCJ program (including course-wide enhancements and/or assignment/evaluation revisions), and/or our assessment plan. Data will also be shared with the School/College and will be used to acknowledge successes of our program.

2	Students will conduct CCJ research.	Learning outcome will be assessed for students in required <i>CCJ 4960: CCJ Capstone</i>	Capstone project: CCJ 4960	Assessment artifacts, rubrics, and examined data will be shared with all CCJ faculty and discussed each fall (early in the semester). Decisions, if appropriate, may be made then to improve/revise program learning outcomes (those assessed in a given year), the CCJ program (including course-wide enhancements and/or assignment/evaluation revisions), and/or our assessment plan. Data will also be shared with the School/College and will be used to acknowledge successes of our program.
3	Students will identify multicultural CCJ competence.	Learning outcome will be assessed for students in required <i>CCJ 4960: CCJ Capstone</i>	Capstone Project: CCJ 4960	Assessment artifacts, rubrics, and examined data will be shared with all CCJ faculty and discussed each fall (early in the semester). Decisions, if appropriate, may be made then to improve/revise program learning outcomes (those assessed in a given year), the CCJ program (including course-wide enhancements and/or assignment/evaluation revisions), and/or our assessment plan. Data will also be shared with the School/College and will be used to acknowledge successes of our program.
4	Students will apply CCJ theories and/or practices/policies of social, human, and criminal justice.	Learning outcome will be assessed in <i>CCJ 4960: CCJ Capstone</i>	Capstone Project: CCJ 4960	Assessment artifacts, rubrics, and examined data will be shared with all CCJ faculty and discussed each fall (early in the semester). Decisions, if appropriate, may be made then to improve/revise program learning outcomes (those assessed in a given year), the CCJ program (including course-wide enhancements and/or assignment/evaluation revisions), and/or our assessment plan. Data will also be shared with the School/College and will be used to acknowledge

				successes of our program.
5	Students will assess the ethical implications of CCJ and practice ethical principles.	Learning outcome will be assessed for students in required <i>CCJ 4960: CCJ Capstone</i>	Capstone Projects: CCJ 4960	Assessment artifacts, rubrics, and examined data will be shared with all CCJ faculty and discussed each fall (early in the semester). Decisions, if appropriate, may be made then to improve/revise program learning outcomes (those assessed in a given year), the CCJ program (including course-wide enhancements and/or assignment/evaluation revisions), and/or our assessment plan. Data will also be shared with the School/College and will be used to acknowledge successes of our program.

1. On what schedule/cycle will faculty assess each of the above-noted program learning outcomes? (*It is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.*)

CCJ learning outcomes will be discussed and reviewed each year by all CCJ faculty to identify necessary updates or revisions. We will use data from our assessment rubrics to thoroughly review (or re-review) at least two learning outcomes each academic year. We plan to review LOs #3 & #5 for AY 2021-22. We re-reviewed LO #1 AY 2020-2021 as we did not have at least an 80% achievement of mastery when we initially assessed this LO in AY 2019-2020. We will also conduct a more detailed review of all BACCJ program learning outcomes (and our assessment plan) during AY 2021-2022, as we will be completing our assessment cycle after this AY.

2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

All CCJ faculty participated in development of our CCJ program's learning outcomes and participated in the development of our assessment plan. The BACCJ committee meets monthly to review curriculum and discuss changes to the assessment plan and outcome results. All BACCJ faculty have reviewed, commented, and provided feedback on rubrics to assess our learning outcomes. (We also invite current BACCJ students to attend our monthly BACCJ Program meeting and make space available for them to share their input regarding Program Assessment [as well as other Program issues]).

3. On what schedule/cycle will faculty review and, if needed, modify this assessment plan?

Each year CCJ faculty will discuss and review the prior year's data/results and use that to inform the assessment process and plan for the next year. It is anticipated that data will be collected in the spring semester and then be presented/discussed at the beginning of the next fall semester – giving us time to revise, if necessary, our data collection plan for the next spring. Through our faculty discussion of the master measure we are utilizing it was determined that the Capstone project does not explicitly assess competence of two of our learning objectives. This was addressed in Spring of 2021, and changes were implemented so that we would have a more thorough assessment tool available in AY 2021-2022. This fall the BACCJ will continue to review our assessment progress, data, and outcomes and will determine if further changes or enhancements are needed to better measure our outcomes (and, that we have the correct outcomes – if we find that we do not or that we'd like to revise/change any LOs, that will be documented in our revised plan).

