

December 1, 2011

Chairs and Program Directors:

Learning Outcomes Data for the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities

Working with Academic Affairs, the Faculty Senate is initiating the implementation of the “Policy on Instructional Program Priorities” ([www.csus.edu/acaf/Academic Affairs/2011 AP IPP.pdf](http://www.csus.edu/acaf/Academic%20Affairs/2011%20AP%20IPP.pdf)). This policy sets criteria by which to sort Sacramento State’s academic programs into quartiles for the purpose of informing the process of resource allocation. One of the four variables within the “Primary Criteria” refers to: *“Clearly developed learning outcomes,” [and asks] “Has the program moved productively to clarify for students enrolled in it what they can expect to take away from the program and how that outcome is assessed? Has the program made curricular adjustments based on its assessment efforts?”* The other “Primary” and “Secondary” criteria will be addressed in a separate document. The objective presently is to provide the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities, which will implement the quartile process, with a fairly standardized presentation of learning-outcomes efforts across instructional programs.

This document includes a template for reporting to the Senate Committee the status of your program’s (or, in many cases, programs’) efforts to identify and assess ongoing accomplishment of the desired learning outcomes of the program’s curriculum. There are two significant foci: 1) describing the link between your program’s desired learning outcomes and the University’s *Baccalaureate Learning Goals* (www.csus.edu/acaf/ge); 2) describing the program’s desired learning outcomes, the manner by which to assess their ongoing accomplishment, and the effect of assessment data on continual review and potential adjustment of the program’s curriculum.

What is a “program” in the present context? It is a curriculum offered via the General Fund (i.e., “stateside,” not through CCE), the completion of which leads to a bachelor’s or master’s degree, a credential, a minor, or a certificate. (Not included among programs in the current context are curricula leading to doctoral degrees.) Most departments on campus have at least one bachelor’s program. Some offer both the BA and BS; these will be treated as separate programs in the current context. Some offer the bachelor’s with *official* “concentrations” (e.g., BA in Communication Studies with a concentration in Digital Media) ultimately noted on the graduate’s transcript. Many departments offer minors and certificates. Many departments also have a master’s degree program; some departments have only master’s degree programs. In addition, we have some stand-alone interdisciplinary programs that lead to a bachelor’s or master’s degree. Credential programs are offered by departments in the Colleges of Education, Health and Human Services, and Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

For a complete list of the degrees (including official concentrations for which learning-outcomes should be pursued), minor, certificate, and credential programs in question, please access the University’s web site, proceed to “Academics” (www.csus.edu/Academics/index.html), and then to the lower left corner of the page, to the section on “Degrees and Programs”(undergraduate, graduate). Important Note: Some of the degree concentrations and options on the list are not “official,” i.e., are not noted on the graduate’s transcript. These presently will not be considered “programs.” Don

Taylor will be in touch with the chairs of departments with such concentrations and options to clarify their status.

Please complete the template on the following pages for every program on the list cited above, even if the same goals and assessment processes apply to each program under your department's umbrella. If for some reason your program has not been listed, please contact your dean and Don Taylor (dtaylor@csus.edu) immediately.

Every department or stand-alone program offering an undergraduate degree must have designated learning outcomes and direct or indirect measures by which to determine whether or not the desired outcomes are being achieved. Nearly all such departments and programs have on record an "assessment report" submitted to Academic Affairs in July, 2011. Information provided on the template below should be in harmony with the information provided in that report. Some departments and programs were permitted to forego submission of a report in July because they were in the process of an accreditation review which seeks information on learning outcomes and assessment efforts. Each is asked now to complete the template, translating accreditation information into information comparable to that provided by the other programs completing the template.

While undergraduate degree programs clearly fall within the learning-outcomes framework, the situation regarding graduate and credential degree programs is less clear. They presently vary (are permitted to vary) in the extent to and manner in which they set desired learning outcomes and assessment strategies. Graduate and credential programs are asked to complete the template to the degree applicable; if entirely inapplicable, please so indicate at the top of the template and provide a statement that clarifies the reasons for the inapplicability. Include in the statement of inapplicability reference to item 6 in the template.

Minor and certificate programs also vary in attention to learning outcomes and assessment strategies. Such programs are asked to complete the template to the degree applicable; if entirely inapplicable, please so indicate at the top of the template and provide a statement that clarifies the reasons for the inapplicability.

Please download and complete the template and send it electronically to Don Taylor (dtaylor@csus.edu) by January 25, 2012.

Thank you.

Joseph F. Sheley, Provost

Template

Program: Undergraduate

Department: Criminal Justice

Number of students enrolled in the program in fall, 2011: 1792

Faculty member completing template: Hugh Wilson, Chair, January 25, 2012

Period of reference in the template: 2006-07 to present

1. Please describe your program's learning-outcomes trajectory since 2006-07: Has there been a transformation of organizational culture regarding the establishment of learning outcomes and the capacity to assess progress toward their achievement? If so, during which academic year would you say the transformation became noticeable? What lies ahead; what is the next likely step in developing a learning-outcomes organizational culture within the program?

[Please limit your response to 200 words or less]

In 2001, Criminal Justice was one of the first academic programs at CSUS to record an assessment plan. Since 2006, the Division has utilized regular practices of formative and summative assessment to ensure that program and curricular decisions are informed by the highest academic and professional standards and practice. At the heart of the Division's assessment culture and philosophy is that *it is not just assessment of learning, but assessment for learning*. Although the Division previously existed as a leader in outcomes assessment, the last five years have exemplified the Division's most forward thinking views and assessment practices. This period reflects the evolving culture as one that has acquired a collective assessment perspective. This perspective, now reflected by a large and diverse interdisciplinary faculty body, has produced consistent progress to regularly identify, achieve, and assess the quality and appropriateness of learning outcomes, curricular decisions, and related faculty professional development. Evidence of this trajectory is present in the Division's yearly reports and projects, learning objectives for syllabi, subject-related faculty cohort discussions, advising and course mapping, curriculum restructuring, and emphasis in all RTP evaluations. Our assessment culture is the impetus for our current self-study focus of 'value rubrics.'

(See Appendix for Chronology of Assessment Projects)

2. Please list in prioritized order (or indicate no prioritization regarding) up to four desired learning outcomes ("takeaways" concerning such elements of curriculum as perspectives, specific content knowledge, skill sets, confidence levels) for students completing the program. For *each* stated outcome, please provide the reason that it was designated as desired by the faculty associated with the program. **No Priority Ranking**

- a) Improvement of student writing to meet diverse standards of competence required of criminal justice professionals.
- b) Improvement in student capacity to think critically to meet the changing and complex demands in the criminal justice environment that relate to ethical decision making and problem solving.
- c) Improving student ability to demonstrate competency of knowledge acquisition of the criminal justice curriculum core.
- d)

[Please limit your response *per outcome* to 300 words or less]

A. Writing:

Criminal Justice Division faculty view competent student writing skills as critical to the success and upward mobility of criminal justice professionals as well as those students wishing to advance their academic careers. The Division's large and diverse interdisciplinary faculty body believes that strengthening student writing is the job of all academic units and as part of the assessment process has taken aggressive steps to increase student writing competency. One important strength of the Division's faculty body is the ability to improve student writing as it is required across a wide spectrum of the criminal justice professional and academic communities. The Division's collective view is that student writing competency should reflect the ability to use writing as a medium for critical thinking and problem solving.

In addition to the collective faculty view that writing competency is one critical trademark of having earned a CSUS criminal justice degree, regular faculty interaction with the criminal justice professional community affirms the need to equip criminal justice students with writing skills that will promote their success in future academic and professional capacities. The view of the professional community which emphasized student writing competency was a significant influence in the Division's decision to pursue writing as one of its first assessment objectives.

B. Critical Thinking:

It is the collective intent of Division faculty to offer a higher level of baccalaureate instruction and graduate instruction than that which is found at other colleges and universities. The Criminal Justice Program is benefited by the number, diversity, interdisciplinary experience, training, and expertise of Division faculty, and this is reflected in the offerings of the curriculum. As such, it is the collective faculty view that instruction should develop, promote, and increase students' ability to think critically in terms of applying knowledge, decision making, problem solving, and ethical reasoning in an ever-increasing complex criminal justice environment. The reality of criminal justice professional practice is that the consequences of decisions often made during complicated and stressful problem solving scenarios echo for years. It is also inherent to the collective faculty view that many students, for various reasons, will not assume positions in professional criminal justice practice. Subsequently, the ability to think critically, as it is

combined with the other aspects of a criminal justice education, gives student future strengths as citizens and, as such, strengthens families and communities.

All Division faculty take the responsibility to positively influence and increase students' ability to think critically as students progress through the curriculum to ultimately arrive at the capstone course. The identification of critical thinking as an assessment objective remains, along with writing, as a continuing assessment objective. The use of writing to develop and promote critical thinking is a natural fit.

C. Knowledge Acquisition

The Division's assessment plan states that graduates of the CSUS Criminal Justice Program should demonstrate a knowledge base that is reflective of the criminal justice curriculum core. The curriculum core represents the interdisciplinary standards for what Division faculty consider a rigorous, high quality criminal justice education. These standards reflect those of the American Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, the national and most authoritative body for the advancement of university level criminal justice education. These standards for knowledge acquisition prepare graduates with a solid foundation of interdisciplinary knowledge that advantages them as they pursue diverse opportunities within the local, national, and global criminal justice professional community. As such, the Division's faculty and its assessment plan have identified the core knowledge base as:

- a. criminal justice and juvenile justice processes (law, crime, and the administration of justice)
- b. criminology (the causes of crime, social responses to crime, typologies, offenders, and victims)
- c. law enforcement (police administration, crime investigation, leadership, problem-oriented policing, community policing, police and community relations, planning, ethics, and the legal use of discretion)
- d. law adjudication (criminal law, prosecution, defenses to crimes, evidence, legal procedure, court procedure, alternative dispute resolution)
- e. corrections (incarceration, treatment and legal rights of offenders, community-based corrections, restorative justice)

These core areas exist as knowledge-based examples of the Division's efforts to establish competency in the discipline.

3. *For undergraduate programs only*, in what ways are the set of desired learning outcomes described above aligned with the University's Baccalaureate Learning Goals? Please be as specific as possible.

[Please limit your response to 400 words or less]

A. Writing

The Criminal Justice curriculum is represented within the objectives of every baccalaureate learning goal. The Division utilizes the objective of improving student writing to increase not only student competency in the areas of written and oral communication, but as the primary medium to encourage critical and creative thinking, acquire information literacy through research for writing in the social sciences, as a basis for peer mentoring and problem solving, and as a way to establish and demonstrate competency in the discipline. Writing is utilized to integrate concepts from the interdisciplinary criminal justice curriculum, and it is used to demonstrate competency with quantitative analysis as required the by CRJ 101, Introduction to Criminal Justice Research Methods course. Writing is used extensively to promote and assess intercultural knowledge, awareness, and civic knowledge addressed in the Division's six different area D2, Race and Ethnicity courses. Writing is required and emphasized in every criminal justice course. It helps prepare students for the WPJ and ultimately the writing intensive capstone course, CRJ 190.

B. Critical Thinking

Elevating students' capacity to think critically is a cornerstone of not only the Division's assessment philosophy but its efforts to ensure a higher level of criminal justice education. Critical thinking is an essential component of students' ability to demonstrate command of the curriculum and competency in the discipline. Critical thinking, combined with writing, is integral to the Division's effort to teach and promote ethical reasoning and increase student capacity to assess the credibility of data and information retrieved through human and technological sources. Critical thinking and writing are important means by which students are required to apply knowledge and demonstrate complex problem solving capacity.

C. Knowledge Acquisition

The interdisciplinary criminal justice curriculum core and the objectives identified in the Division's assessment plan are represented significantly within the baccalaureate learning goals. In addition to establishing competency in the discipline, the core assures integrative learning through its interdisciplinary structure. It directly addresses diversity, intercultural knowledge and competence, and civic engagement through service learning. It addresses information literacy and research methods in the social sciences. It emphasizes cumulative and life-long learning in a quickly changing and increasingly complex world. Beginning in AY 2013-2014, additional courses in Psychology, Sociology, History, Government, and Statistics will be required for admission to the major. All of these components may be observed within the appendix documents. Please see course planning document and course syllabi for the criminal justice core.

4. For **each** desired outcome indicated in item 2 above, please:

a) Describe the method(s) by which its ongoing pursuit is monitored and measured.

Writing is required and emphasized in every criminal justice course. Faculty cohorts identified by discipline meet at least once yearly, and usually more often, and discuss subject matter, learning objectives, assignments, teaching strategies, trends, and perceptions of student progress that include writing assessment. This cohort discussion process is used to formatively and summatively modify and redirect subject curriculum. The outcomes of these discussions are transmitted to the Division's Assessment Committee, which facilitates assessment-related discussion at every monthly faculty meeting. Beginning in AY 2005/2006, writing assessment has been conducted yearly by administering consistent writing prompts in most sections of the Division's required writing intensive capstone course. These assignments are assessed with a common rubric by members of the Assessment Committee (see appendix). Additionally, all RTP evaluations comment on the quality of faculty writing strategies, assignments, and rubrics contained in the teaching materials section of the WPAF. This is true for full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

(Please see attached writing exam with rubric administered as component of assessment process)

b) **Critical Thinking** assessment objectives, addressed through problem solving scenarios included in writing assignments are required in every criminal justice course. Since critical thinking assessment rubrics vary, no one standard for assessment has yet been employed. A companion objective in criminal justice courses is ethical reasoning. As with writing assessment, critical thinking is assessed through the cohort process, and it has also been assessed yearly since AY 2005/2006 as a component of the writing assessment instrument. The Division is increasing its emphasis on critical thinking this academic year with the Division's self-study that focuses on creating value rubrics that identify:

- 1. The values guiding our curricular decisions.**
- 2. What do we want our students to acquire specifically in the area of content, skills, and values from our value-guided curriculum?**
- 3. What are we doing to monitor and insure that our value-guided curriculum is doing what we want it to do?**
- 4. How will we utilize assessment findings to advance specified curricular outcomes and promote ongoing faculty develop**

Important to note in this description of the self-study is the Division's attempt to address more complicated and complex cognitive aspects of student progress and development in the area of critical thinking—in progress this academic year.

(Please see attached rubrics)

c) Knowledge Acquisition for assessment purposes began in 2005 when learning objectives for the curriculum were identified by subject related cohorts of faculty. These learning objectives have been collectively addressed during the delivery of the course by all full-time faculty and part-time faculty teaching the same course. By 2006, all core courses and

all elective courses had collectively identified learning objectives commonly addressed in all sections of the course. Some learning objectives within each course address the acquisition and application of knowledge and some address other cognitive skills. Each year faculty meet at least once to discuss the achievement and need for modification of the learning objectives. Changes in learning objectives proceed to the Curriculum Committee and Division Chair for review. In AY 2005/2006, the Assessment Committee began creating and discussing with faculty a knowledge-based multiple choice exam and subsequently a writing prompt that attempted to assess the knowledge possessed relative to the curriculum core. The exam, administered as a pre and post curriculum exam, was administered to newly admitted freshmen at orientation, in dedicated criminal justice courses, and in the Division's capstone course. This multiple choice exam was last administered in spring, 2010 and an example of it is included in the appendix.

b) Include a description of the sample of students (e.g., random sample of transfer students declaring the major; graduating seniors) from whom data were/will be collected and the frequency and schedule with which the data in question were/will be collected.

1. WRITING: Different types of writing, such as legal briefs, research papers, and daily and weekly reports and blogs, are required in every criminal justice course. Writing is a primary instrument to progress toward and assess learning objectives. Writing strategies along with writing competency is a focus of every faculty cohort and Assessment Committee meeting and discussion. Beginning in AY 2005/2006 the Assessment Committee, with cooperation of the faculty teaching the writing intensive capstone course, created and administered to at least six sections of the capstone course, a common writing assessment exam. The exam was evaluated by the Assessment Committee using a common rubric that was developed prior to creating the writing prompt. The Assessment committee deliberated on what was learned from the process; and as a matter of protocol, reported its findings to the faculty during the Division's yearly fall retreat. Writing exams included in appendix.

2. CRITICAL THINKING: Even though various strategies are in place to emphasize and assess critical thinking in all courses, two primary assessment instruments have been utilized. The writing assessment described above and administered to students in the capstone courses since 2005 included specific critical thinking assessment components. Additionally, in 2010/2011, an Assessment Committee survey of 377 alumni addressed critical thinking and writing as two of its assessment focuses. This was included in the Division's assessment report for that year. See attachment.

3. KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION: In respect to knowledge acquisition, since AY 2005/2006 the Division has utilized a curriculum matrix to assess where various knowledge-based learning objectives are addressed within the curriculum. Like writing and critical thinking, they are reviewed and assessed through the subject-related Cohort Committee and Assessment Committee review process. In 2009, the Assessment Committee began an intensive process to

re-design and review with the faculty at-large a new knowledge-based assessment exam. This exam was subsequently administered as a pilot to two sections of the capstone course in the spring of 2010. The results of this exam were evaluated by the Assessment Committee and presented to the faculty at its fall 2011 retreat. The Committee is still discussing the efficacy of administering such an exam within a Division with approximately 1800 majors. At this time, the subject-related exam is still under review with the primary concern being 'scientific reliability.' See attachment.

c) Describe and append a sample (or samples) of the "instrument" (e.g., survey or test), "artifact" (e.g., writing sample and evaluative protocol, performance review sheet), or other device used to assess the status of the learning outcomes desired by the program.

1. Please refer to: Assessment Plan, 2010/2011 for survey data; CRJ 194 Writing and Critical Thinking Assessment Essay Prompt and Rubric; Survey of Faculty Writing Practices, item; Alumni Survey, item; Division of Criminal Justice Assessment Exam, spring 2010, item; Cohort Committee Annual Course Review Sheet, item; Curriculum Matrix for the Curriculum Core titles, What a Student Knows; Proposal of current year's self-study identifying new assessment directions.

d) Explain how the program faculty analyzed and evaluated (will analyze and evaluate) the data to reach conclusions about each desired student learning outcome.

