

## Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Criminology and Criminal Justice	Department:
Degree or Certificate Level: Bachelor of Arts in Criminology and Criminal Justice (BACCJ)	College/School: School of Social Work/ College for Public Health and Social Justice
Date (Month/Year): August 2021	Primary Assessment Contact: Shannon Cooper-Sadlo, PhD
In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 2020-21	
In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? AY 2021-22	

### 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 #2:

- 1) Students will apply CCJ theory.
- 2) Students will conduct CCJ research.

### 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.

Student data was collected from one overarching CCJ course: CCJ 4960 (CCJ Capstone). Capstone research papers and presentations from CCJ 4960 were used to assess our graduating seniors' ability to identify and apply CCJ theories. The Capstone research paper requires CCJ students to undertake and present a comprehensive CCJ research project. Thus, students' achievement on the Capstone research project and presentation (in its entirety) represents the extent to which students attained LO 2 whereas students' achievement on the theory component/expectations of the Capstone research project represents the extent to which students attained LO 1.

No Madrid student artifacts were included in our assessment activities. We do not offer off-campus courses.

### 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.

CCJ faculty and the BACCJ Program Director reviewed students' achievement on the required Capstone research project (and each of its requisite components) to identify how well, overall, our graduating BACCJ students met LOs #1 and #2 (the learning outcomes under examination for AY 2020/2021). This information was shared with the BACCJ committee. Discussion surrounded the results for students' achievement of both LOs, including potential pathways to improve student performance on for these specific learning objectives and overall, in the BACCJ Program. Additional discussion was had regarding the appropriateness of the BACCJ Program's learning objectives (LOs) (e.g., do our learning objectives need to be enhanced or revised) as well as the extent to which our primary assessment artifact (i.e., the BACCJ Capstone project) still captures students' attainment of our LOs and/or if we need to develop a better tool (e.g., an exit exam).

Capstone assignment information (including the theory components (LO #1), rubric, and grading form are all attached at the end of 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)?

The BACCJ Program identifies 80% as our competency/LO mastery benchmark. More specifically, we define students as competent if they have mastered each of our LOs by achieving 80% or higher on the components of the assessment tool that correspond to each LO. Moreover, the BACCJ Program sets our Program competency benchmark at 80% too – i.e., 80% of all graduating students must be competent in/have mastered (at the benchmark level or higher) in each LO area.

1) Students will apply CCJ theory: **88.2% achieved 80% or higher (15/17 students).** 2) Students will conduct CCJ research: **76.4% achieved 80% or higher (13/17 students).**

CCJ faculty and the CCJ Programs Director reviewed students' achievement on the required Capstone research project (and each of its requisite components) to identify how well, overall, our graduating BACCJ students met LOs #1 and #2 (the learning outcomes under examination for AY 2020/2021). More specifically, Professor Brumfield-Young reviewed each CCJ 4960 Capstone project. Professor Brumfield-Young shared the assignments, rubric and results with Dr. Shannon Cooper-Sadlo (BACCJ Program Director). This information was also shared with the BACCJ committee for discussion (see specific discussion points highlighted above). Due to COVID protocols during Spring 2021, the BACCJ Capstone course was offered in a hybrid modality. It is unclear, at this time, the impact the course's hybrid modality had, if any, on our students' achievement. In our next assessment period (AY 2021/2022), we plan to offer the course using our traditional, in-person model; thus, we will be able to examine/explore differences in student scores, if any, across the two years and, may better understand the differential impact (again, if any) of the two course modalities.

In non-pandemic (and post-pandemic) times, CCJ only offers face-to-face, on-ground courses at the St. Louis campus.

#### 5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

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

The data indicate that it is critical that we continue to challenge our students, expose them to important CCJ theoretical frameworks and timely analyses/research examination of the applicability of these theories as well as rigorous examination of CJ policies and practices. It also indicates, as discussed in more detail below, that the revisions made to our CCJ theories courses had a positive impact on students' ability to apply CCJ theory (as was assessed in the Capstone Project). Although not reported as part of this year's report, we also identified other areas of learning assessed in the Capstone Project that may need further reinforcement and curricular revision (e.g., ethical foundation, multiculturalism) as they seemed to bring the overall scores on the Capstone Projects lower. This brief examination suggested to the CCJ faculty that we should more carefully examine how we are teaching in each of these areas and, thus, we plan to assess the related LOs in these areas for our next annual assessment cycle.