Important Note: There may be a wholly new plan implemented for AY 2021/2022 as CCJ faculty will discuss replacement of our current master measure of assessment (BACCJ Capstone Project) with a different master measure of sorts (e.g., an exit examination or other tool). Should the CCJ faculty decide to pursue this change in assessment tool, we will be careful to document the change and how any newly adopted measurement tool accurately and comprehensively allows us to assess student achievement of appropriate learning outcomes.

***IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any assessment rubrics (as noted above) along with this report.***

***Attached to this plan is the comprehensive assignment (BACCJ Capstone Project). The rubric that is also included in this submission includes all the learning objectives addressed by the assignment. The annual report isolates the specified learning objectives identified for review and assessment in a given AY.***

## **Thesis Paper:**

As an integrative exercise bringing together the various strands of your CCJ training, each of you will write a major thesis paper. This paper will be worked on throughout the semester and will be the primary component of your grade in this class. Take it seriously and do a good job. Start work on it now; please don't wait.

Each student is required to write and submit an original thesis paper. This paper must be between 18-20 pages long (exclusive of abstract, references, and tables). In other words, the paper **must contain 18-20 pages of text**. I will stop reading at the bottom of page 20 and will assign your grade based on the first 20 pages. NO EXCEPTIONS. Tables, pictures, figures, etc., must be attached at the end in an appendix if used. References must be listed at the end in 2 reference lists (one for scholarly, one for non-scholarly). Use Times New Roman 12-point font and standard margins. Your paper should be double spaced. **Follow APA and be sure you list page numbers for articles, or they will not be counted as scholarly sources.**

Your paper should also have a **title page** with the title of your paper, your name, and the name of this class on it. Your paper should include an abstract page (200 words approx.) that identifies your problem and explains your policy in summary form (title and abstract pages do not count toward text page minimum/maximum). See the title page example for more details on the format.

The paper's body or text will be divided into **4 major sections** with subheadings as indicated. All headings must be in bold. You may use additional headings as necessary, but you **must** use these at a minimum:

### **Section 1: Introduction (2-4 pages)**

Unless you are laying out a legal framework or other necessary specialized knowledge, avoid rambling and a discussion of empirical studies in the Intro, that is for the Literature Review. You must use concrete evidence that you must cite to establish the problem and quantify the harm (e.g., statistics from government publications). This section should contain specific statistics and/or highlight a particular case that encapsulates your problem in an interesting and thought-provoking way. See the model.

In the Introduction, you must identify a problem within the criminal justice system. You need to completely describe and document the problem. You must use statistics or other hard evidence to quantify the extent of the problem. You may wish to lead in with a specific case highlighting the problem. In this section, you need to marshal facts and evidence persuasively to establish that a problem exists and quantify its magnitude. You need to convince the reader that your problem is sufficiently important and/or sufficiently large to warrant a public policy initiative to address it.

You also need to document specific, concrete harms flowing from the problem. Again, use statistics and other hard evidence to quantify the harm. **The policy you devise in the last section should substantially mitigate these identified harms.** Data showing that a problem is growing is often persuasive. Examples of concrete harm might include increased recidivism, brutalization within the system, wasted money etc. You need to identify a social cost of some kind in concrete terms.

If a legal framework or other specialized knowledge is necessary for understanding and contextualizing your paper, it should be stated here. Do not assume knowledge.

**The last sentence of your introduction must contain the hypothesis you are testing.** This is your research question, and it must explore the existence of a causal relationship. **In other words, you must frame your research question as to whether an independent variable causes a dependent variable.** This hypothesis must explain/contribute to your problem and the associated harms in an obvious way, which you must clearly explain.

For example, your problem may be prison overcrowding. Your concrete harms might include increased violence in prison and inmates' brutalization that result in more and/or more serious crimes when the inmates are released. Your hypothesis is that being African-American increases the likelihood of incarceration, which contributes substantially to overcrowding. Your policy might be to develop sentencing caps to limit sentences for drug offenses (assuming you can empirically show minorities receive disproportionately long sentences for drug offenses and that this is a major driver of overcrowding).