1. Previously described – Summary: Assessment objectives collectively identified and agreed upon by Assessment Committee and faculty-at-large. Assessment Committee creates assessment instruments for Division-wide assessment projects. Instruments submitted to Curriculum Committee and Chair for review/feedback. Instruments administered to sample populations. Assessment Committee evaluates progress and results and reports same to faculty-at-large at every monthly faculty meeting and yearly retreat. Subject-related Cohort Committees meet during beginning of each academic year to discuss collective strategies, including assignments, to achieve learning objectives. Committees meet again toward end of year to assess progress. Committees report results at yearly faculty retreats. Division's assessment plan includes yearly reports of formative and summative assessment practices, including any survey results, for purposes of revision and informing the identification of new assessment objectives.

[Please limit your response to 200 words or less *per learning outcome*]

*(If the requested data and/or analysis are not yet available for any of the learning outcomes, please explain why and describe the plan by which these will occur. **Please limit your response to 500 words or less.**)*

5. Regarding each outcome and method discussed in items 2 and 4 above, please provide examples of how findings from the learning outcomes process have been utilized to address decisions to revise or maintain elements of the curriculum (including decisions to alter the

program's desired outcomes). If such decision-making has not yet occurred, please describe the plan by which it will occur.

[Please limit your response to 200 words or less per item]

a) Writing: The initial efforts to improve student writing have remained a specific emphasis of the Division's teaching culture for the past seven years. What began as conversations about improving writing proceeded to decisions to require increased writing in all criminal justice courses; collectively address it through the subject-related Faculty Cohort process in respect to writing assignments and strategies; create and administer common writing assessment instruments as devised by the Assessment Committee; survey faculty about student writing; survey alumni about how writing skills affect their professional capacity; make CRJ 194/190 a writing intensive course; and emphasized faculty participation in developing and encouraging writing in all RTP evaluations. By way of student competency, improving writing remains a core instructional value.

b) Critical Thinking: As with writing, emphasizing critical thinking has persisted as an important component of the Division's teaching culture and of its efforts to deliver a higher quality criminal justice education. The emphasis on critical thinking has been influential in decisions to broaden the diversity of the curriculum in respect to supporting courses counting toward the major. The emphasis on critical thinking was instrumental in creating the Division's capstone course, contemporary Issues in Criminal Justice, in which students are required to express diverse aspects of the curriculum to complicated problem solving scenarios, many of which involve ethical reasoning scenarios. This coincides with the larger assessment efforts to use students in the eight sections of capstone courses as a population to assess critical thinking and writing, as well as command of the knowledge base of the curriculum. And importantly, critical thinking, in terms of increasing the quality of a criminal justice education, is one strong emphasis in this year's self-study which has as its focus the desire to identify and reflect on the values that will drive our curriculum of the future.

c) Knowledge Acquisition: As with writing and critical thinking, the Division's teaching culture is one that promotes broad-based efforts to provide students with skills, knowledge, and abilities to successfully progress to leadership positions within a rapidly changing and increasingly complex criminal justice environment. The knowledge base provided by the criminal justice curriculum has also evolved over the last five years to provide students who don't become criminal justice professionals, personal and intellectual skills and a higher level perspective of citizenship that is reflective of a high quality liberal education. The Division views its curriculum as a nationally recognized model for a higher level University criminal justice education. The continual assessment of the curriculum through subject-related faculty cohort discussions, Curriculum Committee Discussions, and Assessment Committee discussions has ensured that learning objectives and outcomes support and are supported by the curriculum. The findings produced by numerous assessment exams and instruments and processes to evaluate learning outcomes over the past seven years has produced insightful

but not scientifically conclusive evidence of progress toward course and program objectives. The best evidence suggests that the Division's efforts have been sustained and progressive and provide a good foundation from which to continue this year's examination.

6. Has the program systematically sought data from alumni to measure the longer-term effects of accomplishment of the program's learning outcomes? If so, please describe the approach to this information-gathering and the ways in which the information will be applied to the program's curriculum. If such activity has not yet occurred, please describe the plan by which it will occur.
[Please limit your response to 300 words or less]

Until 2010, (excluding self-studies) the Division had not systematically used officially acquired data to survey alumni in respect to learning outcomes. That being said, however, the Division's large and diverse faculty possesses a high degree of connectedness to the professional and academic criminal justice communities. As such, the Division and its graduates remain integrated with a high level of connectedness which produces continual feedback.

However, as part of its assessments efforts in 2010/2011, The Division's Assessment Committee electronically surveyed 377 CRJ alumni about: Student perceptions on whether CRJ degree improved writing skills; Student perceptions about whether CRJ degree improved critical thinking skills; Student perceptions about how CSUS prepared them for graduation; Student perceptions about how CRJ degree has helped in career; Student perceptions about how CRJ degree prepared them for field of choice; Student perceptions about how CRJ degree has positively impacted quality of life; Student perceptions about how CRJ degree will serve them in the future. In respect to writing, it was interesting to note that 71% (N 192) of alumni who graduated before 2000 reported that their CRJ degree helped improve their writing skills. In contrast, alumni who graduated between 2006 & 2010, 86.9% (N 128) reported that their CRJ degree improved their writing skills. This reflects the period of time that the Division put much effort into improving student writing. Similarly, in respect to critical thinking, 91.3% (N 191) of students who graduated prior to 2000 reported their CRJ helped improve their critical thinking skills. In contrast, alumni who graduated between 2006 & 2010, 94.6% (N 128) reported that their CRJ degree helped them improve critical thinking skills. The Division's Assessment committee is continuing to consider the most appropriate use of this information as it responds to this year's charge to identify new assessment directions.

7. Does the program pursue learning outcomes identified by an accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization as important? Does the set of outcomes pursued by your program exceed those identified as important by your accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization?

[Please limit your response to 300 words or less]

Although University level criminal justice education is not subject to accreditation by a governing body, the Division subscribes to standards put forth by the American Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, the national, authoritative body for University level criminal justice

education. The Division's curriculum as well as standards for faculty responsibility and development meet or exceed ACJS standards in all areas.

- 8.** Finally, what additional information would you like to share with the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities regarding the program's desired learning outcomes and assessment of their accomplishment?

[Please limit your response to 200 words or less]

Since 2001, the Criminal Justice Division has worked to maintain a leadership role in respect to outcomes assessment. All Criminal Justice faculty members are informed and practiced in the commitment to use assessment as an important decision making tool in determining the Division's future directions. Even though it was not without some significant difficulty to infuse an accepted assessment culture into such a large and diverse faculty body supporting 1800 majors, the Division has done so and remains committed to sustaining its assessment-oriented faculty and teaching culture established over the last several years. The Division also recognizes the need to further establish and refine its assessment processes to illuminate priorities and mitigate liabilities incurred as a result of decreasing University resources. The Division's history over this time period is one of commitment to using assessment as one important process to ensure its delivery of a nationally recognized criminal justice education.

<http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/Reports/>.

Assessment History 2004-2012

In **Fall 2004**, the Division of Criminal Justice began instituting prerequisites to the program so that students would complete the coursework in a logical manner. The first of these was the Pre-Criminal Justice major; pre-major students were restricted to lower division Criminal Justice courses, so as to be better-prepared for upper division courses. When the lower division coursework was completed, students were then eligible for Criminal Justice major classes and upper division work.

To assess specific knowledge gained relating to the learning objectives within the upper division core, the Division created a pre-test/post-test consisting of a multiple choice exam and essay prompt. The pre-test was first administered in Fall 2004 to incoming transfer students during orientation, and to exiting students enrolled in the capstone course, CRJ 194.

During **AY 05/06**, the Division began administering the pre-test in CRJ 110, as it was a course in which all students should have enrolled upon completing the lower division classes; the post-test continued to be administered in CRJ 194. The Division also reviewed the exam and its administration, and addressed concerns raised about how well the exam tested the Division course objectives, the variability in the exam's administration, and students' lack of commitment to completing an un-weighted exam to the best of their abilities.

In **AY 06/07**, the pre-test was removed from CRJ 110, and became the final requirement for reclassification from pre-major to major status. This change allowed a more uniform administration of the exam by placing it on the WebCT platform. However, it was found that the brevity of essays completed on WebCT made them very difficult to assess, versus the hand-written essays. A very small sample of pre-test/post-test comparison was available for analysis, as the students who first took the exam began to exit.

The Division suspended the administration of the assessment exam in **Fall 2007**, while the Division began a thorough review of its practices and testing instrument. The Division faculty were surveyed regarding their classroom writing practices, using the information gathered as a discussion point for meetings of faculty class cohorts. The class cohorts began a review of the Division core class syllabi and course objectives to ensure that students taking the same course with different instructors were receiving the same body of knowledge.

Pre-testing was discontinued in **AY 08/09**. In Fall 2008, both the multiple choice and essay portions of the exam were revised to reflect curriculum learning objectives and emphasize critical thinking, and administered to students in CRJ 194. The post-test administration was standardized, and given a weight of 10% of the student's grade to ensure that students approached the exam seriously. A random sample of the essays was reviewed to test the instrument. Feedback from the students and faculty indicated some substantive and logistical problems with the questions that had been previously submitted for the multiple choice questions.

The Assessment Committee once again revised the multiple choice portion of the exam in **AY 09/10**. It was evident that the course cohorts had been thoroughly reviewing their materials, as the new questions submitted provided a robust sample of the thinking of each cohort. The Committee's review of the essay prompts found that time constraints and a substantive overlap caused the second question to be poorly or briefly answered. In response, the Committee combined the two questions into a single concise prompt. The revised post-test was piloted in Dr. Maguire's Spring 2010 CRJ 194 class. The essay results were analyzed in Fall 2010, and found that our majors were able to think critically and communicate through writing at an above average (B-) level.

In **AY 10/11**, the Assessment Committee designed and administered a survey of alumni. It was administered in April 2011 to alumni who graduated between 1960 and 2010. The respondents reported very positive outcomes as a result of their coursework during the degree or having the degree for their career or life achievement. When comparing earlier graduates to recent graduates, increasing or decreasing percentages of students over time (graduated prior to 2000 compared to 2006-2010) reporting positive outcomes are what would be expected given changes in the program. Overall, alumni feedback provides evidence that coursework and the CRJ degree itself has a positive impact on students.

In **AY 11/12**, the Committee is focusing on the CRJ advising process, and creating a long-term plan to foster the success of our current students and future alumni.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
Division of Criminal Justice
Assessment Plan
Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice

The faculty of the Division of Criminal Justice are committed to providing criminal justice students the highest quality educational experience possible. Criminal Justice faculty are committed to providing students the opportunity to acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities that will enable them to pursue their highest academic and professional aspirations. Faculty are further committed to strengthening student intellectual development by modeling an ethic devoted to lifelong learning. To do so, the division must continually engage in assessment of student outcomes and division practices and procedures in support of students and apply the results of these evaluations to our program content, teaching and student support services.

Principles underlying the development and implementation of an assessment plan in the Criminal Justice Division.

1. The primary purpose of outcomes assessment is to enhance teaching and learning, rather than the promotion of accountability to higher authorities in the University.
2. All aspects of the creation, modification, and implementation of an assessment plan shall be reviewed and approved by a majority of the regular members of the full-time faculty of the Criminal Justice Division.
3. Outcomes assessment is concerned with the performance of the Division as a whole, rather than the performance of individual faculty members or students.
4. Outcomes assessment is not concerned with the evaluation of individual students for purposes of determining their status.
5. Outcomes assessment is not concerned with the evaluation of individual faculty members for purposes of making personnel decisions, including decisions regarding tenure, promotion, or salary increases.
6. Raw data generated by the outcomes assessment process is available only to the members of the Division of Criminal Justice.
7. The goals of the outcomes assessment program is to create a basis for the integration of assessment into ongoing educational endeavors using a variety of measures of performance to assist in the improvement of the criminal justice program.
8. Student participation in the outcomes assessment process is an important part of the assessment plan.

Assessing Student Outcomes

One important means of ensuring these processes is through the development and implementation of a student outcomes assessment plan. Criminal Justice faculty recognize that assessment efforts should flow through the university's mission statement and that the purpose of assessment is improvement of the university's programs. Faculty further recognize that assessment of academic achievement will be guided by faculty and that the process itself should utilize multiple measures and not rely on a single instrument or activity. Results acquired from

the assessment process will be used for decision-making and the assessment process will itself be evaluated. The results of assessment activities are to be viewed as a means rather than an end.

GOALS:

Program goals and objectives are addressed within three critical areas of student performance and development:

1. What a student knows.
2. What a student can do.
3. What a student cares about.

What A Student Knows - Goals

Graduates of the CSUS Criminal Justice Program should possess a knowledge base that concerns the areas of. (these are reflective of the criminal justice curriculum core)

- a. criminal justice and juvenile justice processes (law, crime, and the administration of justice)
- b. criminology (the causes of crime, typologies, offenders, and victims)
- c. law enforcement (police administration, crime investigation, leadership, problem-oriented policing, community policing, police and community relations, planning ethics, and the legal use of discretion)
- d. law adjudication (criminal law, prosecution, defenses to crimes, evidence, legal procedure, court procedure)
- e. corrections (incarceration, treatment and legal rights of offenders, community-based corrections)

What A Student Can Do - Goals

Graduates of the CSUS Criminal Justice Program should be able to:

- a. analyze information
- b. think critically
- c. read effectively
- d. speak effectively
- e. write effectively
- f. research effectively g. solve problems

What A Student Cares About - Personal Growth and Citizenship - Goals

Graduates of the CSUS Criminal Justice Program should have developed:

- a. interpersonal and leadership skills
- b. an acute sense of one's personal identity and potential
- c. cultural awareness, flexibility, and sensitivity to fully appreciate the values and differences of a diverse society

- d. the ability to recognize the rights, responsibilities, and privileges of a citizen

OBJECTIVES

Objectives are brief, clear statements that describe the desired learning outcomes of instruction. Attention is focused on the specific types of performances that students are expected to demonstrate at the end of instruction.

The following are examples of objectives that relate to goals defining "What A Criminal Justice Graduate Can Do."

Goal: CSUS graduates should be able to analyze information

Specific Objectives - CSUS Criminal Justice graduates should be able to:

- a. Identify and examine a complex whole on the basis of its respective parts and on the relationship between those parts.
- b. Read, interpret and use criminal justice and criminological data skillfully.
- c. Read, interpret, and comprehend, research reports, and identify the strengths and weaknesses of these reports.
- d. Adopt and express a scientific orientation in which everything is open to further testing, reinterpretation, or refutation.
- e. Read, interpret, and restate the meaning of legal statutes, associated case law, and legal dispositions.

Goal: CSUS graduates should be able to think critically

Specific Objectives - CSUS Criminal Justice graduates should be able to:

- a. Evaluate (assess the credibility of communication and the strengths of its claims and arguments) criminological explanations and criminal justice policies.
- b. Identify and interpret (understand and express the meaning of) ethical problems they may confront in criminal justice practice.
- c. Identify and evaluate the assumptions underlying criminal justice policies and assess their empirical basis.
- d. Identify and avoid errors in reasoning, such as provincialism, overgeneralization, and emotional identification relative to argument.
- e. Apply deductive and inductive approaches to the construction of theories to account for crime and justice phenomena.
- f. Evaluate criminal justice programs on the basis of the relative efficiency and effectiveness of the program's processes and outcomes.

Goal: CSUS Criminal Justice graduates should be able to read effectively

Specific Objectives - CSUS Criminal Justice graduates should be able to:

- a. Read, comprehend, and evaluate information contained in texts, technical reports, instruction manuals, computer media, data in graphs and charts, periodicals, journal articles, and memos.
- b. Read for content by identifying themes, recognizing relationships, understanding the use of devices such as metaphor, irony, and humor, conceptualizing abstractions, and recognizing confusing, vague, and ambiguous language.
- c. Read for analysis by identifying the explicit and implied features of the text, especially the arguments or positions that put forth a conclusion.
- d. Read for evaluation by judging and assessing the credibility of a text and the strength of claims or positions.
- e. Read for inference and reasoning to form new knowledge, draw conclusions, solve problems, explain, decide and/or predict.
- f. Read with reflection to monitor one's comprehension and to correct one's process of thinking.

Goal: CSUS Criminal Justice graduates should be able to speak effectively

Specific Objectives - CSUS Criminal Justice graduates should be able to:

- a. Demonstrate mastery of the processes of basic speech communication (skills relating to the selection and arrangement of elements to produce spoken messages).
- b. Demonstrate mastery of interpersonal and group communication (skills relating to the management of human relations)
- c. Demonstrate mastery of communication codes (skills relating to the ability to use and understand spoken English and non-verbal signs)
- d. Demonstrate mastery of oral message evaluation (skills relating to the evaluation of oral messages and their effects)
- e. Distinguish and avoid language-indicating bias.
- f. Outline key points and sub-points of their spoken messages.
- g. Use pronunciation, grammar, and articulation appropriate for designated audience.
- h. Adapt to changes in audience characteristics.
- i. Support arguments with relevant and adequate evidence.
- j. Restate assumptions, evidence, and conclusions of an argument.

Goal: CSUS Criminal Justice graduates should be able to write effectively.

Specific Objectives - CSUS Criminal Justice graduates should be able to define, explain, criticize, propose, recommend, review, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate.

Their writing should be characterized by:

- a. well developed main idea
- b. major points developed with multi-level elaboration
- c. relevant generalizations
- c. clear organizational plan that is suited to the topic
- d. development of all parts of the composition with no digressions
- e. use of vocabulary specific to the purpose of the paper
- f. compliance with the conventions of grammar, punctuation, formatting, and spelling.

