**Annual Assessment Report for 2020-2021 AY**

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2020-21 AY will be due September 30th 2021 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Douglas Fraleigh (douglasf@csufresno.edu).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. Furthermore, only report on two or three student learning outcomes even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program: **Forensic Behavioral Sciences** Degree **B.S.**

Assessment Coordinator: **Dr. Andrea Arndorfer**

1. **Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.**

Student Learning Outcome 4:Students will be able to demonstrate their ability to apply critical thinking to evaluate situations and make decisions in their specific field.

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?** **Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.**

During the Spring 2021 semester, students’ critical thinking skills were assessed from evaluating their written responses to a class assignment in FBS 114 (Ethics in Forensic Behavioral Sciences). Across the two sections of the course, two different assignments were evaluated. For each assignment, students were presented with an ethical dilemma related to the forensic behavioral sciences and were asked to identify the issue, the ethical and/or legal components of the issue, relate course concepts to the issue, propose solutions to the dilemma, identify implications across various stakeholders, reach a conclusion about how they would handle the situation, etc. Full assignment instructions for both sections of the course are attached in Appendix A and B.

The following rubric was used for this assessment. The benchmark is for all four questions. We expected **75% or more** **of the evaluated students** would **achieve a score of 3 (proficient or higher)** on the rubric. Because critical thinking skills are not expected to be mastered until the conclusion of students’ progress in the degree program, only those students listed as being (1) an FBS major, CRIM major – FBS option, or FBS double-major, and (2) of senior status were evaluated.



1. **What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient.**

The assessment was administered to students enrolled in the two sections of FBS 114 (Ethics in Forensic Behavioral Sciences) offered during the Spring 2021 semester. There were 70 assignments submitted for evaluation across both sections of FBS 114. As previously indicated, because critical thinking skills are not expected to be mastered until the conclusion of students’ progress in the degree program, only those students listed as being (1) an FBS major, CRIM major-FBS option, or FBS double major, and (2) of senior status were evaluated. Of the 70 assignments, 27 were from seniors pursuing a B.S. in Forensic Behavioral Sciences or the Forensic Behavioral Sciences option for the B.S. in Criminology. Two of the 27 students were double majoring in FBS and another area of study. Three of the 27 seniors did not submit an assignment. Thus, the 24 submitted assignments were the source of data for this analysis.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | % of students meeting this benchmark | 4(Advanced) | 3(Proficient -*Benchmark*) | 2(Developing) | 1(Insufficient) |
| Q1: Identify & Summarize Issue | **83.3% (20)** | **12.5% (3)** | **70.8% (17)** | 16.7% (4) | 0% (0) |
| Q2: Supporting Data/Evidence | **87.5% (21)** | **8.3% (2)** | **79.2% (19)** | 12.5% (3) | 0% (0) |
| Q3: Conclusions, Implications, & Consequences | **83.4% (20)** | **16.7% (4)** | **66.7% (16)** | 16.7% (4) | 0% (0) |
| Q4: Overall Approach to Critical Thinking | **95.8% (23)** | **12.5% (3)** | **83.3% (20)** | 4.2% (1) | 0% (0) |

In the area of identifying and summarizing the issue (Q1), a majority of the students (83.3%, *n* = 20) met the benchmark. Similarly, in providing supporting data/evidence related to the issue, almost all students met the benchmark (87.5%, *n* = 21). Thus, the data suggest that most students are able to adequately identify and summarize key aspects of ethical dilemmas in the field and to support their conclusions with data and/or evidence. However, it is concerning that a significant minority of students failed to successfully demonstrate these basic critical thinking skills at such an advanced point in the degree program. A closer look at the responses of those students who scored below the benchmark revealed that these students either (1) failed to closely follow the assignment instructions for those questions (i.e., Q1 and Q2) and/or (2) did not elaborate on their response (e.g., the student only identified ethical violations but did not summarize why and/or what about the identified factors was unethical).

In areas of drawing conclusions and noting the implications and consequences (Q3), 83.4% (*n* = 20) of students met the benchmark and can be considered proficient. That is, the majority of students were able to go beyond the basic skill of identifying and summarizing real-world ethical violations, and were also able to recognize and explain the larger impact of such violations on a variety of stakeholders (e.g., the victim, the perpetrator, society, other professionals in the field, etc.).

A final item (Q4) was designed to assess the overall approach to critical thinking. All but one student (95.8%, *n* = 24) met the benchmark and can be considered proficient. These data are encouraging! Overall, students successfully demonstrated their ability to apply critical thinking to evaluate situations and make decisions in their specific field (i.e., the forensic behavioral sciences).