Control variables will be discussed in the literature review but need not be stated here (control variables are other factors known to influence your dependent variable, in this example, your dependent variable is incarceration, offense severity and prior criminal record are two factors known to influence being incarcerated as well as the length of incarceration so they would be appropriate control variables).

**The research question must be causal in nature but does not have to use the word cause.** Acceptable examples include: Does race contribute to sentence severity? Do zero-tolerance policies increase incarceration rates among young African-American males? Does being female make it more likely that you will receive a lenient sentence?

## Section 2: Theory (2-4 pages)

You need to engage in a sophisticated and nuanced discussion of which theory or theories informed your paper (it is better to do a good job with 1 than to cursorily mention several, **in no case should you try to cover more than 3 theories.** A thorough discussion of multiple theories may be hard to do in only 5 pages, and a superficial discussion will adversely affect your grade. Each theory must be fully explained. Tell me about the origin and history of the theory. Who developed it? Be sure to mention any and all significant elaborations/modifications beyond the original theory, especially if they relate to your paper somehow. I expect a nuanced and expert discussion of the theory, which is why you shouldn't try to talk about a bunch of them. Explain all concepts associated with the theory in detail, and be sure I can tell that you understand how the theory works and what it purports to explain. Be sure to elaborate on any underlying assumptions the theory rests on (e.g., what assumptions about human nature underlie this theory?). Look at Vold and Bernard's Crim Theory textbook as a place to start (this is not a scholarly source because it's a textbook, but it's a useful place to start).

The theory might explain an association between your independent and dependent variables or inform your policy selection. Examples: Race threat theory as an explanation for disproportionate minority confinement. Strain theory as an explanation for why members of the urban underclass commit more crimes than wealthy people. Theory may explain why you selected your policy. Example: Your problem is prison overcrowding; your theory is selective incapacitation, which informed your selection of a first timer diversion program followed up by long sentences for 3rd-time offenders. Other examples, a policy advocating for harsher penalties may be predicated on the classical theory of criminology and deterrence, which focuses on crime as a product of free will and humans as rational actors who can be dissuaded from crime by swift, certain and severe penalties.

Penal policies will probably be predicated on a theory of punishment like retribution, deterrence, incapacitation, or rehabilitation, etc. A crime control policy may be predicated on a criminological theory like social disorganization, social control, or strain.

A court's policy may relate to the working group theory.

The point is theory must be clearly integrated into and must inform your work. You may not do an a-theoretical project for this assignment. You need to tie it to theory in some way. Make sure theory is covered before you pick a topic.

Your theory section should be placed before your literature review if it primarily explains associations important for understanding your problem (e.g. associations between independent and dependent variables) or at the beginning of your policy section if you used it primarily to select a policy response.

### **Section 3: Literature Review (6-8 pages)**

In this section, you should do a comprehensive and exhaustive assessment of the existing empirical literature relevant to your research question (independent – dependent variable relationship). This needs to be a thematic and synthetic evaluation of existing scholarly, empirical literature and not a serial recitation of many studies or a bunch of statistics. In other words, this is not a book report. Avoid listing studies serially and then just summarizing them. An example of this is saying “Smith and Jones found X” and then summarizing their study and findings before moving on to the next study. Rather, your literature review must show a synthesis and integration of the empirical literature.

Avoid picking a problem that does not have enough empirical literature for you to do this project. A discussion of naked stats or theorizing is not adequate. **You need to have 8 (or more) empirical studies that you are evaluating and synthesizing (See references section for the total number of required sources).** Naked stats from governmental periodicals or other sources do **not** belong here – use them in your intro to quantify your problem and resulting harms.

You should organize the literature review thematically. **You must use at least 3 thematically derived subheadings to organize and integrate your literature. All headings and subheadings must be in bold.**

The lit review should include an analysis of all of the prior works of empirical significance which inform your study, and they should be organized conceptually, not chronologically or serially. Look at the existing scholarly literature. What factors are important or relevant to your problem? Is there evidence of race or gender bias? Do legal factors like prior records and charged offenses predict outcomes relevant to your problem? What other factors, correlates, or causes are identified in the literature, and what does the literature suggest about their impact? **You must use subheadings (minimum of 3) so I can see how you have thematically arranged the literature.** Look at the examples of literature reviews sent to you for more information.