Process Assessment

The assessment process should also address how well the overall operation of the division fulfills the needs of students. Performance should be evaluated in the following areas:

1. Academic advising
2. Career advising
3. Curriculum
4. Course scheduling
5. Student support and incorporation into university community

Feedback, Incorporation and Reassessment

Assessment exists to allow organization to recognize the need for change and adaptation and to assist in planning and executing needed change and adaptation. The assessment and adaptation process should be an ongoing one that incorporates feedback loops. The division of criminal justice depends upon the Assessment and Academic Standards, Curriculum and Personnel Committees, coordinated by the division chair, to facilitate such change, but most changes require approval by the majority of the faculty members. In addition, some changes and adaptation perceived as desirable are not possible due to resource limits, university policies or labor agreements. Others can only be suggested to individual faculty, but not imposed due to the nature of faculty autonomy. The dispersed nature of the responsibility and authority combined with a lack of effective mechanisms for rewarding or sanctioning non-compliance imposes severe limits upon the capacity to assure implementation of any plan. The lack of any single external accrediting body and the presence of multiple disciplines within the division combine with the size of the faculty to impose real limits on the level of voluntary consensus on objectives and means among the faculty.

In spite of these structural limitations the division maintains an active program to examine and update our operations on an ongoing basis. Teaching cohorts meet annually and review all learning objectives, texts and course syllabi for the course cluster. Changes are recommended and referred to the Assessment and Academic Standards Committee, which approves any changes in learning objectives or other universal mandates. In addition, the Assessment and Academic Standards Committee has initiated periodic assessments using a variety of methods including focus groups and student surveys to assess division performance. The results will be used to recommendation changes in policy, procedures, future hiring, curriculum and student support services to the chair, appropriate committees and the division faculty where appropriate.

In addition, the division will begin administering pre-tests to students entering the major and post-tests to seniors in the capstone in the 04-05 academic year. The Assessment and Academic Standards Committee shall utilize the results from these examinations, including writing samples, to determine the level of student knowledge and skills and identify weaknesses in student performance. Based upon this information the Curriculum and Personnel committees may recommend specific remedies in curriculum content and/or future hiring to the division faculty.



**California State University, Sacramento
Division of Criminal Justice**

**2010-2011
Division Assessment Report**

INTRODUCTION

In the Academic Year (AY) 2010-2011, the Division of Criminal Justice had a three pronged assessment plan: we continued our ongoing process of quality assurance through course cohort reviews; we continued the ongoing assessment of our primary student centered goal of improving writing and critical thinking; and lastly, we added a new assessment tool in opening a feedback loop with our alumni and a stronger feedback loop with faculty in the Division. The activities conducted this year serve three purposes; they continue the assessment focus from the last AY, they incorporate a planned new focus on alumni, and they assist the Division in preparation for the self-study in the next AY.

The survey assessment of alumni during this AY enhanced prior AY assessment activities by informing the Division of more distal student outcomes. In this effort, the Division has attempted to understand overall program effect as a method of assessing our teaching strategies and administrative processes within the Division. This assessment focus stems from a shift in assessment philosophy. Rather than examine solely summative issues to understand how well things worked, we have utilized a more formative assessment philosophy in our future assessment efforts. This formative philosophy and the 'why we do what we do' approach to assessment will allow the Division to more accurately examine its assessment practices to inform overall program improvement.

ACADEMIC YEAR 2010-2011 ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

The Assessment Information Loop

The Division has a productive Assessment Committee that routinely engages with the faculty as a whole on issues of student outcome measures, program evaluation and curriculum assessment. The primary and continual goal of the Assessment Committee is quality assurance for the Division. The Division of Criminal Justice has a large faculty body and information is routinely shared and considered toward the benefit of the Division's program. As such, assessment activities are not exclusive to a few faculty assigned to such a committee; all faculty are involved to some degree. This AY the Assessment Committee created an Assessment page on SacCT and enrolled all Division faculty. This served to enhance communication with the faculty as a whole by providing a central location to share information, facilitate greater discussion and exchange ideas.

At the Division's annual retreat and during monthly Division faculty meetings, the Division Assessment Committee communicates their activities and results to the entire faculty with the aim of initiating discussion and provoking ideas for improving the program and student

outcomes. The information sharing and discussions of the assessment of student and program outcomes is part of the Division's information loop. Included in the loop are information collection, analysis and interpretation, reporting results, and discussion of future goals and processes. Essentially, the assessment information loop informs the Division faculty what was learned over the past year about student and program outcomes and allows the Division to understand how it will or how it did change as a result of the information. For example, as a result of information sharing on teaching methods, a number of Division faculty have reported changes to teaching strategies to improve student outcomes. One faculty member has conducted focus groups in class in addition to reviewing numerous publications on different learning and teaching styles in his effort to improve student engagement, active learning, addressing different learning styles and, ultimately, improving student learning and learning outcomes. Feedback from students on the inclusive approach by this faculty is very positive. Another faculty member has focused on student engagement in the classroom in an effort to improve student accountability and encourage students to be more prepared for class. This professor incorporates problem-based learning techniques and components of the student-centered instructional model. Both these professors communicate their efforts and innovative strategies to the entire faculty. It should be noted, both these faculty were invited to present their teaching styles and/or course preparation materials at a conference attended by other professors from around Northern California.

The Division has closed some loops, figuratively speaking, and opened others. This is the nature of assessment. From AY 2005-2010, the Assessment Committee collected data consistent with its focus on student writing and critical thinking. The results of which were fed back to the faculty for discussion, interpretation and program response. In some cases, test questions were eliminated, in other cases new tests and rubrics were developed. Another result was that a new policy requiring mandatory writing assignments in every upper division CRJ course was instituted. These activities are examples of closing the loop; however, strategic planning for program improvement opens new loops for future data collection and dissemination of results such as this year's focus on alumni to measure student outcomes.

Faculty discussion and feedback received during and following discussion is invaluable to the effort of program and student outcome improvement. In addition to discussion at regular faculty meetings and the annual faculty retreat, information is shared through Assessment Committee reports, Assessment Committee meetings and activities, Curriculum Committee meetings and reports, Course Cohort meetings, SacCT, and faculty advising. Through all of these various activities, each has its own information loop in which information and ideas are presented, discussed and decisions made with the intent to improve courses, teaching, student learning, program areas, the program overall, etc. Each of these micro information loops then feed into the larger information loop of the entire Division to improve courses, teaching, student learning, program areas, the program overall.

The actions and recommendations of the Assessment Committee are formed based on information from the entire information loop; conducting assessment activities, faculty input, course cohort meetings, and working with the Division Curriculum Committee, to improve critical thinking, writing, and student outcomes. What we learn directly influences how we change. The process of the Assessment Committee in its annual activities is to plan and design assessment activities, collect data, analyze it, and present it to the full faculty for discussion and program recommendations. Decisions from the faculty body that come about through the Assessment process are actionable and help improve the program.

Review and Evaluation of 2009-2010 Essay Test

In AY 2008-2009, the Division administered an improved form of an earlier assessment instrument, an essay exam, aimed at measuring critical thinking and writing. Test administration was standardized so that every senior was given the same test instructions, at roughly the same time in the academic year. Each senior took the test on a computer with the same time to finish (75 minutes). To help seniors take the exam more seriously, the CRJ 194 Course Cohort faculty agreed to make the essay test worth 10 percent of the CRJ 194 grade. Each CRJ 194 faculty provided feedback on the test and rubric and agreed to use the new rubric for grading the exam as part of the CRJ 194 course. Integrating the essay test as part of the core coursework increased student buy-in and participation with the exam and ensured more uniform administration.

All participating seniors were given pre-test content material (related to the test questions) one class period prior to test day (or two days prior to test day). The students were instructed to not bring notes or outside sources to the test administration. The AY 2009-2010 evaluation of the previous review cycle exams found that students were more likely to develop robust responses to question one and apply less thinking to question two. As a result, Fall 2009 was spent discussing the test and found that, in retrospect, the two questions had substantive overlap. The Assessment Committee combined the two questions into one, more concise prompt.

The Division administered the new test in spring 2010. Although the Division had a smaller number of faculty participating in test administration than it had in spring 2009, we randomly selected students from the graduating class for participation. Early student feedback was more positive about the test prompt than it had been in AY 2008-2009. The same rubric developed in AY 2008-2009 was used to evaluate the essays in Fall 2010 (See Appendix A).

Results

Results of the exam were positive overall. The scores on the questions ranged from 14 (56%) to 25 (100%), while the average score was 20 (80%) out of a total of 25 possible points. The exam rubric focused on five main areas; organization, grammar, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. The average score on the organization section, which addressed areas of organization, proper sentence structure and strength of introduction, multiple paragraphs with topic sentences and a paragraph with a concluding sentence for the essay was 4.3 (86%) out of five possible points. The grammar section, while having the lowest average of the five sections on the rubric, still had an overall average of 3.8 (77%) out of five possible points. The organization and grammar sections cover the ability to write coherently and logically in an organized and grammatically correct manner. The other three sections assessed students' ability for critical thinking and argument presentation.

The intent of the analysis section is to understand students' ability to break material into component parts. As such, at the highest level of ability, student writing should reflect in-depth analysis that consists of recognizing patterns and parts, organizing those parts, recognizing hidden meanings in topics/issues, and identifying components of information while drawing on material and knowledge learned through coursework. The overall average for student responses was 4 (80%) out of a possible five points.

Through analysis, students should recognize component parts from a topic or issue. The purpose of the synthesis section of the exam was to assess students' ability to put parts together for form a new whole; their argument/presentation of a viewpoint, position, etc. Following the rubric, the graders assessed student ability to utilize ideas in a scenario to create new logical ideas and predict, draw conclusions, generalize information to form logical and innovative ideas while drawing on material and knowledge learned through coursework. The average score in this area for student responses was 3.9 (79%) out of five possible points.

The fifth section of the exam assessed student responses in the area of evaluation. This section assessed students' ability to judge the value of material they identified to respond to the essay prompt. The evaluation section was intended to assess a student's writing for demonstration of their ability to compare and discriminate between ideas, recognize subjectivity, assess and verify theories and facts, and choose whether information is important in order to make reasonable arguments based on the information provided while drawing on material and knowledge learned through coursework. The average score for this area was 4 (80%) out of five possible points.

The results of the essay exam overall indicate that the CRJ seniors who took the essay test are able to think critically and communicate through writing at an above average (B-) level.

Alumni Survey

Past assessment review cycles have focused on content, writing, and critical thinking in the evaluation of student and program outcomes by examining seniors in their last semester before graduation. As such, these evaluations inform the Division on how well students write and demonstrate critical thinking skills. In the current AY, the Division continued its commitment to understanding student and program outcomes while incorporating a focus on students who had completed the program already: alumni of the Division. One goal of the Division is to prepare students for graduation and a professional life. The Division was interested in post baccalaureate student outcomes. Understanding student outcomes post-graduation helps the Division understand the effect of the entire program.

The alumni survey was conducted in April 2011. The brief survey focused on selected outcomes of alumni (See Appendix B). With the cooperation of the Alumni Association who identified CRJ alum, an email was sent on behalf of the Division inviting former students to take the short survey. The email message included a link to an online survey provider for alumni choosing to respond.

Results

Year of Graduation

A total of 377 CRJ alumni completed the survey. Of those, 195 graduated between 1960 and 2000 and, 171 graduated between 2000 and 2010; 11 responses were missing data for year graduated. Of the 171 alumni that graduated between 2000 and 2010, 130 graduated in the past five years (2006-2010). In tables that follow, the totals for the 130 graduating between 2006 and 2010 are always shown as a subset of the 171 that graduated in the past 10 years, between 2000 and 2010.

Time to Graduate

Overall, the average amount of time it took CRJ Alumni to graduate with a degree was reported as 4.83 years. The amount of time it takes students to graduate with a degree in CRJ has increased but, only slightly over time. Alumni who graduated prior to 2000 reported that it took them 4.74 years on average to graduate. This compares to an average of 4.86 years for students graduating in 2000 or later. Students graduating in the last five years reported that it took them 4.93 years on average to complete their degree. For those students in the above groups who were first-time freshmen at Sacramento State, the reported time to graduation is consistent with the

time to graduation as reported by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). In the Fall 2009 Fact Book for the Division of Criminal Justice, the OIR reported that the 5 year mean for total time in years for students graduating in 2004-05 through 2008-09 was 4.3 years. Students responding to the survey who graduated in the past five years reported 4.6 total years to graduation. The two averages differ by only 0.3 years, perhaps one semester. This slight difference can possibly be interpreted as a difference between time to graduation reported by students being based on perception rather than actual enrollment data used for the OIR report.

Since the survey question asked how long in total years it took students to complete their degree, transfer students reported total years and not only years spent at Sacramento State once they transferred. For transfer students, the OIR statistics examine only time spent at Sacramento State after transferring so comparisons could not be made between the survey and the OIR report for transfer students.

Transfer Units

Counting all students, 76.7% transferred units from a junior college toward their CRJ degree from Sac State. For students graduating before 2000, 82.1% transferred units from a junior college whereas 71.9% of students graduating in the last year transferred units and, 70% of those graduating in the last five years transferred units. This is an interesting decline of 12.1% between those that graduated prior to 2000 and those graduating in the past 5 years.

Outcomes

The following tables present data on seven outcome questions on the survey. The questions asked alumni about their perceptions on the impact of graduating with a CRJ degree from the CRJ Division at Sac State. Refer to Appendix B for the actual wording of questions four through ten on the survey as represented in Table 1 through Table 7 respectively.

As indicated in Table 1 (survey question 4), a large majority of students reported that their writing skills improved as a result of their coursework while they were a criminal justice major at Sac State. A higher percentage of students graduating more recently (in the past five years) reported that coursework improved their writing skills than did students graduating earlier (before 2000). This is an important finding since over time, the program has incorporated more writing requirements in courses and it would be expected that more recent graduates would have more benefit from the program commitment to improving writing skills.

Table 1*
Student perceptions on whether CRJ degree improved writing skills

Alumni Group	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
All Alumni	297	78.8	73	19.4
Graduated before 2000	139	71.3	52	26.7
Graduated 2000 to 2010	149	87.1	20	11.7
Graduated 2006 to 2010	113	86.9	15	11.5

* Data does not include missing or invalid responses.

Another area of program commitment has been critical thinking. Many faculty in the Division encourage and challenge students to think critically about information on topics that are covered. Table 2 (survey question 5) shows that over 90% of all alumni surveyed felt that their studies as a criminal justice major at Sac State improved their critical thinking skills. Further, a higher percentage of recent graduates compared with those graduating prior to 2000 reported improved writing skills as a result of their criminal justice studies.

Table 2*
Student perceptions on whether CRJ degree improved critical thinking skills

Alumni Group	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
All Alumni	349	92.6	22	5.8
Graduated before 2000	178	91.3	13	6.7
Graduated 2000 to 2010	162	94.7	8	4.7
Graduated 2006 to 2010	123	94.6	6	4.6

* Data does not include missing or invalid responses.

Almost 94% of all alumni reported that their time at Sacramento State prepared them to be successful in their coursework as preparation for graduation (Table 3; survey question 6). For alumni that graduated in the most recent five years, over 90% reported they were prepared for graduation. As students move toward graduation semester after semester, the high percentage of students reporting preparation is not surprising. What is surprising is any number of alumni that report their time at the university did not prepare them for graduation. It is worth following up on this idea perhaps by discussing degree progress and informing students that in addition to taking courses, there are resources such as faculty advising and the CRJ Advising Center available to help them prepare and plan for graduation.

Table 3*
Student perceptions on whether time at Sacramento State prepared for graduation

Alumni Group	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
All Alumni	353	93.6	16	4.2
Graduated before 2000	184	94.4	6	3.1
Graduated 2000 to 2010	159	93.0	10	5.8
Graduated 2006 to 2010	119	91.5	9	6.9

* Data does not include missing or invalid responses.

As indicated in Table 4 (survey question 7), almost 77% of alumni overall reported that having a CRJ degree from this Division at Sacramento State has helped them in their career. As would be expected, a much higher percentage of earlier graduates (87.2%) than recent graduates (59.2%) reported that the CRJ degree has helped in their career since recent grads have had less time to begin their careers and, in some cases, compete for fewer jobs as the result of recent economic realities.

Table 4*
Student perceptions on whether CRJ degree has helped in career

Alumni Group	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
All Alumni	289	76.7	79	21.0
Graduated before 2000	170	87.2	21	10.8
Graduated 2000 to 2010	110	64.3	57	33.3
Graduated 2006 to 2010	77	59.2	50	38.5

* Data does not include missing or invalid responses.

When asked whether their CRJ degree prepared them for their field of choice, 74% of all alumni indicated it did (see Table 5; survey question 8). As would be expected due to the amount of time it can take for graduates to work toward their desired career/field of choice, more alumni graduating prior to 2000 than recent grads (2006-2010) reported their degree helped them.

Table 5*
Student perceptions on whether CRJ degree has prepared them for field of choice

Alumni Group	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
All Alumni	279	74.0	90	23.9
Graduated before 2000	156	80.0	34	17.4
Graduated 2000 to 2010	114	66.7	55	32.2
Graduated 2006 to 2010	82	63.1	47	36.2

* Data does not include missing or invalid responses.

Table 6 (survey question 9) provides the data on perhaps the most positive of the outcomes; impact of degree on alumni lives. Overall, 88% of alumni reported that their CRJ degree from the Division of CRJ at Sacramento State has positively impacted their quality of life. Again, as they are younger and in the early stages of careers or career seeking, a smaller percent of recent grads (2006-2010) than earlier grads reported the degree has positively impacted their quality of life. While fewer, still 80% of the recent grad group felt the degree has already had a positive impact.

Table 6*
Student perceptions on whether CRJ degree has positively impacted quality of life

Alumni Group	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
All Alumni	332	88.1	37	9.8
Graduated before 2000	182	93.3	8	4.1
Graduated 2000 to 2010	141	82.5	28	16.4
Graduated 2006 to 2010	104	80.0	25	19.2

* Data does not include missing or invalid responses.