Despite these encouraging findings, it is important to highlight that basic spelling, grammar, usage, mechanical, etc. errors were plentiful. In some instances, such errors could preclude effective communication of critical thinking skills. The number of errors could be due to the nature of the assignment. That is, the assignments were designed to be thought exercises completed in class or shortly thereafter and not carefully constructed term papers that are composed over a period of weeks. However, note that the assignment instructions for one section of FBS 114 (see Appendix A) emphasizes the importance of clear, concise, error free writing. In any case, greater emphasis should be placed on writing skills to ensure effective communication of the critical thinking skills students have acquired.

1. **What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?**

The instructors in both sections of FBS 114 had students complete an analysis of a real-world ethical in the forensic behavioral sciences. Relating course assignments and activities to real-world cases should serve to increase student interest and the effectiveness of the assignment. Instructors are encouraged to continue using real world cases, examples, and data to stimulate interest in course topics and enrich the student learning experience. Additionally, instructors should discuss the outcome of each case with students, the reasoning behind the decision and case outcome, alternative perspectives, etc. to ensure students have a clear understanding of how real-world practitioners and ethics committees in the field reach conclusions.

Both sections of FBS 114 used and submitted similar assignments for the assessment, which occurred without coordination between the instructors. Thus, continuity was not an issue. However, in future, it would be wise to ensure continuity across sections of the same course to ensure all students are gaining a similar breadth of knowledge, experience, and skills.

Conclusions based on the assessment data are positive: The majority of FBS students were proficient in all four areas of critical thinking. However, only 8-17% of students demonstrated advanced levels of critical thinking by demonstrating an ability to consider evidence and perspectives other than their own. When possible, efforts should be made to develop students’ higher level critical thinking skills. This would ultimately afford students with the ability to consider and support not only their own view but also critically think about and recognize all sides of an issue and provide adequate sources of support (provided support exists). One reason for the low number of students demonstrating advanced critical thinking skills could be due to the way in which critical thinking was assessed. That is, responses to short answer questions may not adequately capture critical thinking skills or preclude students from engaging in deep, critical thought processes. In the future, critical thinking skills may be better assessed by giving students more time to complete the assignment out of class or assigning a paper to allow critical thinking skills to emerge and be assessed.

Finally, proper writing habits need to be enforced. Writing is an important skill in the forensic behavioral sciences and in life. Students should be encouraged to practice proper writing in all coursework. Feedback is an important part of the learning process. To that end, reducing class size and/or providing faculty with graduate teaching assistants, is paramount to providing meaningful feedback that will allow students to improve their writing skills.

1. **If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in last year’s assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report, please write N/A as your answer to this question.**

N/A. Given that this is the first year an assessment report is being submitted for the FBS major, no previous recommendations for changes have been made on the basis of assessment data.

1. **What assessment activities will you be conducting during the next academic year?**

The Forensic Behavioral Sciences degree program plans to assess the following outcomes in AY 2021-2022:

**Student Learning Outcome:** Students will be able to perform data analysis, interpret the findings, and make statistical conclusions.

 Method of Evaluation:

Students in CRIM 50 (Statistical Applications in Criminal Justice) will perform data analysis, interpret the findings, and make statistical conclusions using the SPSS software. Samples of student work will be evaluated according to a rubric. A rubric for assessing CRIM 50 in-class work or assignments will be developed by working with current CRIM 50 instructors.Seventy-five percent of students are expected to demonstrate statistical competency by receiving a mean score of 3 (based on program rubric) on the CRIM 50 in-class work or assignment.

1. **Identify and discuss any major issues identified during your last Program Review and in what ways these issues have or have not been addressed.**

The B.S. in Forensic Behavioral Sciences degree was not in place at the time of the last program review. Major issues identified in the most recent Program Review for the B.S. in Criminology, of which FBS was designated as an option, are discussed below.

**Issue 1: Admission Criteria**

The current GPA for admission to the program is 2.0 whereas comparable schools have admission GPA of 2.8-3.0.

***Action:***

As of Fall 2019, all current Fresno State students wishing to transfer into the Criminology or FBS majors must have a minimum GPA of 2.5.

**Issue 2: Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty Hiring**

The number of tenure/tenure-track faculty was the same in 2016 as in 2012, whereas the undergraduate student enrollment increased 16% from 1500 in 2012 to 1740 in 2016.