### **Section 4: Policy (6-8 pages)**

You will craft a **substantive (not symbolic), evidence-based policy** informed by and responsive to the relevant research evaluated in the literature portion of the paper. In this Policy section, you will **(do it in this order and use these subheadings)**. The purpose of this part of the paper is to explain the content and goals of your policy clearly and concretely (be sure to indicate what would constitute success). In the next portion, you need to advocate for your policy.

Part 1. Explain what the policy is, what it does, and how it will be implemented.

**Content:** Begin with a clear and complete explanation of the content of your proposed policy.



It must be concrete, specific, and thorough. Remember your policy must be substantive, not symbolic, and must be evidence-based (it should be obvious to me how the evidence you discussed in the lit review would lead to your selected policy, make sure there is a clear connection, the policy needs to fix/ameliorate your identified harms).

**Goals:** Clearly and explicitly identify your policy's goals (what are the concrete outcomes you are hoping to achieve?). *These goals should relate to relieving/mitigating the concrete harms you specified in your Intro as flowing from your problem.* Be specific.

## **Part 2. Advocate your policy and address likely critiques.**

In this section, you need to define your policy community and craft a convincing argument that your policy comports with legal requirements and is likely to have benefits that exceed its costs and problems. Be sure to specifically address:

### **Ethical Issues:**

What ethical arguments may someone make regarding your policy? How would you answer those arguments? At least two ethical theories must support your counterarguments. How might ensure that ethical issues that may arise can be addressed?

### **Multiculturalism:**

In advocating for your policy, discuss how inclusivity is part of your policy design. Explain how your policy will be equitable, acknowledges the barriers faced by marginalized groups, and successfully ensures that everyone with your identified issue has the same access or benefit under your policy.

## **Part 3. Implementation: Explain how the policy will be implemented (Use a subheading for each bolded section)**

In this section, develop and articulate your implementation plan. How will your policy be brought into effect? Does it have to be voted on by an organization's board of directors? Maybe you need to lobby the legislature – what interest groups might be relevant? Where applicable, apply what we learned about policymaking in the first part of the class.

**Education:** In this section, you will identify the people or organizations you will need to educate about your policy and how this will occur. How will you get these people to “buy into” your policy? Who might be some viable partners?

**American Criminal Justice System:** Explain how your policy fits within the existing American criminal justice system. Is it legal (i.e., are there potential constitutional problems, what are they, and how will you deal with them)? Is it supportive of American values and ideals concerning

justice? Is your policy primarily concerned with advancing social order (crime control) or protecting individual rights (due process)? What safeguards might be necessary to ensure that your policy is implemented appropriately? Is it analogous to other aspects of the system, and/or have similar policies already been enacted?

**Cost/Benefit Analysis.** Evaluate your policy in terms of efficiency; what resources will you need to carry out your policy? How much will it cost? What are your potential cost savings? Explain why it is a wise or efficient use of resources. Remember, the goal is to use the least amount of resources necessary to accomplish your result. Obviously, this part will be somewhat speculative, but use reason and logic and, where possible get actual cost data (e.g., you could probably find out what the average new prison costs to construct or how much it costs to employ the average police officer). Are there competing goals that will be sacrificed (this is a cost)?

**Externalities.** What might be a side effect (positive or negative)? Be sure to elaborate on the likely unintended consequences that are likely to flow from your proposed policy. How will negative externalities be managed and positive ones capitalized upon?

**Enforcement Mechanism:** Articulate how you will ensure that your policy is enforced? Will there be positive incentives such as access to grants or funding?

The fed can always withhold access to funds to get the states to fall in line as they did with the 21-drinking age, or you may need the Supreme Court to make or alter a ruling. Research other methods of policy enforcement and create something you think is viable.

#### **Part 4. Evaluation**

**Evaluation Methodology:** Discuss how the effects (concrete goals described above) can be measured. What type of assessment mechanism will you put in place to measure the impact of the policy? Will you use a qualitative or quantitative method?

**Equity Outcomes:** Are the outputs and burdens of your policy equitably distributed? If not, why not, and why is potential inequity warranted (perhaps the problem targets one segment of society; thus relief need only target that segment)? Are there potential race, class, or gender affects you need to consider?