Some of the above tables have shown that time has some effect which results in smaller percentages of recent grads versus earlier grads reporting yes to various outcome questions. The data in Table 7 (survey question 10) indicates an inverse effect of time which would also be expected. When asked whether their CRJ degree will serve them in their future, over 80% of alumni overall reported it would. Obviously, since they have been in careers for much longer, about 76% of alumni graduating prior to 2000 reported their degree would serve them in the future whereas over 85% of recent grads perceived that their CRJ degree would help them in their future.

Table 7*
Student perceptions on whether CRJ degree will serve in future

Alumni Group	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
All Alumni	303	80.4	65	17.2
Graduated before 2000	148	75.9	43	22.1
Graduated 2000 to 2010	147	86.0	21	12.3
Graduated 2006 to 2010	111	85.4	18	13.8

* Data does not include missing or invalid responses.

The results of the survey, as shown in Table 1 through Table 7, indicate that alumni report very positive outcomes as a result of their coursework during the degree or having the degree for their career or life achievement. When comparing earlier graduates to recent graduates, increasing or

decreasing percentages of students over time (graduated prior to 2000 compared to 2006-2010) reporting positive outcomes are what would be expected given changes in the program. Overall, alumni feedback provides evidence that coursework and the CRJ degree itself has a positive impact on students.

FUTURE ASSESSMENTS

The assessment activities of the Division continue to work through the cycle of evaluating writing and critical thinking, surveying alumni, and examining content as methods for assessing student outcomes. Over AY 2010-2011, the Division continued its commitment to assessing student outcomes for students about to graduate by evaluating the prior year essay exams while also examining student outcomes for students who have already graduated. Activities over the past AY have not only continued the focus on traditional year to year student outcomes but have allowed the Division to understand alternative activities and possibilities for assessment in the future and provides understanding and preliminary insights into activities and areas of focus as we move toward beginning a self-study in Fall 2011.

The Division's assessment activities are faculty driven to identify the outcomes, define assessment means and decide what to do with the results. Next Fall, the assessment cycle begins again however, each year part of an overall assessment cycle that transitions in focus from year to year while following the longer term approach to overall assessment. The Division is one of the largest criminal justice undergraduate programs in the nation. In the coming years, the Division will focus on identifying strengths and weaknesses of the program as we redefine the program quality as yet another approach to improving student outcomes. The most significant interactions in college education arguably occur in the classroom. Another approach we intend to adopt next year is a survey of CRJ faculty on assessment efforts. The CRJ Division Assessment Committee and faculty remain committed to improving and maintaining higher levels of standardization for teaching and learning.

Appendix A

**RUBRIC FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE 194 ASSESSMENT ESSAY ASSIGNMENT
SACRAMENTO STATE UNIVERSITY**

Author: _____

Reviewer: _____ **Date:** _____

This rubric is designed to make clear the grading process for the CRJ 194 Assessment Essay assignment.

	Possible Points	Score
Organization		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is purposeful, effective, and excellent; writing reflects effective use of transitions to present ideas with no digressions; essay begins with introductory sentence, each paragraph has a topic sentence, and the essay ends with a sentence of conclusion. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is effective, and writing reflects sufficient use of transitions to present ideas logically; topic sentences may be present, conclusion may be present, but are not consistent. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is coherent but simplistic sequencing of events and may have minor digressions; topic sentences and conclusions not present. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is a simple listing of information and details; paragraphs are undeveloped, relies on narrative for structure. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing presents no organizational framework for presentation of content. 	1	
Grammar		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sentence form and word choice are varied and appropriate; punctuation, grammar and spelling are superior with consistent conventions of Standard English. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects consistent control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice and conventions of Standard English. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects adequate control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English. Errors do not slow the reader or impede understanding for the reader in a serious way. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects deficient control of syntax, word choice, and conventions of Standard English. Errors impede or seriously undermine the comprehension of the reader. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects inadequate and inappropriate use of syntax, word choice, and conventions of Standard English. 	1	
Analysis (The ability to break material down into component parts.)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects in-depth analysis that consists of seeing patterns and parts, organizing parts, recognizing hidden meanings, and identifying components of information presented. Analysis draws on information learned in previous courses and disciplines. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects in-depth analysis that consists of seeing patterns and parts, organizing parts, and recognizing hidden meanings, but only in the context of this assignment and information presented. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects logical analysis and ability to see obvious linkages and parts but is limited and narrow in context. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects limited/ weak analysis, errors in perceiving associations; analysis is outside the context of the assignment. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects no analysis of related linkages and parts. 	1	

Synthesis (The ability to put parts together to form a new whole.)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing reflects utilization of ideas presented in assignment to create new, logical ideas and an ability to predict, draw conclusions; generalization of information from facts presented in a correct and logical manner, information drawn from other coursework and studies to form logical and innovative conclusions. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing reflects utilization of ideas presented in assignment to create new logical ideas and an ability to predict, draw conclusions; generalization of facts, but only from those included in the assignment, to come to logical conclusions. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing reflects few new ideas generated from information presented in assignment, or new ideas that are not logical or innovative. Few, if any, generalizations. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing reflects no new ideas generated from the information given in the assignment, poor or incorrect generalizations given. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing includes no new ideas, no generalizations or conclusions based on the material in the assignment. 	1	
Evaluation (The ability to judge the value of material for a given purpose.)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing demonstrates an outstanding ability to compare and discriminate between ideas presented in the assignment, recognize subjectivity, assess and verify the value of theories and facts presented come to a choice of whether the information is important, making reasonable arguments based on the information provided along with other information learned in other classes. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing demonstrates a strong ability to compare and discriminate between ideas presented in the assignment, recognize subjectivity, weigh and verify the value of theories and facts and choose in a logical manner the value of evidence. Writer is able to make reasonable arguments based on the information provided in the assignment. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer shows some ability to be able to compare and discriminate between some facts and theories presented in the assignment and recognize subjectivity. Writer demonstrates some difficulty in reasoning when making arguments based on the information provided in the assignment. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer has difficulty in comparing and discriminating between the facts given in the assignment, does not recognize subjectivity, and cannot give logical rationales when choosing a certain point over another. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of comparing or discriminating between ideas or making choices based on any arguments, or assessing the value of evidence is present in the writing. 	1	

Total Score on Assessment Essay Assignment: _____

Comments

Appendix B

Faculty in the Division of Criminal Justice at Sac State are asking you to participate in a short survey on your experience in the Criminal Justice program at CSU, Sacramento. Responses will be considered for improvements in the Division of Criminal Justice. The survey consists of 10 questions and requires only a couple minutes of your time and all responses are anonymous. Results of this survey will be made available upon request.

Thank you for participating.

1. In what year did you graduate as a criminal justice major from Sac State? (Enter the year in the box below)

2. How much total time in years did it take you to complete your degree? (Enter time in years in the box below)

3. Did you transfer units from a junior college that were used toward your degree at Sac State?

Yes

No

4. Do you feel your coursework as a criminal justice major at Sac State improved your writing skills?

Yes

No

5. Do you think your studies as a criminal justice major at Sac State improved your critical thinking skills?

Yes

No

6. Do you feel your time at Sac State prepared you to graduate?

Yes

No

7. Do you feel that your criminal justice degree from Sac State has helped you in your career?

Yes

No

8. Do you feel your criminal justice degree from Sac State prepared you for your field of choice?

- Yes
- No

9. Do you feel your degree has positively impacted your quality of life?

- Yes
- No

10. Do you feel that your CRJ degree from Sac State will serve you in your future?

- Yes
- No

Assessment Committee Report
Spring 2010

Mary Maguire, Ph.D., Assessment Committee Chair

Approved by Assessment Committee Members:

Tim Croisdale, Ph.D.
Yvette Farmer, Ph.D.
John Panneton, J.D.
Hugh Wilson, D.P.A.

Division of Criminal Justice
Sacramento State University

INTRODUCTION

During the 2009-2010 Academic Year the Division of Criminal Justice continued to build and refine the assessment process to further program improvement. Efforts of previous review cycles to evaluate core courses and develop and administer new assessment tests revealed the need for additional refinement in the AY 2009-2010.

In the AY 2008-2009, the Assessment Committee spent considerable time developing a cohort review tool to more reliably review learning objectives and course content for the core courses of the Criminal Justice major. The Committee also used the increase in communication this tool provided, to assist with building a new multiple choice content test.

An early AY 2009-2010 review of the multiple choice questions (collected in AY 2008-2009) revealed both substantive and logistical problems with the submitted questions. This necessitated another level of question review and a postponed test administration to the Spring 2010. Ultimately, the review process to refine the multiple choice test proved to be a robust review of the thinking in each of the course cohorts. The test was piloted to a group of 41 graduating seniors in Spring 2010.

Additionally, as a result of feedback from students and from faculty readers of the AY 2008-2009 original administration of the critical thinking/writing essay test, revisions of the test questions were undertaken early in AY 2009-2010. Due to the change in the test question for future essay exams, old exams from Spring 2009 did not need to be evaluated. Nevertheless, a preliminary review of a small sample of the Spring 2009 essays revealed the scores to be nearly identical to the mean scores of Fall 2008.

ASSESSMENT FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 2009-2010

Revision and Administration of the Essay Test

Since the Division cannot say with certainty that demonstrated student improvement in writing and critical thinking skills is the direct result of Division coursework, the pre-post test model was discontinued. All Division testing is now only completed for graduating seniors. The post test only method provides the Division with information about the level of thinking, writing and content knowledge of graduating seniors. The Assessment Committee will feed the senior skill levels back to the Division faculty for discussion of possible program improvements or foci.

In the previous review cycle, the Division administered its new assessment instrument, an essay exam, aimed at measuring critical thinking and writing. Test administration was standardized so that every senior was given the same test instructions, at roughly the same time in the academic year. Each senior took the test on a computer with the same

time to finish (75 minutes). To help seniors take the exam more seriously, the CrJ 194 Course Cohort agreed to make the essay test worth 10 percent of the CrJ 194 grade. Each CrJ 194 faculty provided feedback on the test and rubric and agreed to use the new rubric for grading the exam as part of the CrJ 194 course. Integrating the essay test as part of the core coursework increased student buy-in and participation with the exam and ensured more uniform administration.

All participating seniors were given pre-test content material (related to the test questions) one class period prior to test day (or two days prior to test day). The students were instructed to not bring notes or outside sources to the test administration. The AY 2009-2010 evaluation of the previous review cycle exams found that students were more likely to develop robust responses to question one and apply less thinking to question two. As a result, Fall 2009 was spent discussing the test and found that, in retrospect, the two questions had substantive overlap. The Assessment Committee combined the two questions into one, more concise prompt (See Appendix A).

The Division administered the new test in Spring 2010. Although the Division had a smaller number of faculty participating in test administration than it had in Spring 2009, we have randomly selected 20 % of the graduating class (N=45) for evaluation. Early student feedback was more positive about the test prompt than it had been in AY 2008-2009. These essays will be formally evaluated in the Fall 2010. The same rubric developed in AY 2008-2009 will be used to evaluate the essays (See Appendix B).

Development of New Multiple Choice Test

As part of an expanded cohort review process of AY 2008-2009, each cohort was asked to submit two multiple choice questions (with four answer choices) per learning objective. This process ensured that test questions were written across the curriculum and directly tied to each core learning objective. Initial collection of test questions was completed in the previous review cycle.

Early in AY 2009-2010, the Assessment Committee fed the collected test questions back to each member of the corresponding cohort. Cohorts were asked to take the exam questions submitted by colleagues (as if they were students) and review questions for face and construct validity. The faculty review process revealed disagreement about wording of test questions, wording of test answers, relevance of particular questions, and in some cases, the correct answer for questions. In response to faculty disagreement regarding test questions, the Assessment Committee organized an afternoon of cohorts meetings for the purposes of consensus building. Cohorts were given the following specific instructions about test question editing and development:

- 1) The content of questions should be conceptually what the cohort most wants graduates to remember after graduation;

- 2) There should be three questions per each learning objective. If an objective was deemed to not be measurable by a multiple choice questions, it was not included;
- 3) Each question should have four answer choices which should not overlap;
- 4) Each member of the cohort should agree on each question or the question should be deleted.

Food was provided, and the cohorts met for an afternoon to edit questions from the previous review cycle and develop new questions if needed.

The Assessment Committee then constructed the multiple choice content exam by choosing two questions per learning objective per cohort. Of the eight core content cohorts, seven were included. One of the two law cohorts did not submit questions in time for the test pilot. They will be included in future iterations of the test.

The 71 question exam was piloted in Spring 2010 to a group of 41 graduating seniors (See Appendix C).

Review of Core Courses

In the previous review cycle, the Assessment Committee developed an annual review form to assist with consistency of communication among the core cohort sections (See Appendix D). Cohort review had previously been a more informal process, but the increased structure in the review process was hoped to increase communication about course related issues and overall cohort quality for our 1700 majors. This appeared to be a successful tool for cohort communication in the previous review cycle.

In AY 2009-2010, the extensive meeting and discussion for the purposes of test development automatically increased cohort cohesion. All goals of the cohort review process were not met in AY 2009-2010 (review of syllabi for the following criteria: 1) appropriateness of learning objectives; 2) appropriateness of writing assignments tied to the learning objectives; and 3) assignments or content that encourage the development of critical thinking), but much more extensive discussion of learning objectives and course content was reached this AY than had been in previous years.

The process of test building forced faculty to discuss issues of ideology and differences in teaching and evaluation of students. Many new understandings emerged in cohorts that are arguably more beneficial for students than more simplified discussions of syllabi and writing assignments. Ultimately, the joint buy-in of the group test building effort was more effective for faculty interdisciplinary understanding and cohesion than structures previously put in place.

Test Administration and Analysis

The Division conducted two separate assessment measures in AY 2009-2010: a revised essay exam and a new content multiple choice exam.

Critical Thinking and Writing Essay Test

Students in four of the seven sections of CrJ 194 were given material to take home and review one class prior to the essay exam. While students were able to take notes or research the test material prior to class, they were asked to come to class with no notes or books. On the day of the exam, students were supplied with scratch paper and given the test material again along with the newly edited question prompt. Students either emailed their completed exams to their professor or uploaded the exam onto the WebCT platform.

There were approximately 230 graduating seniors in Spring 2010. The Committee wanted to evaluate a sample of at least 20 percent of the current senior cohort. Therefore, a random sample of 45 essays was selected. The Assessment Committee requested the randomly selected essays from each participating CrJ 194 faculty after the tests were completed. These essays will be read and evaluated with the assessment rubric early in Fall 2010.

Content Multiple Choice Test

The 71 question multiple choice exam was piloted with a convenience sample of CrJ 194 students (N=41, 17.8% of the graduating class) late in Spring 2010. The exam was unannounced, and each student was provided with a scantron form and number 2 pencil. Students were offered extra credit for taking the multiple choice exam seriously. Students had 75 minutes to complete the exam. Most students completed the exam between 35 and 50 minutes.

On a separate piece of paper, students were asked to note any questions that they believed were inappropriate or unduly onerous. Additionally, they were asked to write their overall qualitative impressions of the exam.

Results

The multiple choice test

The purpose of the pilot exam was to test questions more than it was to test students. Therefore, overall student scores are less important than each variable or question on the exam. However, as a matter of interest, the median score on the 71 question exam was a 37, and the high score on the exam was a 70.4%. There was one score of C, five scores of D, and thirty-five scores of F.

Each test question was examined separately but in the context of its cohort. Each of the six cohorts tested was examined as a unit. To get the overall score for each cohort, the number of correct answers on the question set was added and then divided by the total number of attempts for those questions. The scores for each cohort range from 35% (CrJ 100) to 61.5% (CrJ 174A). The number of questions passed in a cohort was determined by counting the number of questions in a particular cohort set for which 70% or more of the students choose the correct answer. The number of questions passed per cohort

range from 12.5% (CrJ 100 and CrJ 110) to 50% (CrJ 174A). See Table 1 for a breakdown of test results. Early analysis indicates that significant work on the exam remains.

Table 1: Content Test Scores by Cohort

Cohort	Number of Questions	Score	Questions Passed
CrJ 174A	8 (1-8)	61.5%	50.0%
CrJ 100	8 (9-16)	35.0%	12.5%
CrJ 110	8 (17-24)	55.4%	12.5%
CrJ 120	16 (25-40)	50.9%	25.0%
CrJ 167	16 (41-56)	53.8%	25.0%
CrJ 164	15 (57-72)	58.3%	26.6%

Student’s qualitative responses loosely mirror what the hard data from the exam illustrates. In other words, questions for which only 4 or 5 students responded correctly were also those expressed by students to be less recognizable. The dominant theme in the qualitative test review from piloted students is that material they have not encountered in two or three years is difficult for them to recall in a multiple choice format.

Future Directions

The Assessment Committee will proceed with analysis of the Spring 2010 essay test scores and compare these scores with those in previous review cycles. Early student feedback indicates that the current test prompt was manageable and a reasonable test of thinking and writing. In AY 2010-2011, the Committee will need to consider developing multiple versions of the test if the test is continued.

Additionally, the Committee will review the multiple choice questions piloted in AY 2009-1010. The test and results will be again disseminated to the faculty as a whole for discussion of how to best proceed.

Lastly, the Division will discuss the test results of both exams to determine if new writing methodologies or teaching strategies need to be entertained to meet the Division goals.

Appendix A

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
Division of Criminal Justice

CrJ 194: Contemporary Issues in Criminal Justice
Writing and Critical Thinking Assessment Essay
(Spring, 2010)

Below is information that you will use to write your essay exam and two essay questions. You have the full class time to answer the questions. Please write approximately one, single-spaced page for each question. Remember to manage your time accordingly.

