Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Criminology and Criminal Justice	Department:
Degree or Certificate Level: BA	College/School: School of Social Work/ College for Public Health and Social Justice
Date (Month/Year): December 11,2020	Primary Assessment Contact: Shannon Cooper-Sadlo, PhD

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 2019-2020

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? AY 2020-21

1. Student Learning Outcomes
Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

We identified two LOs for this Program Assessment Plan, we have assessed BACCJ learning outcomes (LOs) LO #1 and #4.

1)   Students will apply CCJ theory.
4)   Students will apply CCJ theories and/or practices/policies of social, human, and criminal justice.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning
Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved this outcome? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Individual student data was collected from one CCJ courses: CCJ 4960 (CCJ Capstone). Capstone papers from CCJ 4960 were utilized for the assessment of our graduating seniors' ability to identify CCJ theories and apply those CCJ theories and/or practices/policies of social, human, and criminal justice.

No Madrid student artifacts were included in our assessment activities.

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process
What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

At least one CCJ faculty member and the CCJ Programs Director reviewed each student paper/test to identify how well, overall, our graduating BACCJ students met LO #1 and 4. More specifically, Professor Brumfield-Young reviewed each CCJ 4960 Capstone project. Professor Brumfield-Young shared the rubric and results with Dr. Shannon Cooper-Sadlo (Program Director). This information was presented to the BACCJ committee for discussion, regarding how to improve student performance for these specific learning objectives.

Rubric, grading form, and assignment are included with this report.

4. **Data/Results**

   What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcomes? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

   At least one CCJ faculty member and the CCJ Programs Director reviewed each student paper/test to identify how well, overall, our graduating BACCJ students met LO #1 and 4. More specifically, Professor Brumfield-Young reviewed each CCJ 4960 Capstone project. Professor Brumfield-Young shared the rubric and results with Dr. Shannon Cooper-Sadlo (Program Director). This information was presented to the BACCJ committee for discussion, regarding how to improve student performance for these specific learning objectives.

   Only offer face to face, on-ground STL courses.

5. **Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions**

   What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

   The data showed that in our theory and application courses it is important to continue to stress and evaluate students' understanding of how theory influences practice. There is further discussion regarding how to highlight specific theories that are relevant for current evidence-based practices.
   We identified 80% as the marker for competence of the LO. Results are as follows:
   19 students completed the capstone project. The specific sections that addressed LO #1 and #4 are identified in the rubric/grading scale and is included in this report. Students at the end of their senior year are evaluated. Below are the scores:
   1)15/19= 78% of students achieved 80% (4 out 5 points)
   2)16/19= 84.2% of students achieved 80% (5.6 out of 7 points)

6. **Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings**
   A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

   Our CCJ faculty meet monthly during the regular academic year and, as such, the assessment findings and further discussion surrounding our assessment plan and this year's report was on our September meeting agenda. The discussion regarding recommendations for change/revision in any program area (or in our assessment activities), took place, initially, at our first meeting (and continue for as long as we need to discuss). As part of our ongoing assessment work we will add "assessment tasks" as a standing item on our monthly meeting agenda and pay careful attention to soliciting feedback from faculty who apply the assessment rubrics to their courses/course activities. All BACCJ Program areas are appropriate foci for our assessment activities and we will make a concerted ongoing effort to discuss assessment, including our plan, its implementation, and the tools (e.g., assignments, rubrics, etc.) used to engage in this important endeavor. The BACCJ committee also invited current BACCJ students to participate in the monthly meetings in order to include student input and feedback.

   B. How specifically have you decided to use findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

   Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies
   - Course content
   - Teaching techniques
   - Improvements in technology
   - Prerequisites
   - Course sequence
   - New courses
   - Deletion of courses
   - Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan	• Student learning outcomes • Student artifacts collected • Evaluation process	• Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics) • Data collection methods • Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of the findings.

It was determined that we would review our course content to ensure our students are able to identify and apply theory into practice. This will include a further exploration of how we integrate theories of human development and theories of diversity, equity, and inclusion. This assessment also has helped us to determine faculty teaching needs for the program.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

7. **Closing the Loop: Review of** <u>Previous</u> **Assessment Findings and Changes**

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

We have changed the evaluation tool to the capstone project as the singular and inclusive measure. The program has also used assessment findings to develop new learning objectives.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

Once the learning objectives were re-evaluated, the committee determined that it was more helpful to use one comprehensive measure that only assessed BACCJ students and was administered in a course. The exit interview that was utilized previously was not always completed. Further, the capstone course is only available to seniors in the BACCJ program, while the exams previously used were in courses that allowed non BACCJ students. The faculty will be reviewing the master measure to ensure that there is an opportunity for explicit measurement in the capstone project.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

The program was able to identify the specific needs of the students and the program and implement programmatic and curricular changes to address areas of growth.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

We will continue to utilize the results of our assessment to inform our curricula and program offerings. The assessment has also helped the program to identify faculty needs for future hires.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.

Capstone Project: LO #1 & #4
Policy (6-8 pages)
You will craft a substantive (not symbolic), evidence-based policy which is 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 clearly and concretely explain the content and goals of your policy (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 the goals of your policy (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.

Implementation: Explain how the policy will be implemented (e.g., do you need an enforcement mechanism, if so what will you use?). How will you monitor/ensure compliance? The fed can always hold money hostage to get the states to fall in line like they did with the 21 drinking age or you may need the Supreme Court to make or alter a ruling. Maybe you need to lobby the legislature – what interests groups might be relevant? Where applicable, apply what we learned about policy making in the first part of the class.

Part 2. Advocate your policy and address likely critiques.
In this part 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 which exceeds the costs and problems associated with it. Be sure to specifically address:
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 in an appropriate manner? 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)?

Equity. 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. What mechanism will you put in place to measure the impact of the policy? 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 which supports the efficacy of your policy and/or refutes or mitigates obvious critiques.

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?

Intervention effect. Discuss how the effects (concrete goals described above) can be measured. How will you know if your policy is a success? How will assessments be used to improve the policy?