**Effective:** Consider how effective the policy is likely to be. **Argue for its efficacy but be sure to address/consider probable critiques.** You need evidence that your policy is going to work. Use existing evaluative research on similar or analogous programs.

How will you deal with problems that are likely to arise? Why is your policy still a good idea, or how do you mitigate/overcome likely critiques? This is where you make an evidence-based argument for why your policy is good public policy.

You will need to refute potential critiques. Be sure to cite literature that supports your policy's efficacy and/or refutes or mitigates obvious critiques.

**Intervention effect.** How will you know if your policy is a success? How will assessments be used to improve the policy?

Also:

1. Review the **6 C's of policy evaluation** (Concentration, Clarity, Challenge, Changeability, Coordination, and Consistency) to ensure your policy analysis has been complete and thorough.
2. Remember, you are advocating for your policy, but you must also realistically assess the downsides. The results of empirical evaluations of the same or similar policies should be integrated in the policy section to support your argument.
3. If your policy is truly novel, try to analogize it to existing evaluative work. There should be some citation to existing authority (professional literature) in your policy section.

## References

You must cite use APA 6<sup>th</sup> edition. Use APA citation in the text of your paper. The minimum number of required sources for this assignment is 20. **You must have at least 15 scholarly sources, of which at least 8 must be empirical studies, plus an additional 5 sources that may or may not be scholarly.** Scholarly sources are peer-reviewed journal articles or books from scholarly presses. Sources listed without page numbers in the reference they will not count as scholarly. All quotes must have a pn (page number) in the citation within the text itself.

**Internet sites or popular media sources like newspapers or magazines never count as scholarly.**

**Examples of scholarly journals** include *Criminology*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Crime and Delinquency*, *Sociology and Social Research*, *Law and Society Review*, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *Social Forces*, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *Women and Criminal Justice*, & *British Journal of Criminology*.

Law reviews are not technically peer-reviewed but they count as scholarly if they are from an accredited law school. Examples: *American Criminal Law Review*, *Harvard Law Review*, or any other law review published by an accredited law school (check [http://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal\\_education/resources/aba\\_approved\\_law\\_schools.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/aba_approved_law_schools.html) if unsure about accreditation status).

Websites of professional CJ organizations, while not scholarly sources themselves, may lead you to statistics and resources that are scholarly

Books published by **academic presses** like Oxford, North Carolina or other University press also count as scholarly but textbooks and books published by non-academic presses like Penguin, McMillan etc. do not count as scholarly. **Materials used for this class do not count toward your source total but may be used.**

**Your reference list must clearly distinguish scholarly from non-scholarly source (i.e. you will have 2 reference lists one designated scholarly and one designated non-scholarly). You must use APA 6<sup>th</sup> edition reference style (see section on APA below) for your reference list and internal citations within the paper. You must list page numbers for all references.**

### **Public Presentation**

As part of your Capstone experience, you will be required to present your research in a semi-professional forum that allows you to demonstrate the knowledge gained not just as a result of the work put into your project but as a culmination of the four years of effort and education as a Criminology and Criminal Justice major. **Each student will prepare a 10-minute presentation using PowerPoint.** This presentation will summarize your paper. After you give your presentation, the audience, comprised of your classmates, the faculty, and guests, will have an opportunity to ask you questions, so be prepared to answer questions about your presentation.

This is to be a professional presentation, and you are expected to approach it as such. You should **wear interview-appropriate clothing and practice your presentation until you can deliver it smoothly and in the 10-minute timeframe** (presentations that deviate from the 10-minute requirement will be penalized as appropriate). You are strongly encouraged to invite **at least** two guests to this event. If possible, I highly recommend you invite family members so they can see first-hand the culmination of your academic career in your chosen major. This is a Zoom event.