Facts:

- Most prison systems in California are severely overcrowded.
- California has the largest prison population in the country, and it has grown almost twice as much as other systems nationwide from 1980 to 2007.
- California's correctional costs have grown by about 50% in the past decade.
- Correctional costs account for approximately 10% of California's overall state spending (almost as much as educational expenditures).
- California spends approximately \$43,000 a year to house one inmate (compared with approx. \$26,000 nationally).
- Recidivism rates have remained relatively constant over time, with approximately 66% of inmates released in California returned to prison within three years (compared to approximately 40% nation-wide).
- Research has shown that some violent offenders can be more effectively managed in the community than others.

California Index Crime Rates per 100,000 Inhabitants* And Inmate Population and Parolees in California** (2002-2007)						
Year	Population	Violent	Property	Murder	CDCR Inmate Population	CDCR % of Inmates on Parole
2002	35,001,986	595.4	3,361.2	6.8	159,695	16.0
2003	35,462,712	579.6	3,426.4	6.7	161,785	14.2
2004	35,842,038	527.8	3,423.9	6.7	163,929	12.7
2005	36,154,147	526.0	3,320.6	6.9	168,035	12.3
2006	36,457,549	532.5	3,170.9	6.8	172,528	12.7
2007	36,553,213	522.6	3,033.0	6.2	171,444	11.8

* FBI, Uniform Crime Reports

** California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)

Scenario:

Independent California State Assembly Member Riggs is being lobbied by a coalition called “Two Strikes – You’re Out” (TSYO) to support legislation designed to increase penalties for repeat criminal offenders in an effort to reduce recidivism. Given that California’s recidivism rate is significantly higher than the national average, members of the coalition have concluded that we are too soft on crime and that we need to hold offenders more accountable for their actions. Specifically, the group wants Assembly Member Riggs to support legislation to amend California’s well-known “**three-strikes**” law, and make it into “**two-strikes**”.

The TSYO coalition has argued that there should be an additional mandatory 15 year prison term whenever someone is convicted of committing a second serious violent felony offense. Members of the coalition are convinced that this law will reduce rates of recidivism by deterring first time offenders from reoffending (specific deterrence), and by keeping others from ever getting involved in criminal activity (general deterrence).

In addition to the TSYO coalition, many state and local politicians, as well as a wide range of other public interest groups such as state and national victims’ rights groups, Mothers’ Against Drunk Drivers, and some law enforcement and corrections organizations around the state have shown strong support for this legislation, citing the need to prevent future victims from getting harmed from known criminals.

Other groups, however, such as the American Civil Liberties Union, Citizen’s for a Balanced Budget, restorative justice proponents, drug and treatment specialists, public teachers’ associations, and law enforcement and correctional organizations are strongly opposed to the proposed to the legislation. Those opposed to this legislation cite the questionable effectiveness of the three-strikes legislation and the need for more re-entry programs. Such reentry programs have been proven to reduce recidivism and avoid enhanced prison time in overcrowded facilities with minimal rehabilitation programming. These groups urge Assembly Member Riggs to support their position.

Assignment:

Assume that you have been hired by Assembly Member Riggs as a staff analyst with a special expertise in criminal justice. She too is quite concerned about crime in our state, but she is not committed to either the proposed TYSO legislation or increased inmate re-entry programs. Therefore, she has asked you to help her determine whether the proposed TYSO legislation or increased inmate re-entry programs would be an effective way to accomplish its intended goal, to deter offending and reduce recidivism. Use the material provided above as well as information you have learned in your Criminal Justice curriculum to analyze the proposed legislation, and please write approximately two, single-spaced pages on the following question:

1. Formulate a reasonable policy alternative designed to reduce crime and promote public safety within the State of California that would appeal to both groups.

Be sure to explain the logic and rationale for your analysis and your proposed policy alternative.

Appendix B

**RUBRIC FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE 194 ASSESSMENT ESSAY ASSIGNMENT
SACRAMENTO STATE UNIVERSITY**

Author: _____

Reviewer: _____ **Date:** _____

This rubric is designed to make clear the grading process for the CRJ 194 Assessment Essay assignment.

	Possible Points	Score
Organization		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is purposeful, effective, and excellent; writing reflects effective use of transitions to present ideas with no digressions; essay begins with introductory sentence, each paragraph has a topic sentence, and the essay ends with a sentence of conclusion. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is effective, and writing reflects sufficient use of transitions to present ideas logically; topic sentences may be present, conclusion may be present, but are not consistent. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is coherent but simplistic sequencing of events and may have minor digressions; topic sentences and conclusions not present. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is a simple listing of information and details; paragraphs are undeveloped, relies on narrative for structure. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing presents no organizational framework for presentation of content. 	1	
Grammar		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sentence form and word choice are varied and appropriate; punctuation, grammar and spelling are superior with consistent conventions of Standard English. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects consistent control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice and conventions of Standard English. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects adequate control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English. Errors do not slow the reader or impede understanding for the reader in a serious way. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects deficient control of syntax, word choice, and conventions of Standard English. Errors impede or seriously undermine the comprehension of the reader. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects inadequate and inappropriate use of syntax, word choice, and conventions of Standard English. 	1	
Analysis (The ability to break material down into component parts.)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects in-depth analysis that consists of seeing patterns and parts, organizing parts, recognizing hidden meanings, and identifying components of information presented. Analysis draws on information learned in previous courses and disciplines. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects in-depth analysis that consists of seeing patterns and parts, organizing parts, and recognizing hidden meanings, but only in the context of this assignment and information presented. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects logical analysis and ability to see obvious linkages and parts but is limited and narrow in context. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects limited/ weak analysis, errors in perceiving associations; analysis is outside the context of the assignment. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects no analysis of related linkages and parts. 	1	
Synthesis (The ability to put parts together to form a new whole.)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects utilization of ideas presented in assignment to create new, logical ideas and an ability to predict, draw conclusions; generalization of information from facts presented in a correct and logical manner, information drawn from other coursework and studies to form logical and innovative conclusions. 	5	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing reflects utilization of ideas presented in assignment to create new logical ideas and an ability to predict, draw conclusions; generalization of facts, but only from those included in the assignment, to come to logical conclusions. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing reflects few new ideas generated from information presented in assignment, or new ideas that are not logical or innovative. Few, if any, generalizations. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing reflects no new ideas generated from the information given in the assignment, poor or incorrect generalizations given. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing includes no new ideas, no generalizations or conclusions based on the material in the assignment. 	1	
Evaluation (The ability to judge the value of material for a given purpose.)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing demonstrates an outstanding ability to compare and discriminate between ideas presented in the assignment, recognize subjectivity, assess and verify the value of theories and facts presented come to a choice of whether the information is important, making reasonable arguments based on the information provided along with other information learned in other classes. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing demonstrates a strong ability to compare and discriminate between ideas presented in the assignment, recognize subjectivity, weigh and verify the value of theories and facts and choose in a logical manner the value of evidence. Writer is able to make reasonable arguments based on the information provided in the assignment. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer shows some ability to be able to compare and discriminate between some facts and theories presented in the assignment and recognize subjectivity. Writer demonstrates some difficulty in reasoning when making arguments based on the information provided in the assignment. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer has difficulty in comparing and discriminating between the facts given in the assignment, does not recognize subjectivity, and cannot give logical rationales when choosing a certain point over another. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of comparing or discriminating between ideas or making choices based on any arguments, or assessing the value of evidence is present in the writing. 	1	

Total Score on Assessment Essay Assignment: _____

Comments

Appendix C

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SACRAMENTO
Division of Criminal Justice Assessment Exam

(Spring, 2010)

This multiple choice exam measures knowledge related to each of the upper division core courses in the Criminal Justice major. Questions are based on the learning objectives from each course. There are 72 questions and you have seventy five minutes to complete the exam.

1. Probable cause is defined as a state of facts that would lead a reasonable person to:
 - A) Have an honest and strong suspicion that the person to be arrested committed a crime or the place to be searched will reveal evidence of a crime.
 - B) Believe more likely than not that the person to be arrested committed a crime or the place to be searched will reveal evidence of a crime
 - C) Suspect that a crime had been committed, was being committed or was about to be committed.
 - D) Suspect that the person who was detained was armed and dangerous.

2. With the exception of warrants issued under the Patriot Act, warrants are issued by:
 - A) Investigating law enforcement officers
 - B) Prosecutors
 - C) Judges and magistrates
 - D) U.S. Attorneys

3. A stop and frisk must be justified by:
 - A) Probable cause
 - B) Reasonable suspicion
 - C) An arrest warrant
 - D) A search warrant

4. A consent to search is valid if the consent was:
 - A) Voluntarily made
 - B) Knowingly made
 - C) Intelligently made
 - D) All of the above.

5. The purpose of the Exclusionary Rule is to:
 - A) Vindicate the public's need for justice.
 - B) Vindicate the accused's constitutional right.
 - C) Deter judges from issuing invalid warrants.
 - D) Deter future police misconduct.

6. When police rely on a defective search warrant that they believed was valid, the evidence obtained will still be admissible in court under what exception to the Fruit of the Poisonous Tree Doctrine?

- A) Inevitable discovery
- B) Independent source
- C) Good faith
- D) Attenuation

7. The use of torture to obtain a confession violates the:

- A) Fourth amendment protection against unreasonable searches and seizures
- B) Fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination
- C) Sixth amendment right to counsel
- D) Fourteenth amendment right to due process

8. The accused is entitled to the presence of counsel under the Sixth Amendment during:

- A) The booking process
- B) A pre-indictment line-up
- C) A post-indictment line-up
- D) All of the above

9. Methodology is

- A) the science of knowing
- B) the science of finding out
- C) the science of discovery
- D) the science of causality

10. Variables that can be controlled by you, i.e., that you can manipulate or change are known as

- A) control variables
- B) spurious variables
- C) dependent variables
- D) independent variables

11. Professor Martin is interested in examining why individuals commit identity theft. She derives a hypothesis from Social Strain theory before collecting the data that will be used to test that hypothesis. Dr. Martin's approach to this research reflects

- A) inductive reasoning
- B) deductive reasoning
- C) retrospective reasoning
- D) introspective reasoning

12. Which of the following is NOT a criterion for evaluating social scientific theory?
- A) truth or falsity
 - B) its logic or reasonableness
 - C) its range of application/utility
 - D) accuracy of any prediction
13. To study organized crime, a researcher finds one member of an organized crime family to interview. During this interview, she requests the names of leading members of other organized crime families (and their own crime family). She interviews these other members and then asks them for other members involved in organized crime, and interviews these newly referred members. She continues in this manner until she has interviewed 45 members from 19 different families. Her sampling method is:
- A) Availability sampling
 - B) Quota sampling
 - C) Purposive sampling
 - D) Snowball sampling
14. You are interviewing children involved with a foster agency that have experienced abuse. You have a second group of children from a local elementary school that are matched to the foster group as a control group. Which research method are you using?
- A) Classical Experiment
 - B) Survey
 - C) Non-equivalent groups design
 - D) Longitudinal experiment
15. Deception in social scientific research is
- A) rare because of all the myriad number of ethical constraints
 - B) methodological unsound
 - C) commonly used and practiced
 - D) inappropriate
16. Ethical issues/quandaries in social science research
- A) means that research participants' rights will be violated in order to pursue the research
 - B) means that researcher's have the right to pursue knowledge at all costs
 - C) have no absolute right or wrong answers
 - D) given contemporary guidelines, pose few problems in most research
- 17 Crime is a legal concept defined by the _____.
- A) General population
 - B) The political state and its subdivisions
 - C) International courts
 - D) Constitution

18. Finish the quote: “Indeed, to make a complete crime recognizable by human law, there must be both a will and an act....An overt act is necessary...before the man is liable for punishment. _____ is no crime.”

- A) A vicious will without a vicious act.
- B) A vicious act with a vicious act.
- C) A vicious mind with a vicious act.
- D) A vicious mind with a vicious mind.

19. A convicted offender who committed a gruesome murder is sentenced to death. Learning of this sentence stops a young man from acting in a violent manner. (“This could happen to me, he thinks”). The punishment goal represented above is:

- A) Specific Deterrence
- B) General Deterrence
- C) Rehabilitation
- D) Just Deserts

20. Because a person's behavior is determined by internal and external factors, punishment is largely ineffective. Which paradigm does this statement best reflect?

- A) classical
- B) positivist
- C) Marxist
- D) Biological

21. The assertion that man is basically a conforming being who violates society's laws after disjunction between goals and means becomes so great that he finds the only way he can achieve these goals is through illegal channels is associated with which of the following theories?

- A) Differential Association
- B) Strain
- C) Social Control
- D) Labeling

22. The assertion that we are born with a natural proclivity to violate the rules of society and that delinquency is viewed as a logical consequence of one's failure to develop internalized prohibitions against law breaking is associated with which of the following theories:

- A) Differential Association
- B) Strain
- C) Social Control
- D) Self-Control Theory

23. The _____ is a major intellectual shift in the way people viewed the world and their place in it, questioning traditional religious and political values, and substituting humanism, rationalism, and naturalism.

- A) Classical school
- B) Positivist school
- C) Enlightenment
- D) Modern school

24. Laws tend to:

- A) Remain relatively stable across cultures and through time.
- B) Vary across cultures, but within a particular society tend to be stable over time.
- C) Be stable across cultures, but fluctuate over time.
- D) Vary by time and across different cultures

25. Early evaluations of intensive supervision reflect which of the following?

- A) Offenders are likely to commit a serious offense in six months.
- B) More technical violations occur than with traditional probation.
- C) Little money is saved.
- D) Probation officers dislike this approach to monitoring.

26. Studies of community service and restitution programs have generally found them vulnerable to:

- A) political attacks by conservative politicians.
- B) budget cuts, since most are perceived as “frill”.
- C) the problem with net widening.
- D) All of these.

27. A consequence of the view of differential criminality would be that:

- A) it would mean the creation of a ‘criminal class’ of people who are dangerous.
- B) the view is vulnerable to charges of racism.
- C) it can inform preventative detention policies.
- D) the view is vulnerable to charges of racism AND it would mean the creation of a ‘criminal class’ of people who are dangerous.

28. Predictive studies calculate that the future prison population in the United States is likely to:

- A) finally stop growing.
- B) increase steadily.
- C) shrink.
- D) remain stable.

29. One correctional philosophy examines the inmate subculture as having a major influence on the prisonization process. How is 'inmate subculture' defined?
- A) It is defined by the administration.
 - B) It is defined by courts.
 - C) It is defined by inmate experiences.
 - D) It is a part of statute law.
30. The enlightenment period proposed which of the following correctional reforms?
- A) A rewriting of penal codes to increase the severity of criminal sanctions.
 - B) A greater belief in the application of pain as a specific and general deterrent.
 - C) The invention of the penitentiary, where prisoners could be isolated from the temptations of the outside world.
 - D) An increase in the number of criminal laws and, as a result, a growth in the numbers and types of prisoners.
31. The most powerful new studies of correctional rehabilitation programs try to express their effectiveness in which of the following ways?
- A) To the warden.
 - B) In cost-benefit ratios.
 - C) In the most positive way.
 - D) In a way that will increase funding.
32. Recent research has indicated that rehabilitation can work if _____ are/is focused upon.
- A) criminogenic needs
 - B) drug abuse
 - C) motivation of the offender
 - D) none of the above
33. When parole officers play the role of _____, they can restrict many aspects of the parolee's life and initiate revocation for violations.
- A) cop
 - B) social worker
 - C) welfare worker
 - D) paternal officer
34. _____ occurs when an ex-offender's poor decision making makes adjustment problems worse.
- A) Monitored supervision
 - B) A technical violation
 - C) Intensive supervision parole
 - D) The relapse process
35. One serious dilemma for the criminal justice system which does not concern a theory of punishment but rather a problem of justice is _____.
- A) prosecutorial misconduct

- B) people who are falsely accused and convicted
- C) lax supervision in probation
- D) harsher treatment for females convicted of crimes

36. Critiques of restorative justice claim all but which of the following as a problem with its theory?

- A) The concept is vague.
- B) Procedural safeguards are impaired.
- C) It is not harsh enough.
- D) There is little knowledge of its effects and results

37. Which response is NOT a con of the Three Strikes Law?

- A) Prison overcrowding increases.
- B) The aging of the prison population.
- C) The growing mentally ill population.
- D) More murders of law enforcement and witnesses.

38. What is Truth in Sentencing?

- A) Offenders serve 100% of their sentences.
- B) Offenders serve more of their sentences (approximately 85%).
- C) The sentencing guidelines have increased sentences.
- D) None of the above.

39. An inmate assaults a correctional officer. What can the inmate NOT expect from the correctional system?

- A) Rules violation report.
- B) A new sentence.
- C) Time spent in secure housing.
- D) All privileges taken away for the rest of his/her sentence.

40. An inmate grieves the fact that he has not been given access to a dentist although he has had pain in his mouth for a month, and made multiple requests. His request is granted due, at least in part, to:

- A) the 8th Amendment.
- B) the 14th Amendment.
- C) the 4th Amendment.
- D) the 1st Amendment.