***Action:***

A total of three tenure-track faculty have joined the Department between August 2019 and August 2021. The Department has an active search for a new tenure-track hire to start in August 2022.

**Issue 3: Writing Effectiveness**

There are limited writing assignments (2–3-page papers) in the undergraduate program. More extended papers would help improve the effectiveness of student writing, which was found by employers to be deficient.

***Action:***

A Writing Committee composed of departmental faculty was developed in 2019. Faculty will meet to discuss two possible W courses: “Report Writing and Professionalization in Criminal Justice Related Fields” and “Research and Writing in Criminology.” A taskforce and timeline for curriculum development and implementation will be discussed by the committee.

**Issue 4: Academic and Practical Divide**

There is an apparent division between academic and practical components of the program with the danger of the practical components being used as a critique of the academic rather than being enhanced by the academic components.

***Action:***

Although completion of a field internship (CRIM 180I) is not a requirement for the FBS degree, the Department has made numerous changes to the internship program in recent years. New placement options have been added, which was increased the total number of available agencies. The Department also implemented new procedures to make evaluations of students’ internships more efficient. For example, paper documents were previously delivered to faculty. Now, all course requirements are uploaded to CANVAS. An additional issue was that students believed their CRIM courses had to directly relate to their internship for CRIM courses to have value. To alleviate this problem, language was added to internship syllabi encouraging students to understand that all coursework applies to the practice, as course components contribute to skills and knowledge within the field. In addition, the Department is now keeping a database with students’ contact information to examine job placements post-graduation. Post-graduate placement statistics will strengthen knowledge of the effectiveness of our program.

**Issue 5: Collaboration**

Compared with other programs in the college, the disproportionate size of the Criminology program may result in factionalism and competition over resources.

***Action:***

The Forensic Behavioral Sciences program has a longstanding collaboration with the Psychology Department. To satisfy upper-division degree requirements, FBS majors are required to complete either PSYCH 127 (Forensic Cognitive Science) or PSYCH 128 (Cognitive Science). Students also must complete at least one 4-credit Psychology course to fulfill their major elective requirements. During the Spring 2021 semester, we collaborated with the Anthropology Department and accepted ANTH 169T (Introduction to Forensic Anthropology) to fulfill an elective course requirement for the FBS Elective Cluster. We continue to accept AFRS 146 (Law and the Minority Community), ANTH 101 (Fieldwork in Archaeology), ANTH 169T (Forensic Anthropology), PAX 110 (Peace Building), and PHIL 151 (Cognitive Science: Mind) as electives in our major. The FBS faculty will continue to explore collaborations with other Colleges and Departments and Programs within the College of Social Sciences.

**Issue 6: Retention Rate**

The first-year retention rate for Criminology and transfer students is down from previous years. These declines are also reflected in similar College and University rates over the same time period.

***Action:***

The Department is working with Supplemental Instruction (SI) to ensure that there is SI support for all sections of CRIM 50 and FBS 155, the latter course has traditionally had a high rate of failure. After Fall 2018, all sections of CRIM 50 and some sections of FBS 155 have been supported by a SI.

**Issue 7: Class Size and Offerings**

Class size maximizes at around 48-50 students. These class sizes impact the ability to assign and grade writing assignments to improve student writing effectiveness.

CRIM 1 is an important introductory orientation course that is a valuable foundation for the program provided the course is taken early enough (i.e., during the students first or second year in the program). Given that only one section of the course is offered a semester, students find it difficult to register for and complete the course early enough during their time in the program.

***Action:***

The Department began offering more course sections than normal in Fall 2019 and has had slightly reduced class sizes as a result. The additional sections have regularly included a second section of CRIM 1 to assist with the bottleneck issue for this course.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A**

FBS 114 (03) ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS

Nicole Todd began seeing a therapist for her experiences with depression. Within a few sessions, Nicole alleged that the lines of therapy quickly became blurred. Read her account of the events that transpired as well as the complaint she submitted to the licensing board about the alleged events. Then, using the knowledge you’ve obtained in FBS 114 this semester, discuss the following in your response to this real-life situation:

1. Using the APA ethical code (meaning identify the standards in your paper), identify and explain the ethical issues present in this case. You need to identify at least **5 issues** across at least **2 different chapters/sections**.
2. Based on the evidence provided, discuss your personal opinion on the facts of this case and how it should be handled.
3. Imagine that you are a member of the APA ethics committee and this complaint has been made to the committee. Take a position on what should happen to Dr. X, and support your position based on the evidence provided and what you have learned in class. Make sure you consider only what the committee can do in this part of your paper, which you learned about earlier this semester. If you'd like to discuss things beyond what the committee can do (like many of the things in the bullet below) that is fine too, but I want to see that you understand what the committee has the power to do.
	* For example, what should happen to Nicole Todd’s therapist? Should he lose his license and never be allowed to practice again? Should he suffer some other kind of punishment – either more or less harsh than these outcomes? Or, should nothing happen, because, despite Nicole Todd’s vulnerability, one might argue the relationship was consensual?
4. Propose at least 2 possible solutions for combating issues, like those alleged by Nicole, in psychotherapy sessions. However, these need to be applicable to more than just this one case and need to be more than just ideals, but specific actions that can be taken. These should also be things that are beyond what we assume they're instructed as a part of their training, like identify and/or have better boundaries is something that we would expect they're told to do already.
5. Identify the possible consequences and implications of this case for (a) Dr. X, (b) Nicole, and (c) society. Explain the reasoning behind your responses and please use the letters (a), (b), and (c) in your answer.

Please separate your answers to each of the 5 parts above, and this assignment should be *at least* 2 double-spaced pages. You can number each, or just answer them in order in different paragraphs. All responses should be clear, concise, and error free. That is, please write grammatically; do not include sentence fragments, verbs that do not agree with their subjects, dangling participles, or split infinitives. If you need assistance with your writing, contact the writing center on campus and/or a reputable grammar or composition text.

**Appendix B**

FBS 114 (06) ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS

**This assignment has 2 parts (Part 1 is worth 18 points and part 2 is worth 2 points). Part 1 is to answer the questions below and make a decision on how you would act. Part 2 is to respond to 1 peer about their response (needs to be more than simply, ‘I agree.’ What did they think of that you didn’t, what are they missing in their answer, etc.). The goal of the response to a peer is to promote ethical thinking and the ability to take other perspectives – gear your response for this.**

You are a psychologist who was referred a psychological evaluation in a psychiatric hospital. The individual you will be testing is currently at the hospital on an involuntary status per WIC 5150 for Danger to Self and Danger to Others. The referral question is to determine an accurate diagnosis.

During the course of your evaluation, the client’s mother drops off a document the client wrote. The document contains a suicide note, along with statements about each member of his graduating class of high school (the client is scheduled to graduate in several days). Most of the statements are extremely negative, and there are instructions for the client’s best friend to give each note to each student they are addressed to after the client’s death by suicide (which he planned for the day of graduation). Also contained within this document is a statement the client wrote about wanting to murder his step-brother who he shares a room with. He reported he fantasized about “slitting his [referring to his step-brother] throat with a knife while he sleeps.” His step-brother is a 9-year-old boy, the son of his mother’s husband. The client also wrote about fantasizing about killing chickens (his family has a small farm and he is tasked with taking care of the animals). However, he has never engaged in violent acts toward an animal or person.

After reading the document, the treatment team (containing the psychiatrist, social worker, registered nurse, and other care providers) urges you (the psychologist) to complete a Tarasoff. To do this, you would have to violate the client’s right to confidentiality. However, as a psychologist, you also have the duty to protect others.

Read about Tarasoff from the code. You can also use online or other sources (cite any in your writings, as necessary). Answer the questions below.

Below represents a summary of your evaluation (redacted):

**Evaluative Procedures:**

Clinical Interview

Chart Review

Collateral Interview with Ms. MOTHER (patient’s mother)

Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-IV (MCMI-IV)

Social Communication Questionnaire (SCQ)

Historical, Clinical, and Risk Management (HCR-20)

**Summary:**

Mr. XX, an 18-year-old male, presented as guarded and provided vague and short answers to most questions during the evaluation. He described a normal childhood and denied abuse or trauma. However, Ms. MOTHER believes the separation from Mr. XX’s biological father could have been a traumatic experience for him. Ms. MOTHER and Mr. XX’s biological father divorced when Mr. XX was around 8 years of age, but his father continued to be involved in his life until around age 13 after which his father stopping contacting and visiting him.

With regard to relationships, Mr. XX reported he has “six to eight” best friends, but had difficulty describing what makes someone a best friend. Further, he continued to report he prefers solitary activities, and does not enjoy being around others. He has never had a romantic or sexual relationship, and has no interest in either. He also had difficulty describing his relationships with family members, and reported he “keeps things in” and does not share much personal information with them. This is consistent with Ms. MOTHER’s report, who stated around age 14 Mr. XX became uncomfortable discussing things with her.