Name

Thesis Rubric - Capstone

Description

Rubric Detail

Criteria	Levels of Achievement			
	Novice	Competent	Proficient	Advanced
Introduction	<p><b>0 to 3.45 points</b></p> <p>Problem may not be clearly identified or described. Student may ramble or list statistics or hard evidence to quantify the extent of the problem. Student may struggle to convince the reader that the problem is important, causes harm or warrants a public policy. The hypothesis could be more clear or could be in a better location per the assignment.</p>	<p><b>3.5 to 3.95 points</b></p> <p>Problem is identified and described. Student uses statistics or hard evidence to quantify the extent of the problem. Student convinces the reader that the problem is important, causes harm and warrants a public policy. The hypothesis is stated in the last line or within the introduction.</p>	<p><b>3.96 to 4.45 points</b></p> <p>Problem is clearly identified and described. Student does a good job of using statistics or hard evidence to quantify the extent of the problem. Student sufficiently convinces the reader that the problem is important, causes harm and warrants a public policy. Causal hypothesis is clearly stated in the last line of the introduction.</p>	<p><b>4.5 to 5 points</b></p> <p>Problem is clearly identified. Student does an exemplary job of using statistics or hard evidence to quantify the extent of the problem. Student more than sufficiently convinces the reader that the problem is important, causes harm and warrants a public policy. Causal hypothesis is clearly stated in the last line of the introduction.</p>

	<b>Levels of Achievement</b>			
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Novice</b>	<b>Competent</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
<b>Theory</b>	<p><b>0 to 3.45 points</b></p> <p>Student engaged in a vague discussion of criminological theories . Student discussed some but not all of the following: to whom the theory is attributed, the development of the theory and modifications of the theory, especially those that impact the student's topic. The student's may or may not have preceded the literature review as per the assignment's instructions.</p>	<p><b>3.5 to 3.95 points</b></p> <p>Student engaged in a functional discussion of criminological theories . Student discussed some for not all of the following: to whom the theory was attributed, the development of the theory and modifications of the theory, especially those that impact the student's topic. The student's discussion of theory preceded the literature review as per the assignment's instructions.</p>	<p><b>3.96 to 4.45 points</b></p> <p>Student engaged in a well organized discussion of no more than three criminological theories. Student discussed to whom the theory was attributed, the development of the theory and modifications of the theory, especially those that impact the student's topic. The student's discussion of theory preceded the literature review as per the assignment's instructions.</p>	<p><b>4.5 to 5 points</b></p> <p>Student engaged in a sophisticated and nuanced discussion of no more than three criminological theories. Student discussed to whom the theory was attributed, the development of the theory and modifications of the theory, especially those that impact the student's topic. Theory was clearly thematic and integrated into and informs the student's work. The student's discussion of theory preceded the literature review as per the assignment's instructions.</p>
<b>Literature Review</b>	<p><b>0 to 3.45 points</b></p> <p>Student attempted to perform a synthetic evaluation of empirical studies. Student listed studies serially and showed little synthesis and integration of the empirical literature.</p>	<p><b>3.5 to 3.95 points</b></p> <p>Student attempted to perform a synthetic evaluation of empirical studies. Student listed studies serially but showed some synthesis and integration of the empirical literature.</p>	<p><b>3.96 to 4.45 points</b></p> <p>Student performed a synthetic evaluation of empirical studies. Student avoided listing studies serially and showed a synthesis and integration of the empirical literature. The student demonstrated that they are conversant with the empirical evidence and clearly articulates the relationship between the hypothesis and the selected data.</p>	<p><b>4.5 to 5 points</b></p> <p>Student performed a thematic and synthetic evaluation of empirical studies. Student avoided listing studies serially and showed a synthesis and integration of the empirical literature. The student demonstrated that they are conversant with the empirical evidence and clearly articulates the relationship between the hypothesis and the selected data.</p>