41. Although shaped by American political values, early US municipal policing was largely patterned after:

- A) French Gendarmes
- B) London Metropolitan Police
- C) Royal Irish Constabulary
- D) Slave patrols

42. Civil policing first appeared in a few US cities primarily as a result of
- A) The Civil War
 - B) Immigration
 - C) The Industrial Revolution
 - D) The Constitution
43. Early municipal policing in the US can be characterized as:
- A) Dominated by local politics
 - B) Focused on order maintenance
 - C) Including welfare functions
 - D) All the above
44. The police professional movement largely adopted the values of
- A) Progressivism
 - B) Jacksonian Democracy
 - C) The Wigs
 - D) Populism
45. Egon Bittner characterized policing as a tainted profession because police:
- A) Have the unique authority to exercise coercive force.
 - B) Are corrupt
 - C) Are racist
 - D) Are ineffective in controlling crime
46. Which of these is not routinely viewed by scholars as a potential cause of police misconduct:
- A) Lack of training
 - B) Organizational culture
 - C) Failure to screen out high risk candidates
 - D) Opportunity
47. Police agencies in the US began to incorporate women into their field operations in the 1970s because:
- A) Of the case *Gilbert v. NYPD*
 - B) Expansion of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to government
 - C) The leadership of the International Association of Chiefs of Police
 - D) A shortage of male applicants
48. The number of African Americans in US police agencies is:
- A) Significantly under their representation in the population
 - B) Significantly over their representation in the population
 - C) Approximately equal to their representation in the population
 - D) Declining rapidly

49. Police officers exercise wide discretion in their daily activities largely because:
- A) The public wants them to do so
 - B) The law does not place restraints on their actions
 - C) They are constantly in danger
 - D) They routinely address ambiguous situations without direct supervision
50. Which of the following issues is a major concern on police use of discretion among minority communities?
- A) Police corruption
 - B) Racial profiling
 - C) Code of silence
 - D) Substance abuse
51. Compstat is a process for crime control which:
- A) Originated in the NYPD
 - B) Involves regular meetings to hold managers accountable
 - C) Utilizes crime analysis data
 - D) All the above
52. Which of the following theories offers more potential for police influencing crime?
- A) Strain theory
 - B) Differential association theory
 - C) Social control theory
 - D) Routine activities theory
53. Which of the following has not been a prominent issue for police in the past decade:
- A) Racial profiling
 - B) High speed pursuit
 - C) Age discrimination
 - D) Use of force
54. Which of these is not a current approach concept in policing
- A) Hot spot policing
 - B) Problem oriented policing
 - C) Quality of life policing
 - D) Intensive investigation policing
55. Survey research shows that police use force (firearms, control holds, impact weapons, pepper spray or Tazers) in:
- A) Less than 1% of contacts with citizens
 - B) About 5% of contacts with citizens
 - C) Only when their lives are threatened
 - D) Routinely
56. Which of the statements on Tazer is correct?
- A) It was developed in the 1980s.

- B)Tazer is considered a risk-free and no accidental death has been reported.
 - C)Tazers are widely issued to most police departments in this country.
 - D)None of the above
57. The concept of the bureaucratic organization was first introduced by :
- A)Frederick W. Taylor
 - B)Max Weber
 - C)Henry Fayole
 - D)Egon Bittner
58. The early 20th century movement advocated by Frederick W. Taylor which focused on discovering the one best method was:
- A)The Hawthorne Study
 - B)Participative Management
 - C)Scientific Management
 - D)none of the above.
59. The current model of policing is Community Oriented Policing. Central to this approach is:
- A) is the sharing of power with the community.
 - B) the notion that Community's need not participate in policing at all.
 - C) the use of Bounded Rationality.
 - D) the informal social control mechanism.
60. If you were asked to describe the organizational culture of an organization, you would discuss:
- A) the beliefs, actions and understanding of the organization from the perspective of the line workers
 - B) the beliefs actions and understanding of the organization from the perspective of management
 - C) both a and b
 - D) neither a b or c
61. Under the US federalist structure, the level of government primarily responsible for defining crimes under the criminal law is:
- A)City
 - B)County
 - C)State
 - D)Federal
62. The Tenth Amendment of the US Constitution restricts the authority of
- A)The States
 - B)The Federal Government
 - C)The People
 - D)None of these

63. Which of the following were significant influences in shaping criminal justice from 1968-1973?
- A) Civil rights movement
 - B) Increasing crime rates
 - C) Prisoner litigation
 - D) All of the above
64. The origins of “Civil Service” in the United States was the:
- A) Pendelton Act
 - B) The Volstead Act
 - C) The Kerner Commission
 - D) The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA)
65. The economic changes during the last two year of the first decade of the 21st Century is likely to result in:
- A) Pension reform at the state and local level
 - B) Increase in staffing in policing, corrections and probation
 - C) Moving all state prisoners to county facilities.
 - D) None of the above
66. The future of criminal justice will be most likely affected by
- A) The emergence of the X and Y generation
 - B) Technological advances
 - C) A declining birth rate in the United States
 - D) Agency consolidation
67. Who are the gatekeepers to the American System of Criminal Justice
- A) Corrections Officers
 - B) Parole and probation officers
 - C) The District Attorneys Office
 - D) Law Enforcement
68. Public and private organizations differ in that
- A) Only private institutions have to deal with unions and collective bargaining
 - B) Only a public agency can be a bureaucracy
 - C) The civil rights act of 1964 only applies to public agencies
 - D) Public agencies have more constituencies to serve
69. The policies initiated by which of these acts continues to greatly influence justice policy in the US?
- A) The Volstead Act
 - B) The National Firearms Act
 - C) The Harrison Narcotics Act
 - D) The Homestead Act

70. The _____ was created in 1969 and greatly influenced justice policy in the US until the early 1980s.

- A) National Institute of Justice
- B) The American Justice Institute
- C) The Justice Policy Center
- D) The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

71. The primary issue in racial profiling is whether or not race can be:

- A) A component of reasonable suspicion
- B) Determined by electronic surveillance
- C) Is confused due to our multicultural society
- D) Considered in hiring

72. The use of force by local and state criminal justice agencies is regulated by:

- A) Federal law
- B) State law
- C) Agency policy
- D) all of the above

Appendix D

ANNUAL COURSE REVIEW

Date _____

CrJ _____

1. Has the committee confirmed that syllabi for all sections contain the current learning objectives?

Yes ___

No ___ If no, please confirm that all faculty have the current learning objectives.

2. Are learning objectives appropriate?

- Measurable
- Contains ethical component
- Includes each content area cited on matrix
- GE course contain required GE objectives

Yes ___

No ___ If no, please attach proposed revisions for Curriculum Committee.

3. Did the committee review how learning objectives are addressed?

Yes ___

No ___

4. Do course assignments seem to help students meet the current learning objectives?

Yes ___

No ___

5. Is a writing assignment included in all sections?

Yes ___

No ___ If no, please confirm that all faculty are now aware of this requirement.

6. Did the committee review strategies and activities designed to encourage the development of critical thinking*?

Yes ____
No ____

7. Does the committee recommend adoption of a common text or common assignment?

Yes ____ If yes, please attach recommendations
No ____

8. List all participants:

Course Coordinator

Date

*The level(s) of cognitive thinking that we are targeting for development may vary depending on the nature of the course (e.g., lower division vs. upper division). Recognizing that professional definitions of “critical thinking” may also vary, in this context the Assessment Committee is using the term "critical thinking" to refer to a set of skills designed to advance students' abilities to apply, analyze, synthesize and evaluate course content (as identified and defined in Bloom’s taxonomy of cognitive domains). Other definitions are welcomed for consideration.

INTRODUCTION

During the 2008-2009 Academic Year the Division of Criminal Justice continued to refine our assessment process in pursuit of program improvement. As a result of last year's comprehensive review, we significantly revised our process and initiated new evaluation tools during the 2008-2009 year.

Between AY (academic years) 2004/5 and 2007/8 the Division tested criminal justice content knowledge with a multiple choice test and writing skills with an essay test. These tests were administered in a pre-post test format. Each new major (both native and transfer) and the majority of graduating seniors took the multiple choice and essay exams. This initial effort of evaluating content and writing skills, revealed several problems inherent in testing such a large number of majors. There was considerable variation in test administration. Student and faculty feedback indicated that the validity of both tests was questionable. In response to this feedback, we decided to thoroughly review and revise our process during AY 2008-2009.

As a result of this review, the Division developed a new writing exam with an emphasis on critical thinking. Additionally, we initiated a review of all upper division, core courses as well as a means of building a new multiple choice content test that would more closely follow the learning objectives of each upper division core course.

ASSESSMENT FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 2008-2009

Review of Core Courses

With between 1600 and 1700 majors, the Division of Criminal Justice offers between 11 and 17 sections of each core, upper division course yearly. To ensure quality and consistency among the sections, the Division asks that course cohorts (all those who teach a particular course) meet to discuss course related issues. This has been an informal process with some cohorts meeting more regularly than others. The initial goal of the 08-09 Assessment Committee was to improve this cohort review process.

The Division has identified writing and critical thinking as an important focus in each core course. With these goals in mind, the Committee developed an Annual Course Review Form that asks each core course cohort to report on their review of syllabi for the following criteria: 1) appropriateness of learning objectives; 2) appropriateness of writing assignments tied to the learning objectives; and 3) assignments or content that encourage the development of critical thinking (see Appendix A).

Each core cohort met in AY 2008-2009 and submitted their new annual review form to the Division Curriculum Committee and Assessment Committee. The aim of providing cohorts with a form to submit was to provide structure and consistency in course review. It appears that this has occurred and the Division plans to continue use of the form. After review of the submitted forms, the Assessment Committee will determine how to improve the form for future use.

Development of New Multiple Choice Test

The multiple choice content exam previously used to test specific criminal justice knowledge both at entrance to the program and at graduation was largely developed by one faculty member. While this was a strong exam, the Criminal Justice faculty are diverse and any evaluation of the student's experience needs to be from an equally diverse perspective.

As part of the cohort review process, each cohort was asked to submit two multiple choice questions (with four answer choices) per learning objective. This process ensured that test questions were written across the curriculum and are directly tied to each core learning objective. The process of collecting test questions, which took the academic year, is complete. We have also requested and received the test currently used by the Department of Criminology at Fresno State. Test construction will begin in AY 2009-2010.

Development and Administration of New Essay Test

In previous review cycles the Criminal Justice Division administered an essay exam to test student writing. This was administered as a pre-test initially in new student orientations and later in CrJ 110, a class usually taken early in the major course sequence. It was also administered as a post-test in CrJ 194, a class usually taken at the end of the major sequence. Due to the difference in faculty styles and course structures, there was considerable variance in how the test was administered. All students were informed that the test had no bearing on their grade or graduation. Faculty and students reported that, in particular, post-test students (seniors) were not taking the test seriously.

The 2008-2009 Assessment Committee focused efforts to improve both the substance of the test and the process of test administration. Because the Division of Criminal Justice has as its core goals the development of writing and critical thinking skills, we focused on developing an exam that assesses both writing and critical thinking. The Assessment Committee incorporated elements from Bloom's cognitive model and the work of Richard Paul and Linda Elder on critical thinking into the attached rubric which measures both writing and elements of critical thinking (analysis, synthesis and evaluation). Finally, the Committee engaged in an intensive collaborative process to write an essay test that asks students to demonstrate each of these skills (see Appendix C).

Since the Division cannot say with certainty that demonstrated student improvement in writing and critical thinking skills is the direct result of Division coursework, the pre-post test model was discontinued. The process of the test administration was standardized so that every senior was given the same test instructions, at roughly the same time in the academic year. Each senior took the test on a computer with the same time to finish (75 minutes). To help seniors take the exam more seriously, the CrJ 194 Course Cohort agreed to make the essay test worth 10 percent of the CrJ 194 grade. Each CrJ 194 faculty provided feedback on the test and rubric and agreed to use the new rubric for grading the exam as part of the CrJ 194 course. Integrating the essay test as part of the core coursework increased student buy-in and participation with the exam and ensured more uniform administration.

Test Administration and Analysis

Students in each CrJ 194 class were given material to take home and review one class prior to the essay exam. While students were able to take notes or research the test material prior to class, they were asked to come to class with no notes or books. On the day of the exam, students were supplied with scratch paper and given the test material again along with two related question prompts. Students either emailed their completed exams to their professor or uploaded the exam onto the WebCT platform.

There were approximately 171 seniors in Fall 08. The Committee wanted to evaluate a sample of at least thirty percent of the current senior cohort. Therefore, a random sample of 50 essays was selected. There were six sections of CrJ 194 in Fall 08 with class sizes ranging from 24 to 37 students. The sample was stratified so that each course section had a proportionate number of essays represented in the sample. The Assessment Committee requested the randomly selected essays from each CrJ 194 faculty after the tests were completed.

Prior to scoring the sample, a group of non-sample essays was selected for evaluation by the Committee to determine inter-rater reliability. The sample essays were divided relatively evenly across the Committee for evaluation, and scores were entered into Excel for analysis. While the results of the Spring test administration will not be analyzed until Fall 09, the results of the Fall 08 test are positive.

Results

The evaluations were measured using a rubric with a five point scale that roughly mirrors the typical five point grading scale with five being the highest score. The mean scores for each criterion are all in the 3 range with modal scores ranging from average to above average (see Table 1). Each student's total score was calculated by summing their score for each of the criteria evaluated. The range

of possible total scores was from 5 to 25. The actual range of total scores for the Fall 08 sample was 7 to 25 with a mean of 16.

Table 1: Score Means and Modes

	Organization	Grammar	Analysis	Synthesis	Evaluation	Total Score
Score Mean	3.46	3.28	3.26	3.42	3.22	16.52
Score Mode	4	3	3	4	3	13

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The Assessment Committee will proceed with analysis of the Spring 09 essay test scores and compare these scores with the Fall 08 scores. Early student feedback as well as anecdotal faculty feedback indicates that the essay test prompts might be too long for the time allotted. Test editing, if necessary, will take place after more discussion of the AY08-09 test results. Additionally, the Committee will need to consider developing multiple versions of the test as the number of administrations increase.

Additionally, the Committee will review the multiple choice questions submitted by the core course cohorts and develop the new multiple choice content exam. The new content exam will likely be administered late in the Fall 09 semester.

Lastly, the Division will discuss the results of the writing and critical thinking essay exam and the content exam to determine if new writing methodologies or teaching strategies need to be entertained to meet the Division goals. Until that process has been completed, we do not contemplate any changes to our course content or curriculum.

Preliminary examination of the results indicates that the majority of our students are writing at least at the expected level of proficiency. The nature of this evaluation does not support reaching conclusions regarding student subject matter knowledge.

Appendix A

ANNUAL COURSE REVIEW

Date _____

CrJ _____

1. Has the committee confirmed that syllabi for all sections contain the current learning objectives?

Yes ___

No ___ If no, please confirm that all faculty have the current learning objectives.

2. Are learning objectives appropriate?

- Measurable
- Contains ethical component
- Includes each content area cited on matrix
- GE course contain required GE objectives

Yes ___

No ___ If no, please attach proposed revisions for Curriculum Committee.

3. Did the committee review how learning objectives are addressed?

Yes ___

No ___

4. Do course assignments seem to help students meet the current learning objectives?

Yes ___

No ___

5. Is a writing assignment included in all sections?

Yes ___

No ___ If no, please confirm that all faculty are now aware of this requirement.

6. Did the committee review strategies and activities designed to encourage the development of critical thinking*?

Yes ____

No ____

7. Does the committee recommend adoption of a common text or common assignment?

Yes ____ If yes, please attach recommendations

No ____

8. List all participants:

Course Coordinator

Date

*The level(s) of cognitive thinking that we are targeting for development may vary depending on the nature of the course (e.g., lower division vs. upper division). Recognizing that professional definitions of "critical thinking" may also vary, in this context the Assessment Committee is using the term "critical thinking" to refer to a set of skills designed to advance students' abilities to apply, analyze, synthesize and evaluate course content (as identified and defined in Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive domains). Other definitions are welcomed for consideration.

Appendix B

RUBRIC FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE 194 ASSESSMENT ESSAY ASSIGNMENT SACRAMENTO STATE UNIVERSITY

Author: _____

Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

This rubric is designed to make clear the grading process for the CRJ 194 Assessment Essay assignment.

	Possible Points	Score
Organization		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is purposeful, effective, and excellent; writing reflects effective use of transitions to present ideas with no digressions; essay begins with introductory sentence, each paragraph has a topic sentence, and the essay ends with a sentence of conclusion. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is effective, and writing reflects sufficient use of transitions to present ideas logically; topic sentences may be present, conclusion may be present, but are not consistent. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is coherent but simplistic sequencing of events and may have minor digressions; topic sentences and conclusions not present. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is a simple listing of information and details; paragraphs are undeveloped, relies on narrative for structure. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing presents no organizational framework for presentation of content. 	1	
Grammar		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sentence form and word choice are varied and appropriate; punctuation, grammar and spelling are superior with consistent conventions of Standard English. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects consistent control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice and conventions of Standard English. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects adequate control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English. Errors do not slow the reader or impede understanding for the reader in a serious way. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects deficient control of syntax, word choice, and conventions of Standard English. Errors impede or seriously undermine the comprehension of the reader. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects inadequate and inappropriate use of syntax, word choice, and conventions of Standard English. 	1	
Analysis (The ability to break material down into component parts.)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects in-depth analysis that consists of seeing patterns and parts, organizing parts, recognizing hidden meanings, and identifying components of information presented. Analysis draws on information learned in previous courses and disciplines. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects in-depth analysis that consists of seeing patterns and parts, organizing parts, and recognizing hidden meanings, but only in the context of this assignment and information presented. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects logical analysis and ability to see obvious linkages and parts but is limited and narrow in context. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects limited/ weak analysis, errors in perceiving associations; analysis is outside the context of the assignment. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing reflects no analysis of related linkages and parts. 	1	

Synthesis (The ability to put parts together to form a new whole.)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing reflects utilization of ideas presented in assignment to create new, logical ideas and an ability to predict, draw conclusions; generalization of information from facts presented in a correct and logical manner, information drawn from other coursework and studies to form logical and innovative conclusions. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing reflects utilization of ideas presented in assignment to create new logical ideas and an ability to predict, draw conclusions; generalization of facts, but only from those included in the assignment, to come to logical conclusions. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing reflects few new ideas generated from information presented in assignment, or new ideas that are not logical or innovative. Few, if any, generalizations. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing reflects no new ideas generated from the information given in the assignment, poor or incorrect generalizations given. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing includes no new ideas, no generalizations or conclusions based on the material in the assignment. 	1	
Evaluation (The ability to judge the value of material for a given purpose.)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing demonstrates an outstanding ability to compare and discriminate between ideas presented in the assignment, recognize subjectivity, assess and verify the value of theories and facts presented come to a choice of whether the information is important, making reasonable arguments based on the information provided along with other information learned in other classes. 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing demonstrates a strong ability to compare and discriminate between ideas presented in the assignment, recognize subjectivity, weigh and verify the value of theories and facts and choose in a logical manner the value of evidence. Writer is able to make reasonable arguments based on the information provided in the assignment. 	4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer shows some ability to be able to compare and discriminate between some facts and theories presented in the assignment and recognize subjectivity. Writer demonstrates some difficulty in reasoning when making arguments based on the information provided in the assignment. 	3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer has difficulty in comparing and discriminating between the facts given in the assignment, does not recognize subjectivity, and cannot give logical rationales when choosing a certain point over another. 	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of comparing or discriminating between ideas or making choices based on any arguments, or assessing the value of evidence is present in the writing. 	1	

Total Score on Assessment Essay Assignment:

Comments

Appendix C

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO Division of Criminal Justice

CrJ 194: Contemporary Issues in Criminal Justice Writing and Critical Thinking Assessment Essay

Below is information that you will use to write your in-class essay exam. You will be given the essay questions when the exam begins and will have the full class time to answer the questions. In the mean time, you should just review and think about this information. You can look up more information on this subject before the exam, but no additional information will be necessary to answer the questions, or permitted at the exam. (Do not bring any materials to the exam.) At the exam you will be given two essay questions and will be expected to write approximately one page per question. You will be evaluated according to the criteria listed on the attached essay rubric. Remember to manage your time accordingly. Please log on to a computer as soon as you arrive to class.