Mr. XX was admitted to the psychiatric hospital after putting a belt around his neck, and contemplating stepping off a stool. Rather than go through with the action, Mr. XX called his friend who arrived to his house and stopped the attempt. Mr. XX stated this incident was precipitated by feelings of purposelessness after he became interested in philosophy and read that “there is no objective purpose.” Mr. XX wrote a lengthy suicide note which his mother later found, addressing comments to members of his high school graduating class which were to be given to them by his best friend. Also in the note was a homicidal statement directed at the child of his mother’s boyfriend who lives with him. During the present hospitalization, he continued to deny homicidal ideation and stated that he would never hurt anyone.

Multiple tests were administered to better understand Mr. XX’s symptoms. The MCMI-IV, used to evaluate individuals for emotional, behavioral, or interpersonal difficulties, was administered to Mr. XX. His responses indicate he has deficiencies in social and personal attainments, as well as a tendency to falter toward self-defeating acts and contraindicated interpersonal exchanges. Although he is typically able to function adequately, periods of marked emotional, cognitive, or behavioral dysfunction are likely. Further, results suggest he exhibits a quiet, inexpressive, and dependent way of relating to others, along with a marked deficit in social interest. As a result of this introversive style, he is likely to be uninterested in stimulus-seeking behavior, and he may exhibit an impoverished affect as well as peculiar or confused interpersonal thinking. He most likely prefers a simple, repetitive, and dependent life pattern that allows him to avoid self-assertion and remain isolated from normal social aspirations. Finally, his disengagement and disinterest in most of the rewards of human relationships may make him appear strange, disconnected, and lifeless to others. Mrs. MOTHER was given the SCQ, a parent/caregiver dimensional measure of ASD symptomatology, and her scores suggest no further testing for ASD is indicated. Ms. MOTHER shared that she observed no significant symptoms of ASD during Mr. XX’s childhood nor at his current developmental level. On a measure of his risk of violence (HCR-20), he achieved scores indicative of a low risk of future violence.

During his stay at the psychiatric hospital, Mr. XX remained guarded with flat affect, made inconsistent eye contact, and did not socialize with peers. Mr. XX’s current symptoms represent a pattern of detachment from social relationships and a restricted range of expression of emotions in interpersonal settings that began around age 14. He neither enjoys nor desires close relationships, prefers solitary activities, has no interest in having sexual experiences with another person, takes pleasure in few activities, lacks close friends or confidants, is indifferent to praise or criticism, and presents as emotionally cold and detached. Based on the evaluation, Mr. XX’s symptoms are best explained by Schizoid Personality Disorder. He does not meet diagnostic criteria for a psychotic disorder.

Despite these challenges, Mr. XX demonstrates numerous strengths that can aid in his recovery. He was cooperative throughout the evaluation, and cooperative with his treatment at the psychiatric hospital. Further, Mr. XX appears to have motivation for treatment, as he agreed to attend a partial hospitalization program to continue his treatment after discharge from the hospital. Further, Mr. XX’s mother played an active role in the assessment process and expressed her love, concern, and dedication to her son’s mental health treatment needs and recovery. These strengths should be considered and integrated into Mr. XX’s treatment, as appropriate, as they represent positive protective factors.

**DSM-5 Diagnostic Impressions:**

301.20 (F60.1) Schizoid Personality Disorder

You must make a decision if you will complete a Tarasoff report or not. To do so, utilize the 6 steps of ethical decision making by answering each question below:

1. What personal values of yours relate to this situation? How might these personal values impact your decision or professional behavior in this situation?
	1. Can you identify any conflicts of interest?
	2. How will you take care of your mental health while managing this difficult case?
2. Identify relevant General Principles that apply.
	1. Identify relevant Ethical Standards that apply (although we have not gone over them yet, I want you to go through the code and identify which ones apply – I will grade lightly on these since I have not gone over them yet).
3. Identify relevant local, state, and federal laws that might apply.
	1. Identify how you should act to act in accordance with the laws.
	2. How might this impact the decision you will make?
4. Attempt to understand the perspectives of different stakeholders who might be affected by your decision.
	1. Be sure to consider, power, privilege, and oppression.
	2. Who might you consult with about this case? What would you ask them?
5. Apply steps 1 through 4 for each potential solution you can think of.
	1. Come up with as many possible solutions as you can.
	2. What ethical theories are you basing your solutions off?
	3. Make a decision – will you make the report or not?
6. This step is where you monitor and evaluate the effect of your decision. Since you cannot do this, I will post what I did next week, and we can discuss it.