Criteria	Levels of Achievement			
	Novice	Competent	Proficient	Advanced
<b>Policy</b>	<p><b>0 to 3.45 points</b></p> <p>The policy duplicates one already in use OR is not substantive evidence based and non-responsive to most of the relevant research evaluated in the literature portion of the paper. The content, goals, and measure of success of the policy are outlined but are very vague.</p>	<p><b>3.5 to 3.95 points</b></p> <p>The policy is or evidence based and responsive to most of the relevant research evaluated in the literature portion of the paper. The content, goals, and measure of success of the policy are outlined but could be more clearly defined.</p>	<p><b>3.96 to 4.45 points</b></p> <p>The policy is original, substantive, evidence based and responsive to most of the relevant research evaluated in the literature portion of the paper. The content, goals, and measure of success of the policy are outlined but could be more clear.</p>	<p><b>4.5 to 5 points</b></p> <p>The policy is original, substantive, evidence based, and responsive to the relevant research evaluated in the literature portion of the paper. The content, goals, and measure of success of the policy are clearly outlined.</p>
<b>Multiculturalism and Identity</b>	<p><b>0 to 3.45 points</b></p> <p>With direction, this policy could better discuss how inclusivity is part of the policy design. It further lacks some clarity regarding how the policy will be equitable, acknowledge the barriers faced by marginalized groups, and falls short of successfully ensuring that those with the identified issue has the same access or benefit under the policy.</p>	<p><b>3.5 to 3.95 points</b></p> <p>The policy attempts to discuss how inclusivity is part of the policy design. It further lacks some detail regarding how the policy will be equitable, acknowledging the barriers faced by marginalized groups, and successfully ensuring that everyone with the identified issue has the same access or benefit under the policy</p>	<p><b>3.96 to 4.45 points</b></p> <p>The policy discusses how inclusivity is part of the policy design. Attempts to explain how the policy will be equitable, acknowledge the barriers faced by marginalized groups, and lays a foundation that many with the identified issue will have the same access or benefit under the policy.</p>	<p><b>4.5 to 5 points</b></p> <p>The policy discusses how inclusivity is part of the policy design. Explains how the policy will be equitable, acknowledge the barriers faced by marginalized groups, and successfully ensure that everyone with the identified issue has the same access or benefit under the policy.</p>



	<b>Levels of Achievement</b>			
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Novice</b>	<b>Competent</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
<b>Ethics</b>	<p><b>0 to 3.45 points</b></p> <p>Ethical arguments regarding the policy are vaguely identified and discussed. Fewer than two ethical theories supported counter arguments and a basic discussion attempted to remedy how ethical issues that could arise from the policy might be addressed.</p>	<p><b>3.5 to 3.95 points</b></p> <p>Ethical arguments regarding the policy are competently identified and discussed. At least two ethical theories supported counter arguments and a basic discussion addressed how ethical issues that could arise from the policy might be addressed.</p>	<p><b>3.96 to 4.45 points</b></p> <p>Ethical arguments regarding the policy are somewhat identified and discussed. At least two ethical theories supported counter arguments and a skilled discussion addressed how ethical issues that could arise from the policy might be addressed.</p>	<p><b>4.5 to 5 points</b></p> <p>Ethical arguments regarding the policy are clearly identified and discussed. At least two ethical theories supported counter arguments and a nuanced discussion addressed how ethical issues that could arise from the policy might be addressed.</p>
<b>Formatting &amp; Organization</b>	<p><b>0 to 0.5 points</b></p> <p>Thesis vaguely states the hypothesis attempts to be the focal point throughout each section the paper. Each of the four sections is included in the paper but may or may not be the order as in the assignment. Sections are not within the requisite page count. APA 6th Edition rules are followed as outlined in the assignment with several errors. Requisite number of sources may or may not be used as outlined in assignment.</p>	<p><b>0.6 to 1 points</b></p> <p>Thesis states the hypothesis and is mostly the focal point throughout each section the paper. Each of the four sections are in the order as outlined in the assignment and are within the requisite page count. APA 6th Edition rules are followed as outlined in the assignment with 6 or fewer errors. Requisite number of sources are used as outlined in assignment.</p>	<p><b>1.1 to 2 points</b></p> <p>Thesis clearly and concisely states the hypothesis and is consistently the focal point throughout each section the paper. Each of the four sections are in the order as outlined in the assignment and are within the requisite page count. APA 6th Edition rules are followed as outlined in the assignment 2 or fewer errors. Requisite number of sources are used as outlined in assignment.</p>	<p><b>2.1 to 2.5 points</b></p> <p>Thesis clearly and concisely states the hypothesis and is consistently the focal point throughout each section the paper. Each of the four sections are in the order as outlined in the assignment and are within the requisite page count. APA 6th Edition rules are followed as outlined in the assignment without errors. Requisite number of sources are used as outlined in assignment.</p>

Criteria	Levels of Achievement			
	Novice	Competent	Proficient	Advanced
Grammar	<p><b>0 to 0.5 points</b></p> <p>Grammar and language usage errors which interfere with writer's purpose</p>	<p><b>0.6 to 1 points</b></p> <p>Some grammar and language usage errors, but not severe enough to interfere significantly with writer's purpose</p>	<p><b>1.1 to 2 points</b></p> <p>Few grammar and language and usage errors.</p>	<p><b>2.1 to 2.5 points</b></p> <p>Free of grammar and language and usage errors.</p>