Facts:

- California has the largest prison population in the country, and it has grown almost twice as much as other systems nationwide from 1980 to 2007.
- Most prison systems in California are severely overcrowded.
- California's correctional costs have grown by about 50% in the past decade.
- Correctional costs account for approximately 10% of the California's overall state spending (almost as much as educational expenditures).
- California spends approximately \$43,000 a year to house one inmate (compared with approx. \$26,000 nationally).
- Recidivism rates have remained relatively constant over time, with approximately 66% of inmates released in California returned to prison within three years (compared to approximately 40% nation-wide).

**California Index Crime Rates per 100,000 Inhabitants*
And Inmate Population and Parolees in California**
(2002-2007)**

Year	Population	Violent	Property	Murder	CDCR Inmate Population	CDCR % of Inmates on Parole
2002	35,001,986	595.4	3,361.2	6.8	159,695	16.0
2003	35,462,712	579.6	3,426.4	6.7	161,785	14.2
2004	35,842,038	527.8	3,423.9	6.7	163,929	12.7
2005	36,154,147	526.0	3,320.6	6.9	168,035	12.3
2006	36,457,549	532.5	3,170.9	6.8	172,528	12.7
2007	36,553,213	522.6	3,033.0	6.2	171,444	11.8

* FBI, Uniform Crime Reports

** California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

(CDCR)

Scenario:

Independent California State Assembly Member Riggs is being lobbied by a coalition called “Two Strikes – You’re Out” (TSYO) to support legislation designed to increase penalties for repeat criminal offenders in effort to reduce recidivism. Given that California’s recidivism rate is significantly higher than the national average, members of the coalition have concluded that we are too soft on crime and that we need to hold offenders more accountable for their actions. Specifically, the group wants Assembly Member Riggs to support legislation to amend California’s well-known “**three-strikes**” law, and make it into “**two-strikes**.”

The TSYO coalition has argued that there should be an additional mandatory 15 year prison term whenever someone is convicted of committing a second serious violent felony offense. Members of the coalition are convinced that this law will reduce rates of recidivism by deterring first time offenders from reoffending (specific deterrence), and by keeping others from ever getting involved in criminal activity (general deterrence).

In addition to the TSYO collation, many state and local politicians, as well as a wide range of other public interest groups such as state and national victims’ rights groups, Mothers’ Against Drunk Drivers, and some law enforcement officials around the state have shown strong support for this legislation, citing the need to prevent future victims from getting harmed from known criminals.

Other groups, however, such as the American Civil Liberties Union, Citizen’s for a Balanced Budget, restorative justice proponents, treatment specialists, drug specialists, public teachers’ associations and other law enforcement organizations are strongly opposed to the legislation. Those

opposed to the legislation cite the questionable effectiveness of the three-strikes legislation, and the need for more re-entry programs, which have been proven to reduce recidivism, to be drafted as legislation instead of the current proposal which would lead to enhanced prison time in overcrowded facilities with minimal rehabilitation programming.

Assignment:

Assume that you have been hired by Assembly Member Riggs as a staff analyst with a special expertise in criminal justice. She too is quite concerned about crime in our state but is not sure if she should support this particular piece of legislation. Therefore, she has asked you to help her determine the extent to which this legislation is an effective way to accomplish its intended goal, to deter offending and reduce recidivism. Using the material provided above as well as information you have learned in your Criminal Justice curriculum, please write approximately one, single-spaced page on each of the following:

1. Analyze the proposed legislation, and;
2. Formulate a reasonable policy alternative designed to reduce crime and promote public safety within in the State of California.

Be sure to explain the logic and rationale for both the analysis of the proposed legislation, as well as your proposed policy alternative.

DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 2007/2008

I. INTRODUCTION

The Division of Criminal Justice recognizes the importance of an ongoing assessment process of student outcomes and overall program quality. As a result, over the past eight years, the Division has undertaken systematic efforts to improve our measures of student learning and integrate this knowledge into our program structure. We have employed a variety of surveys, assessment exams and curriculum reviews to improve our performance. Although the results from these efforts have provided us with some useful data which we have utilized in modifying our curriculum, they have also raised a number of unanswered questions about program design, implementation and the assessment process itself. Although we recognize that the process calls for yearly data, we view assessment as an ongoing process. Although yearly reporting may facilitate administration of the process, we do not believe that our process should essentially be built around yearly cycles.

A key component of our Division's assessment program has been to periodically review the methods we use to measure our success in educating criminal justice majors. Because the assessment process itself is dynamic and on-going, periodic adjustments to our methodology are essential. Thus, this annual report must take into account that assessment decisions made in any given academic year are, in large part, dependent upon information supplied from prior years. Furthermore, it must also be recognized that decisions made this year about effective outcome assessment strategies will effect policies and practices throughout the Division for years. In summary, any effective assessment program must not only look to the past for guidance but must incorporate what is learned into both planning for the immediate and long-term future.

Beginning in the 2004-2005 Academic Year, the Division initiated a new phase in its assessment efforts which incorporated a pre-test and post-test designed to measure changes in student knowledge in the field of criminal justice. This rather ambitious effort was a significant leap beyond anything we had previously attempted. The pre-test was administered to all new majors as a component of the reclassification from pre-major to major. This was done at orientation for transfer students and on-line for native freshmen. The test consisted of multiple choice knowledge questions in the core criminal justice areas and a writing sample. The post-test was later administered in the capstone course, CRJ 194. Problems with administration of the pre-test necessitated a change to administration of this test in CRJ 110, a course normally taken in the first semester of upper division work.

Even with these changes in administration the resulting test data, which showed only modest increase in specific knowledge and not significant change in writing skill, raised vexing questions regarding the validity of the test instrument, the administration of the instrument, our entire program or all the forgoing. Given the seriousness of the questions raised, we concluded that a review of the assessment process should occur before any action is taken regarding these findings. Our goal is to create a process which provides meaningful, valid and reliable data in future years.

II. GOALS AND/OR LEARNING OBJECTIVES ASSESSED IN AY 2008

In an effort to answer questions raised by the 2006-2007 results and the prior results from analysis of the substantive knowledge portion of the test, the Division Assessment and Academic Standards Committee conducted a comprehensive historical review of the methods we have employed to assess student learning over the past eight years. In doing so, a great deal of time was spent in a discussion of the Division's goals and objectives as set forth in our original student outcomes assessment plan. We concluded that the principles set forth in the 2000 plan continue to be relevant and viable today. Effective writing, with the attendant analytical skills encompassed in such writing, remains the Division's highest priority. While writing skill constitutes the most pressing outcome objective, we also seek to assure that graduates possess a basic overall knowledge of the field and its subcomponents (see Attachment 1), can think critically, can read and speak effectively and can apply ethical values to decisions.

The review of our assessment process itself began with the collection of all assessment materials that had been generated since the original plan had been presented to the University. Since a number of the newer faculty members on the Assessment and Academic Standards Committee had neither participated in the original report nor in subsequent surveys or "assessment exams", the collection and review of these historical materials was productive for a number of reasons. First, the review highlighted the importance of linking the Division's learning objectives with each criminal justice course. Thus, an annual meeting of teaching cohorts to review syllabi, writing assignments and learning objectives is essential. Second, the review allowed the Division to determine where our projected plans had, in fact, been implemented successfully and where our efforts had fallen short. Finally, the historical perspective gave us an opportunity to begin developing a comprehensive assessment strategy that more accurately measures to what degree our students are obtaining the skills and knowledge outlined in our learning objectives.

It has previously been reported that our Division began administering examinations in Fall 2004 to criminal justice pre-majors and graduating seniors. As a general rule, most pre-majors were given the exam during orientation sessions while the seniors completed the same exam during their capstone course (CRJ 194). The results of the pre-tests and post-tests, which were composed of both essay and multiple choice sections, were evaluated by the Academic Standards and Assessment Committee during the 2006/2007 academic year. Comparison of mean scores and ranges between pre-tests and post-tests and writing samples from matched pre-tests and post-tests were reviewed for evidence of student improvement in both content related knowledge (the multiple choice test) and writing skills (the essay exam). Response patterns for individual questions were reviewed, as was question content and structure. Essay exams were also analyzed to determine whether students had achieved a minimum level of writing proficiency. The analysis of the review was contained in last year's annual report.

In our on-going effort to improve the Division's assessment program, a decision was made in Fall 2007 to temporarily suspend the administration of the assessment exam. While the decision was a difficult one, several issues concerning both the reliability and the validity of

the exam itself were raised to warrant the suspension. Presently, the Division is considering whether the examination results reflect a lack of knowledge growth on the part of students, problems in administration of the examination and/or the validity of the test itself. Serious questions have been raised as to our ability to create a valid subject knowledge test, given the wide diversity of faculty teaching core subjects, the latitude faculty may exercise within their individual sections and the high percentage of transfer students in the program. In addition, significant challenges exist in administering an examination uniformly. The size and nature of our program, combined with resource limitations precludes administering an admissions examination to all majors. We are currently contemplating elimination of the pre-test component and focusing exclusively on competency at program completion. Although the use of the capstone course will surely be the venue for any such effort, we must generate a new assessment instrument or process for the 2008-2009 academic year.

The outcome of last year's assessment of the writing samples from the pre-tests and post-tests raised questions regarding our programmatic efforts at improving student writing. In an effort to evaluate our programmatic practices in this area, we conducted a faculty survey Spring 2008. The objective of the survey was to ascertain how our faculty were attempting to promote student writing effectiveness. Division policy requires that all criminal justice courses include student writing assignments and course cohorts were encouraged during their annual reviews to develop equivalent, though not identical, writing assignments in their respective areas. This survey, the first of two-parts, was designed to test whether the faculty was giving writing assignments and, if so, in what form and how frequently.

TABLE 1

Perceived Importance of Instructor Writing Practices	
<i>Instructor Writing Practice</i>	<i>Percent Strongly Agree or Agree</i>
Cover Plagiarism	95%
Review Organization	100%
Review Expected Content	100%
Utilize a Grading Rubric	95%
Discuss the Grading Rubric with Students	100%

Virtually all faculty members recognize the importance of engaging in writing practices as an essential part of their instruction to students. For example, all faculty members agree or strongly agree that reviewing organization and expected content as well as discussing the grading rubric with students is important. In addition, almost all faculty members believe that it's important to cover plagiarism and utilize a grading rubric.

TABLE 2

Percent of Faculty Members Using Specific Writing Assignments/Activities			
<i>Type of Writing Assignment/Activity</i>	<i>1st Prep</i>	<i>2nd Prep</i>	<i>3rd Prep</i>
In-class writing assignments	67%	71%	63%
Journals	19%	16%	14%
Reaction Papers	33%	26%	50%
Research Papers	65%	53%	71%
Case Briefs	20%	26%	29%
Essay Exams	83%	74%	71%
Essay Assignments	71%	68%	86%
Multiple Drafting & Revision	48%	42%	43%
Progressive Writing	48%	47%	57%

Faculty members in the Division of Criminal Justice use a variety of writing assignments in their courses. The activities that are most consistently used by a majority of faculty include: in-class writing assignments, research papers, essay exams, and essay assignments. One potential problem uncovered by the survey was the fact that less than 50% of the faculty employed the technique of reviewing multiple drafts of a student paper. If the goal of the Division is to improve student writing, reviewing and commenting upon drafts and re-drafts of student work may be essential for student improvement as indicated by our focus group participants from assessment efforts conducted in previous years. This specific finding in the survey will be a topic for discussion in the up-coming academic year. Also, the survey results will provide a useful framework for each teaching cohort when they discuss appropriate student writing assignments.

As previously mentioned, the Spring 2008 survey is the first part of a two-part project designed to assess student writing. The second phase will be designed to assess faculty perceptions of the extent to which our students actually improve their writing skills during the course of their academic experience with us. The idea for a two-part survey grew from our analysis of the essay portion of the Division's assessment exam conducted in AY 2006/2007.

III. ANTICIPATED PROGRAM CHANGES

The Division anticipates that a decision will be made in Fall 2008 regarding the utility of an assessment exam as a measure of learning student outcomes. Unlike a pure practice discipline, such as nursing or physical therapy, criminal justice is not structured solely around preparation for entry into a particular profession. Nor is it a classic social science focused primarily on academic perspective alone. Rather, emphasis is upon providing students with a broad understanding of the entire field of criminal justice, including history, structure, law, ethics and practice. A very significant portion of our graduates never work in the field of criminal justice and those who do work in a wide variety of occupations. We therefore view our primary obligation as providing our graduates with fundamental academic skills in communication, analysis, research and ethics. Yet, criminal justice programs were created to serve students intent on pursuing careers in the field of justice administration and to improve practice in the field. In addition, development of these general academic skills requires content, and we have an obligation to provide students with specific knowledge from the

component disciplines in the field. The most fundamental question we must address is whether to focus our assessment exclusively on skills or to include some revised assessment of content knowledge.

Over the past eight years we have made a number of changes to curriculum ranging from the introduction of research methods and a capstone course to instituting a pre-major and imposing prerequisites to assure a more logical sequence of courses. We do not conclude that additional curriculum changes would be likely to increase our ability to attain our desired learning outcomes. Our primary obstacle in accomplishing uniform outcomes is simply the size of the program and the dearth of resources. We offer between five and nine sections of every core course every semester. Many of these are taught by part-time faculty, and our student-to-faculty ratio is the highest in the University. Although we have structured committees around each course cluster to facilitate common assignments and assure common learning outcomes, we are not able to ensure that all faculty fully participate in this process. In addition, academic freedom limits our capacity to assure common assignments. Resource limitations preclude our reducing student to faculty load to allow more attention to individual student needs. Even discovering weaknesses in specific areas of student knowledge or skills does not assure that we can effectively address the source of the weaknesses.

IV. OTHER ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

In addition to the review of the assessment plan and process and the survey of faculty writing instruction, the course committees reviewed learning objectives and assignments as required by our assessment plan. In addition we revised our matrix of learning outcomes. The revised matrix is attached.

V. PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING FUTURE CHANGES IN ASSESSMENT

Currently, our plan is to institute writing assessment in the capstone class beginning next year. Beginning in Fall 2008, all students taking the required criminal justice capstone course will be assigned a comprehensive writing project. The Division chose CRJ 194 because the course is already constructed to integrate knowledge, concepts and skills associated with the sequence of study. In short, by the time students register for CRJ 194, their writing, critical thinking and content based skills should be at their peak.

The projected writing assignment in the capstone course will represent a portion of the student's final grade. The writing assignment will be identical for all students in all sections of the course. Furthermore, the manner in which the assignment is administered will also be uniform. Due to the large number of majors in the Division a random sample of the papers from each semester will be analyzed by two reviewers using a common rubric. The primary foci of this assessment tool will initially be writing and analytical thinking.

Concurrently with the initiation of the forgoing writing assessment we will evaluate the potential for reinstating a multiple choice examination on content knowledge as well as the long-term potential for initiating an online portfolio or other assessment mechanism.

In addition to projects identified above, the Division will review course syllabi for all core courses in Fall 2008 to determine how the course addresses each of our five educational goals. The Assessment and Academic Standards Committee, in conjunction with the Curriculum Committee, will prepare a brief summary on whether the course outlined in the syllabus appears to achieve our designed goals. The summary will also briefly describe how the syllabus appears to satisfy these requirements. The summaries will be distributed to all faculty in Fall 2008 for their comments and input. The Division believes that such a systematic analysis will provide constructive discussion and commonality of purpose within the teaching cohorts.

