**Major Assessment Report Template**

Please download this document and provide a response to each question in the appropriate section. Send your assessment reports to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Melissa Jordine ([mjordine@csufresno.edu](mailto:mjordine@csufresno.edu)). (Reports can be sent to Dr. Jordine via campus mail to mailstop SS 21). Please complete a separate report for each B.A/B.S. and M.A/M.S. program offered by the department.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report.   The MS Criminology program assessed the following learning outcomes in AY 2018-19:  SLO: Discipline-related Knowledge  **GOAL 1. Enhance academic and professional competencies in criminological content, research methods and demonstrate information literacy.**  1.Students will demonstrate advanced content knowledge in Criminology in specified areas of concentration through assigned papers in required coursework  2 Students will exhibit information literacy through the mastery of criminological debates in literature reviews of the specified areas of concentration. |
| 1. **What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?** If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the assignment/survey is able to measure a specific outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be “On outcome 2.3 we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score of 3 or above on the rubric.”   The Criminology Master’s program collected data on students’ topic specific information literacy and content knowledge. in CRIM 200: Research Methods and CRIM 204 Statistics., by evaluating the writing assignments students are required to complete at the end of each course using the written communication rubric. 204 was chosen as the follow up course, because the majority of the students enrolled were the same students enrolled in CRIM 200 in the previous semester, we wanted to ensure that the sample was consistent and that we were able to evaluate enhanced or decreased performance of these students.  Content Knowledge /Information Literacy Evaluation  The students’ final assignments were observed and evaluated using a rubric that focused primarily on “style and format”, “mechanics,” and “content and organization.” This assessment focused specifically on style and format and content, as these are elements specific to information literacy and content knowledge in Criminology. The categories are evaluated on a scale of 1-4. 1=beginning, 2=developing, 3=accomplished, 4=exemplary. The assignments in each class are focused on developing a criminological research project, which centers around content knowledge and information literacy. Two different faculty members evaluate the student writing in order to ensure reliability of the rubrics. The goal is to have students at least average a score of 3-4 for this requirement. |
| 1. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).   In order to quantitatively analyze students’ content knowledge and information literacy after entering the graduate program, comparison was made between students’ rubric scores in CRIM 200 during the first semester and CRIM 204 in their second semester. This gives us a picture of their criminological knowledge upon entering the program as well as how the same cohort’s knowledge of criminology and the field stand in the following semester. Being able to assess a performance of the same cohort overtime is proving quite valuable in our understanding of student improvement.  Table 2 shows the students’ average information literacy scores in the Fall 2018 semester in CRIM 200 and the Spring 2019 semester in CRIM 204. Again, the rubrics are on a scale of 1-4 and the goal is to see average scores between 3 and 4.  **Table 1. Average Content Knowledge/Information Literacy Scores**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Average of**  **CRIM 200**  **Scores** | **Average of**  **CRIM 204**  **Scores** | | Format | 2.94 | 3.21 | | Content | 3.17 | 3.35 |   Figure 1 further examines how the students’ content knowledge and information literacy changed after entering the graduate program by comparing their CRIM 200 scores and the CRIM 204 scores.  **Figure 1. CRIM 200 and CRIM 204 Average Content Knowledge/Information Literacy Scores**  Such a result indicates that these rubrics were particularly useful in identifying those with limited content knowledge competencies, at the graduate level, beginning their graduate career. This enabled us to give rich feedback and guide the students toward improving their information literacy and content knowledge, as well as their critical thinking skills overall. Following this same cohort into the second semester, we see the average increase in both format and content knowledge. However, style and format continued to improve during the second semester. When looking more closely at the data, the average of total scores was affected by some students not submitting work. We were able to identify these students and begin working with them to improve their skills, encourage timely assignment submission, and discuss better tactics for critical thinking.  Figure 2 highlights the individual categories on our written communication rubric for the Fall Semester of 2017 in CRIM 200. Figure 3, shows the same individual scores for Spring semester, 2018 in CRIM 270T. We can assess changes by category and this year we did note that some of the writing quality fell significantly in the second semester of evaluation. Some of these students have been identified by instructors. Much of the differential in scores was due to student time management and effort during the second semester.  **Figure 2: Individual Rubric Scores, CRIM 200**  **Figure 3: Individual Rubric Scores CRIM 204**  The quantitative analysis results of the students’ writing and their abilities to demonstrate discipline-related knowledge indicated that the new rubric assessment is particularly effective for identifying and aiding those students with limited knowledge and skills in the field of Criminology early on in their graduate career. We were able to address where students fell short on the rubrics and give clear and useful comments that enabled them to improve in the following semester. The students are increasingly comfortable with the scientific format used in the field of criminology, and in discipline specific content knowledge. Looking closely at which categories saw the most and least improvement have also helped us assess where we need to focus our instruction in the future. |
| 1. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.   We were able to address where students fell short on the rubrics and give clear and useful comments that enabled them to improve in the following semester. Being able to not only give the students the rubric to work from, but adding additional comments in their low scoring categories gave them clear direction for improvement. These rubrics are helping faculty assess the students, and also helping the students understand how to assess themselves in preparation for presentations and oral communication. We found that using 2 faculty to evaluate students using the rubrics yielded more validity and reliability of the rubric design.  Overall, we are finding these new rubrics quite useful in our program assessment. We do understand that some differential in scoring can be faculty interpretation of the rubric. However, currently we feel that this differential is not large enough to indicate change needed in the rubrics. We are looking forward to analyzing data from these other direct measures to ensure that our rubrics are continually accurately assessing student work and student growth. These rubrics are enabling identification of students who are underperforming early on in their academic career, so that we can ensure that they are successful as they complete the 2-year program. Faculty have a clearer understanding of the importance of these rubrics and we are all finding these particularly helpful in understanding student performance and how to guide them toward appropriate standards in the field of Criminology. |
| 1. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-2018 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.   During 2019-20 we are assessing: **GOAL 3. Enhance oral communications skills and scientific presentation.**  We will be using rubrics to evaluate student presentations in both semesters; these presentations are an overview of student research proposals and/or literature reviews in a topic of the student’s choosing. The goal is for students to score 3s and 4s in the rubrics as a measure for meeting the standards of oral communication within the field of criminology. |
| 1. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state “no progress.”   **2019-20 Action Plan for MS in Criminology program. Progress is in bold.**  **Action 1:** The Department will continue active recruitment of students to the program to sustain and grow enrollment. **Ongoing. Currently, wee hold various informational sessions on campus to recruit more Fresno State undergraduates to apply to our program.**  **Action 2:** The Department will explore alternative modes of teaching, including online and hybrid delivery formats. **Complete. We have begun offering 1-2 online electives each semester.**  **Action 3:** The Department will explore the option of offering two tracks (i.e., continuing with our face-to-face program and an applied track more focused on criminal justice issues, through an online delivery mode) for the master’s degree. **Ongoing. Meetings have been set with various individuals in order to explore the options for creating an online M.S. program**  **Action 4:** The Department will seek to hire additional tenure-track faculty members. **Ongoing. We hired one faculty member last AY and are in the midst of the hiring process for this current AY.**  **Additional Guidelines:** If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please consider attaching a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions. |