---

[View Associated Items](#)

Print

Close Window

Name

Updated 10 Point Capstone Presentation Rubric

Description

Rubric Detail

	<b>Levels of Achievement</b>			
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Novice</b>	<b>Competent</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Capstone</b>
<b>Context</b>	<p><b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Speaker fails to adapt to the context (e.g., public speaking, interpersonal, small group and teams); and demonstrates some cultural bias and is insensitive to the needs of a diverse audience. Language choices are unclear, inappropriate to the audience and minimally support the effectiveness of the message.</p>	<p><b>0.5 Points</b></p> <p>Speaker attempts to adapt to the context (e.g., public speaking, interpersonal, small group and teams) and inconsistently demonstrates respect and sensitivity for diverse audiences. Language choices are mundane and commonplace and only partially support the effectiveness of the message</p>	<p><b>1 Points</b></p> <p>Speaker adapts to the context (e.g., public speaking, interpersonal, small group and teams) and demonstrates respect and sensitivity for diverse audiences. Language choices are thoughtful, appropriate, and generally support the effectiveness of the message</p>	<p><b>2 Points</b></p> <p>Speaker skillfully adapts style and message to the context (e.g., public speaking, interpersonal, small group and teams) and consistently demonstrates respect and sensitivity for diverse audiences Language choices are imaginative, memorable, compelling, and appropriate and enhance the effectiveness of the message.</p>
<b>Organization</b>	<p><b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Organizational pattern is not observable within in the message. Presents little or no evidence of valid research. Very few in-text citations.</p>	<p><b>0.5 Points</b></p> <p>Organizational pattern is attempted within the message. Presents evidence of research with sources. Missing some in-text citations.</p>	<p><b>1 Points</b></p> <p>Organizational pattern is observable within the message. Presents evidence of valid research with multiple sources. Missing very few in-text citations.</p>	<p><b>2 Points</b></p> <p>Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable, well-structured, and makes the content of the message cohesive. Provides evidence of extensive and valid research. All in-text citations present.</p>

Criteria	Levels of Achievement			
	Novice	Competent	Proficient	Capstone
<b>Delivery</b>	<p><b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Speaker fails to demonstrate mastery of delivery techniques and appears uncomfortable and/or completes more than 1 minute prior to required time.</p>	<p><b>0.5 Points</b></p> <p>Speaker demonstrates some mastery of delivery techniques and appears hesitant and or completes more than 30 seconds but fewer than 1 minute than required time.</p>	<p><b>1 Points</b></p> <p>Speaker demonstrates mastery of delivery techniques and appears comfortable and/or completes more than 15 seconds but fewer than than 30 seconds prior to required time.</p>	<p><b>2 Points</b></p> <p>Speaker consistently demonstrates mastery of delivery techniques and appears polished and confident. Completes in no more than 15 seconds prior to required time time.</p>
<b>Supporting Materials</b>	<p><b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Fails to provide supporting materials or make reference to information that supports the message or establishes the speaker's credibility/authority on the topic.</p>	<p><b>0.5 Points</b></p> <p>Occasionally provides supporting materials and makes reference to information or analysis that supports the message or establishes the speaker's credibility/authority on the topic</p>	<p><b>1 Points</b></p> <p>Provides supporting material and makes appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the message or establishes the speaker's credibility/authority on the topic</p>	<p><b>2 Points</b></p> <p>Provides a variety of supporting material and makes appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the message or establishes the speaker's credibility/authority on the topic.</p>
<b>Central Message</b>	<p><b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Central message is not explicitly stated or understandable. Little to no theoretical references to problem or solution.</p>	<p><b>0.5 Points</b></p> <p>Central message is understandable but is not often repeated or memorable. Limited theoretical references to problem or solution.</p>	<p><b>1 Points</b></p> <p>Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material. Ample theoretical references to problem and solution.</p>	<p><b>2 Points</b></p> <p>Central message is compelling and strongly supported. Theory is well discussed in relationship to problem and solution.</p>

[View Associated Items](#)