#### 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 potential/likely revisions to our assessment plan and the current report is on our September meeting agenda. The discussion regarding recommendations for change/revision in any program area (or in our assessment activities), will take place, initially, at our first meeting (and continue for as long as we need to discuss). As part of our ongoing assessment work, we have added "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 continue to make a concerted effort to discuss assessment, including enhancing and/or revising our annual assessment plan, issues pertaining to the implementation of our plan, and the tools (e.g., assignments, rubrics, etc.) used to engage in this important endeavor. The BACCJ committee also invites current BACCJ students to participate in the monthly meetings to solicit and include student input and feedback on assessment.

**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.

The CCJ Program committee determined that we would review all CCJ courses' content to ensure our students are able to incorporate the knowledge from across the BACCJ curriculum into a comprehensive research project/presentation that includes appropriate opportunities to assess mastery of each of the five BACCJ Program learning objectives. As a result of this year's assessment activities and data, we identified that the BACCJ Program is doing a pretty good job at facilitating graduating students' competency for LO #1 (application of CCJ theory) and approaches the 80% mastery benchmark for LO #2 (conducting CCJ research). However, in assessing LOs #1 and 2 this year, we also identified two areas in the BACCJ Capstone project in which, had we elected to examine those areas – ethics (LO #5) and multicultural competence (LO #3) – for the current assessment report, we would have been severely disappointed. Thus, while we feel that good progress has been made on student achievement of LO #1, we know that there are other areas bringing down student achievement on LO #2 (conducting research – which is measured by the entirety of the BACCJ Capstone Project). As indicated in our 2021/2022 Assessment Plan document, we will further explore and examine how we can more strongly integrate and reinforce CCJ ethical foundations and multicultural competence throughout the CCJ curriculum and particularly in ethics- and multiculturalism- and race-focused classes. Once again, although not intentionally focused to do so, our assessment activities and discussions also help up better determine faculty fit for CCJ courses as well as teaching needs.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

NA

## 7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

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

Our AY 2019-20 assessment report indicated that our BACCJ students were having difficulties applying CCJ theory (we did not meet our self-identified 80% mastery threshold). The CCJ Program committee conducted a curricular review of both of our CCJ theory classes and made changes to the courses and (including assignments) to improve student competency in this area – which this year's (2020/2021) data suggests they have (88%, 15/17, of our graduating BACCJ students met or exceeded our 80% benchmark for this LO).

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

LO #1 (applying theory) was assessed in AY 2019/2020 and achievement was not where we wanted it to be. Thus, as noted above, enhancements were made to both CCJ theories courses, including revisions to in-course assignments and evaluations, and then this LO was re-examined as part of our assessment plan for AY 2020/2021 – the data reported on herein (with 15/17 [88%] graduating BACCJ students achieving or surpassing our 80% benchmark for this LO).

**C. What were the findings of the assessment?**

The findings demonstrated that the changes made in both of our CCJ theories courses resulted in an increase in the percentage of students who reached the 80% benchmark. In AY 19-20, 78% of graduating BACCJ students achieved the 80% benchmark whereas in this past year, AY 20-21, 88.2% achieved at least the 80% benchmark, representing a better than 10% increase in students' mastery/competency of LO #1 (application of CCJ theory).

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

We will continue to utilize the results of our annual assessment data and activities to inform our BACCJ curriculum and related program offerings and enhancements (e.g., opportunities for student exposure to reinforcement of classroom learning). The assessment has also helped the CCJ Program to identify deficiencies in areas of faculty expertise allowing us to consider those needs when discussing current adjunct hiring and future adjunct and FT faculty hiring opportunities.

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

The CCJ Capstone research project assignment instruction and corresponding rubrics are included in this report.

## **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>

	Levels of Achievement			
Criteria	Novice	Competent	Proficient	Advanced
<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](#)

