**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. No GE assessment was required for the 2017-2018 academic year.   The MS Criminology program assessed the following learning outcomes in AY 2017-18:  SLO: Written Communication and Critical Thinking  **GOAL 2. Acquire or enhance the skills necessary to think critically and conduct advanced research. Students** must have an advanced proficiency in writing and the ability to write sophisticated evidence based arguments.  1.Students will perform advanced critical analysis of primary and secondary sources through written assignments in required coursework  2.Students will engage in advanced knowledge of data collection and statistical analysis through assigned coursework.  3. Students will demonstrate research and writing skills by either completing comprehensive Exams, developing and completing a project, or by completing a thesis that has valid evidence based argument, an effective methodology, and is well organized and written. |
| 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’ written communication skills in CRIM 200: Research Methods and CRIM 270T: Psychology of Sex Offenders, by evaluating the writing assignments students are required to complete at the end of each course using the written communication rubric. 270T was chosen as the follow up course, because many 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.  Written Communication Evaluation  The students’ presentations were observed and evaluated using a rubric that focused primarily on “style and format”, “mechanics,” and “content and organization.” These categories are evaluated on a scale of 1-4. 1=beginning, 2=developing, 3=accomplished, 4=exemplary. 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’ written communication competencies after entering the graduate program, comparison was made between students’ rubric scores in CRIM 200 during the first semester and CRIM 270T in their second semester. This gives us a picture of their writing skills upon entering the program as well as how the same cohort’s writing skills 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 oral communication scores in the Fall 2016 semester in CRIM 200 and the Spring 2017 semester in CRIM 270T. 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 Oral Communication Scores**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Average of**  **CRIM 200 writing**  **Scores** | **Average of**  **CRIM 270T writing Scores** | | 2.7 | 3.75 |   Figure 1 further examines how the student’s written communication competencies changed after entering the graduate program by comparing their CRIM 200 presentation scores and the CRIM 270T presentation scores.  **Figure 1. CRIM 200 Average Presentation Scores and CRIM 270T Writing Scores**  Such a result indicates that these rubrics were particularly useful in identifying those with limited writing competencies, at the graduate level, beginning their graduate career. This enabled us to give rich feedback and guide the students toward improving their writing and enhancing their critical thinking skills overall. Following this same cohort into the second semester, we see the average drop slightly in mechanics. Content and organization scored lower on average in the second semester, as well. 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 270T**  The quantitative analysis results of the students’ writing and critical thinking skills 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 presentation skills 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 challenging material through their writing. Knowing 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 2018-19 we are assessing: **GOAL 1. Enhance academic and professional competencies in criminological content, research methods, and demonstrate information literacy.**  We will be using rubrics to evaluate student writing assignments in both semesters; these assignments are typically 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 content knowledge 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.”   **2017-18 Action Plan for MS in Criminology program. Progress is in bold.**   1. develop a formal orientation for incoming students; Completed**. We developed and implemented a formal orientation for new students** 2. develop new admissions and recruitment procedures; **This change has been completed. We clarified our standards for the GRE We had success in significantly increasing our cohort for the 2018-19 school year.** 3. reexamine our comprehensive exam; **Complete. We have made stronger preparation for our students and made changes to our standards for assessment of the exams; allowing rewrites for those who only miss one or two questions rather than forcing students to return for a second semester upon only missing one or two questions.** 4. review our graduate level writing standards; **Complete. The standards and rubric are clear and work well for the graduate writing requirement. We are creating new rubrics in order to track writing standards throughout the graduate career.** 5. explore new ways to provide students with financial support; **In Progress. We applied for and received a grant last year for 10,000 dollars to assist with funding several graduate students in our department. We are looking into grants and other funding that can further support more students through the program.** 6. continue to review curricula and requirements; **Ongoing. The department also applied for and received a grant for a department retreat where the focus is solely our graduate program, assessing and discussing the curriculum, and overall creating more organization and improvement.** 7. introduce student progress reviews; **In Progress. While we are identifying students early who may be struggling with progress, we have not yet implemented a formal process for all.** 8. develop new models of advising/mentoring; **In Progress. We are working toward more faculty mentors for students. We had 3 new faculty last year and we are hiring 2 more this year, this helps us in beginning to create a model of advising and mentoring for our grad students. This will be another part of our plan for the retreat to create a better model and more clear access to advising and mentoring for our students.** 9. increase graduate student research opportunities/IRB; **Complete and ongoing. Many faculty have grants and other opportunities for the students to engage in research. More students than ever are writing theses.** 10. explore the feasibility of starting graduate program option development tracks; **Complete. At this time the option development tracks will not be implemented, however we are considering developing a research institute to further give students opportunities. We will be considering including different tracks during our faculty retreat this year, however this needs to be something that faculty agree on during our discussions of this option.** 11. draft a handbook for the Department Graduate Coordinator**; We have completed changes to our handbook for Fall 2018** 12. develop a Graduate Student Handbook; **Complete** 13. publish a Faculty Profile Handbook for students; **Complete. We now have a college faculty profile handbook. The students are given links to this.** 14. develop a graduate student webpage; **In Progress. created a web-page, we are working on updating and have started the process of creating social media pages.** 15. make formal assignments of faculty to graduate students. **Not Started. we have a strong desire to increase faculty and graduate student mentorship and will be considering formal assignments.**   **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. |