ATTACHMENTS

WHAT A STUDENT KNOWS-GOALS

Outcomes	Where Measured	Means of Evaluation
1. The criminal the justice system in American society (history, purpose, conflicts, policy, current issues & trends & ethical challenges)	1, 2, 4, 5, 120, 175, 167, 194	Examinations, case briefs, essays, research papers
2. Criminal law & legal processes (law of crimes, criminal procedure, legal research, legal theory, evolution of due process and the courts and judicial process)	1, 2, 4 , 110, 120, 167 174A, 175 & 194	Examinations, case briefs, essays & case studies
3. Criminology (theories of crime causation, typologies, offenders and victims)	1, 110, 120 & 194	Examinations, research projects & papers
4. Law enforcement (history & development of police function, administration, ethical issues, police community interaction, police & crime control, discretion, police and democratic values)	1, 4, 5, 164, 167, 174A, 175 & 194	Examinations, case briefs, essays, research papers
5. Corrections (historical development of criminal sanctions, incarceration & treatment, administration of institutional & community-based corrections, current trends, ethical issues & challenges)	1, 4, 5, 120, 164 & 194	Examinations, case briefs, essays, research papers
6. Research methods & sources (sources of research information, interpretation of data, quantitative & qualitative methodology)	100, 110, 120, 164, 175, 174A,167 & 194	Research papers

WHAT A STUDENT CAN DO-GOALS

Outcomes	Where Measured	Means of Evaluation
1. Analyze information	Entire core	Examinations, essays, case briefs, reaction papers, research papers & class participation
2. Think critically	Entire core	Examinations, essays, case briefs, reaction papers, research papers & class participation
3. Read effectively	Entire core	Examinations, essays, case briefs, reaction papers, research papers & class participation
4. Speak effectively	Entire core	Class participation & presentations
5. Write effectively	Entire core	Examinations, essays, case briefs, reaction papers & research papers
6. Research effectively	Upper Div Core	Case briefs & research papers
7. Solve problems	Entire core	Examinations, essays, case briefs, reaction papers, research papers & class participation
8. Recognize ethical conflicts and apply ethical principles	Entire core	Examinations, essays, case briefs, reaction papers, research papers & class participation

What Student Cares About - Goals and Values

Outcomes	Where Measured	Means of Evaluation
1. Develop an awareness of relationship between individual and collective responsibility on the part of organizational members and citizens	5, 120, 164, 167 & 194	Examinations, essays, case briefs, reaction papers, research papers & class participation
2. Develop a personal set of ethical values consistent with administration of justice in a pluralist, democratic society.	Entire core	Examinations, essays, case briefs, reaction papers, research papers & class participation
3. Expand cultural awareness and sensitivity to fully appreciate the values and differences of a diverse society.	1, 5, 110, 120, 164, 167, 175 & 194	Examinations, essays, case briefs, reaction papers, research papers & class participation
4. The ability to recognize the rights, responsibilities, and privileges of citizens & the role of the criminal justice system & criminal justice professionals in preserving citizen rights.	1, 2, 5, 110, 120, 164, 167, 174A, 175, 194	Examinations, essays, case briefs, reaction papers, research papers & class participation

06-07 Assessment Report: Criminal Justice

Name: William Vizzard

Department: Criminal Justice

Contact: vizzard@csus.edu

The assessment process in the Division of Criminal Justice for AY 2006-2007 focused upon a detailed review of the assessment exam administered to Criminal Justice majors. This review was accomplished by an item analysis of the objective questions and an evaluation of the essays completed by students over several semesters. The results encouraged faculty discussion of both the reliability and validity of the exam.

1. What goals or learning objectives/outcomes were assessed in AY 2006-2007?

The primary goal of the assessment process in AY 2006-2007 was to conduct a detailed review of the assessment exam administered to Criminal Justice majors. The topic areas addressed by the assessment exam are writing proficiency, structure & function, crime theory, crime law, research, investigations, administration & ethics. Following is a summary of the findings from two assessment reports completed during the 2006-2007 academic year. The complete assessment report regarding the essay question is available at (link to Farmer document.) The complete assessment report regarding the multiple choice questions is available at (link to Yetter document).

2. How did you assess these learning outcomes?

a. Describe the measures you used and the information gathered. (Description, date administered, results)

The Division of Criminal Justice at California State University, Sacramento began to administer an assessment exam to Criminal Justice pre-majors and graduating seniors during Fall 2004. Most pre-majors completed the exam during their student orientation sessions and graduating seniors completed the exam during their capstone course (CrJ 194). The exam consisted of two sections—one essay question and an objective section with 50 multiple-choice questions.

1) Essay Question. Exam competencies were determined by pre-test and post-test scores taken from the rubrics. To review, a score of 12 or higher was considered competent and a score below 12 was determined not to be competent. Most of the essays reviewed were judged as competent at both the pre-test and the post-test administrations (see table below).

Number and Percent of [Essay] Exam Competencies (N=29)

		Pre-test	
		<u>Not</u> <u>Competent</u>	<u>Competent</u>
Post-test	<u>Competent</u>	3 (10.3%)	21 (72.4%)
	<u>Not</u> <u>Competent</u>	2 (6.9%)	3 (10.3%)

2) Multiple-Choice Questions. Thus far, the division has accumulated six in-class test batches. Three of these batches correspond to the pre-test and three to the post-test. Using these data provided a sample pool of 330 pre-test students and 238 post-test students for a total of 568 students. Although a comparison of these data can be made, most of the students providing post-test data did not complete the pre-test.

Pre-Test Data and Post-Test Data (for Multiple-Choice Questions)

	Pre-Test Data	Post-Test Data
Question Type	% Correct	% Correct
Structure & Function	61%	67%
Crime Theory	59%	66%
Crime Law	54%	62%
Research	56%	51%
Investigations	43%	61%
Admin & Ethics	57%	67%

b. As a result of these assessments what did you learn about the program’s success in helping its students achieve these learning outcomes?

1) Essay Question. A comparison of pre- and post-test scores for individual students revealed that a majority of the students (16 or 55%) improved their performance on the post-test. The performance of twelve students (41%) declined from pre-test to post-test. The two performances that declined by 11 or more points consisted of very short answers (one paragraph or less) with one student indicating “time” at the end of the answer. One student’s scores did not change.

A greater proportion of essay exams completed in Web CT required a third independent review compared to those completed in paper format. The brevity of these essay answers may have contributed to the difficulty in their evaluation. In the end, less than 50% of the Web CT pre-test essay exams were judged to be

competent. Allowing students to complete the essay part of the assessment exam in electronic format does not result in well-written answers.

Most of the essays written by students who had completed both the pre- and the post-tests were evaluated as competent. The average score on pre-test exams compared to the post-tests were virtually the same—approximately 16 points. Further analysis indicates that although more students improved rather than declined in their performances, the improvement was small and did not impact the overall average post-test scores. The results reflect competence with no real improvement in student writing skills from pre-test to post-test exams.

2) Multiple-Choice Questions. In general, post-test scores were higher than pre-test scores, but the differences are relatively small. Most of the students providing post-test data did not take the pre-test so one cannot assume evidence of positive improvement in levels of knowledge. Many seniors did not take the post-test seriously as they knew it did not count as part of their course or major grade and it occurred near the end of the semester along with their usual final assignments. As a result, post-tests were often incomplete, with many questions left unanswered after question 28.

3. As a result of faculty reflection on these results, are there any program changes anticipated?

1) Essay Question. In this report, most students completing exams in paper format have demonstrated at least minimal competence. The Division of Criminal Justice should discuss whether or not minimal competence is an acceptable standard for its students. Future analysis may indicate that minimal competence does not equate to a passing course grade.

If the goal of assessing criminal justice student essays is to determine whether or not students develop their writing skills from pre-test to post-test, then the Division of Criminal Justice must continue to administer an assessment exam to collect the data needed to make such a determination. Of the 831 exams taken to date, only 31 students have taken both pre- and post-tests (and only 29 were appropriate for analysis). This is an extremely small number of exams from which to draw meaningful results regarding student performance.

2) Multiple-Choice Questions. The first idea suggested was to make the [multiple-choice] test a requirement for graduation. This idea would most likely give the assessment exam the focus it deserves from the post-test students. The next, more feasible suggestion would be to move the timing of the exam, possibly to the beginning of the semester. Another suggestion that was brought up was to potentially use students' results on the exam to set up a type of class ranking. This ranking could be announced prior to graduation and entitle the top student, or students, to some sort of acknowledgement or award. The final suggestion was

the idea of weighting the students' score on the assessment exam as part of their overall course grade.

a. How will you know if these changes achieved the desired results?

Continuing to monitor assessment exam results will demonstrate whether students are improving their performances from pre- to post-test administrations.

4. Did your department engage in any other assessment activities such as the development of rubrics or course alignment?

See Attachment 1

5. What assessment activities are planned for the upcoming academic year?

2) Multiple-Choice Questions. First and foremost, the Division's assessment process must be continued. More data is needed in order to develop an accurate picture of the efforts of the department and ensure that future instruction is of the highest quality. At this time, there have not been nearly enough students who have completed both the pre- and post-test assessment exams to paint an accurate picture of what the program is and isn't doing right. To ensure that the assessment is able to provide meaningful data, it will be necessary to further evaluate those questions mentioned earlier in this research. These evaluations will need to be performed by the Division's Assessment committee in order to determine if trends highlighted in this research are the result of the questions or some other influences. If new questions are needed, or if the decision is made to design a new test instrument altogether, the nature of the test and the subject groups must be clearly defined and organized. Those responsible for creating the questions for each subject must recognize the importance of this work and provide the committee with the material necessary to ensure the validity of the test instrument. No matter what, more quantitative data will be highly beneficial to this process.

In addition to continuing the process and looking hard at the exam questions themselves, it will also be necessary to give serious thought to altering the implementation of the test itself. The current placement of the post-test at the tail end of the semester may need to be altered, and consideration should be given to moving the administration of the exam to a time nearer the beginning of the semester. At the same time, it must also be ensured that all faculty, whether responsible for administering the exam or not, are delivering the same information regarding its use, importance and design. The students need to know what it is they are taking and feel that their results, weighted or not, do matter to the department and their overall educations.

Attachment 1

Reviewer: _____

Author: _____ **Pre or Post:** _____

This rubric is designed to make clear the grading process for the essay portion of the Criminal Justice Assessment exam.

	Excellent		Competent		Not Acceptable
	4	3	2	1	0
Presentation					
1. Organization is purposeful, effective, and appropriate.					
2. Sentence form and word choice are varied and appropriate.					
3. Punctuation, grammar, and spelling are appropriate.					
Content					
4. Ideas are clearly discussed and claims are supported.					
Thinking					
5. Makes connections between and among ideas.					
6. Independent and creative thinking is evident.					
Assignment Specific Criteria					
7. Responds to all aspects of the assignment.					
8. Considers the appropriate audience/implied reader.					

Overall Evaluation

- Excellent Competent Not Acceptable

Comments

Criminal Justice Assessment Examination

Structure and Function

1. Which of the following models assumes a systems model of criminal justice?
 - a. due process model
 - b. individual-rights model
 - c. conflict model
 - d. consensus model

2. Who would support the full protection of personal freedoms and civil rights within the criminal justice process?
 - a. a crime-control advocate
 - b. a justice-ideal advocate
 - c. an individual-rights advocate
 - d. a public-order advocate

3. The police reform movement that began in the early 1900s drew directly upon the ideas and values of :
 - a. Jacksonian democracy
 - b. Tammany Hall
 - c. Populism
 - d. The Progressive Movement
 - e. The New Deal

4. In most states, including California, probation departments work under the direction of the
 - a. Court
 - b. Director of Dept. of Corrections
 - c. Director of Social Welfare
 - d. Sheriff
 - e. Board of Supervisors

5. The establishment of POST standards in all states responded to mandates from:
 - a. the Brownlow Commission
 - b. the Knapp Commission
 - c. the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
 - d. the FBI
 - e. the National Institute of Justice

6. The three main components of the criminal justice system in the United States are:
 - a. courts, neighborhoods, religious institutions
 - b. corrections, courts, law enforcement
 - c. law enforcement, courts, schools
 - d. businesses, non profits, charities
 - e. police, courts, victims rights groups

7. Criminal Justice agencies are found at what level(s) of government:
 - a. local, international, diocese
 - b. federal, ward, state
 - c. census tract, gang turf, city
 - d. state, federal, cities and counties
 - e. water districts, school districts, discount malls
8. The criminal justice system in the United States has been influenced by:
 - a. the Civil Rights movement
 - b. urbanization
 - c. immigration
 - d. the economy
 - e. all of the above
9. A college education is considered desirable for police officers because:
 - a. studies have shown that college educated officers have less complaints filed against them by the public
 - b. college educated officers are smarter
 - c. most college educated officers are not minorities
 - d. modern police practice requires a college education
 - e. none of the above
10. What is the most common form of criminal sentencing in the United States?
 - a. imprisonment
 - b. shock incarceration
 - c. probation
 - d. parole

Crime Theory

11. Positivist Criminological theory suggests that:
 - a. God is responsible for crime
 - b. the individual is totally responsible for crime
 - c. factors including, social status, experience, mental and physical traits contribute to crime
 - d. crime should be punished surely and swiftly
 - e. greedy self centered behaviors are responsible for crime
12. Crime policy in the United States is most influenced by:
 - a. Classical Crime Theory
 - b. Positivist Crime Theory
 - c. Marxist Crime Theory
 - d. the Old Testament
 - e. the combination of a and b
13. Which school explains criminal behavior by looking at gene structure, hormones, and inheritance?
 - a. Social-Psychological School
 - b. Classical School
 - c. Biological School
 - d. Psychological School

14. Which school emphasizes the roles of free will and reasonable punishments?
- Sociological School
 - Classical School
 - Biological School
 - Psychological School
15. Shaw and McKay and their concentric zones would be classified within:
- conflict theory
 - social control theory
 - social ecology theory
 - differential association theory
16. Walter Miller described the focal concerns of subcultural participants in terms of:
- excitement
 - trouble
 - toughness
 - all of the above
17. Which of Merton's categories would a law-abiding citizen fall into?
- innovator
 - conformist
 - ritualist
 - retreatist
18. A juvenile who steals a candy bar and states, "No one was really hurt," is using which neutralization technique?
- denial of victim
 - condemnation of the condemners
 - denial of responsibility
 - denial of injury
19. All crime is deviance and all deviance is crime
- True
 - False

Crime Law

20. _____ is a required element of any murder, and is established by showing that the defendant committed an unlawful act without justification or excuse.
- Premeditation
 - Adequate provocation
 - Heat of passion
 - Malice aforethought
21. _____ typically meets the requirement for mitigating murder to manslaughter because it is adequate provocation.
- Simple assault
 - Alleged molestation by a stranger
 - Mutual combat
 - Anger toward a third person

22. Where a defendant is charged with involuntary manslaughter on the basis that the killing occurred during their unlawful act which was a misdemeanor requires _____.
- causation - the act constituting the misdemeanor must be causally connected with the killing
 - intent - not intent to kill, but general criminal intent to commit the misdemeanor
 - dangerous act - the act must be done in a manner dangerous to human life or safety
 - all of the above
23. When a killing occurs during the commission of _____ the defendant can be charged with first degree murder under the felony murder rule (in CA).
- arson
 - rape
 - robbery
 - all of the above
24. An individual who takes and carries away the property of another with the intent to permanently deprive the owner of that property has most likely committed the theft offense to be pled and proved using the elements of:
- embezzlement
 - false pretenses
 - larceny
 - robbery
25. Attempt crimes are 'incomplete' offenses and are sometimes referred to as:
- intangible crimes
 - inchoate crimes
 - poorly planned crimes
 - none of the above
26. In order for the plain-view doctrine to apply:
- officers must have a legal right to be in the viewing area
 - officers must have cause to believe that the evidence is somehow associated with criminal activity
 - both a and b
 - neither a nor b
27. Which Amendment protects against self-incrimination and excludes any form of coercion during interrogation?
- First
 - Fourth
 - Fifth
 - Eighth
28. A grand jury has all of the following characteristics and duties except that it:
- determines if an accused individual should be held over for an actual trial
 - meets in secret, with no opportunity for the accused to cross-examine witnesses
 - may initiate prosecution independent of the prosecutor
 - delivers a verdict of guilty or not guilty in criminal trials

29. Which of the following is not one of the goals of contemporary sentencing?
- a. incapacitation
 - b. rehabilitation
 - c. restitution
 - d. deterrence

Research and Investigations

30. The discovery of blood from a person other than the victim at a violent crime scene would:
- a. prove the person committed the crime
 - b. possibly identify the person whose blood was at the scene
 - c. could link a person once identified to the scene but not identify the person
 - d. always identify the person whose blood was discovered
 - e. exclude some people but never link anyone positively to the blood at the scene.
31. A bullet in the body of a deceased murder victim would most likely serve as:
- a. linking evidence
 - b. tracing evidence
 - c. corpus delicti evidence
 - d. none of these
 - e. all of these
32. As society becomes more dependent upon computers, the damage potential of viruses will likely:
- a. increase
 - b. decrease
 - c. stay the same
 - d. be unpredictable; we have no way of knowing
33. Who created the first “modern” system of personal identification?
- a. J. Edgar Hoover
 - b. Kirk Bloodsworth
 - c. Alphonse Bertillon
 - d. Francis Galton
34. Control of a crime scene should always pass to the most senior officer present.
- a. True
 - b. False
35. Logical sets of attributes are known as:
- a. values
 - b. variables
 - c. concepts
 - d. operational definitions
36. It is safe to say that the most widely used measures of crime are based on:
- a. crimes known to the police
 - b. criminal victimization reports
 - c. self reported criminality
 - d. prisoner drug use forecasting

37. The most conventional type of experiment is referred to as a:
- time series experiment
 - quasi-experiment
 - classical experiment
 - cross sectional experiment
38. Which of the following groups of crimes is best measured by self report surveys?
- victimless crimes
 - public order crimes and delinquency
 - crimes rarely observed by or reported to the police
 - all of the above
39. Which of the following techniques of data collection is MOST likely to make a guarantee of anonymity difficult?
- interviews
 - mailed questionnaires
 - secondary data analysis
 - unobtrusive measures

Administration and Ethics

40. The role of internal affairs in most criminal justice agencies includes:
- investigation of crimes by employees
 - investigation of misconduct by employees
 - handling citizen complaints against employees
 - counseling and religious guidance of employees
 - a, b and c
41. Because California is the largest state in the union:
- we have the largest number of US Senators
 - we have the same number of US Senators as Wyoming
 - we have more US Senators than some states and fewer than others
 - we have fewer US Representatives than Michigan
 - we have the same number of US Representatives that New York has
42. The rate of crime has declined in the 1990's. As a result:
- there are fewer people sentenced to prison than in the 1980's
 - prisoners serve a shorter time than in the 1980's
 - states have built fewer prisons than in the 1960's
 - probation caseloads have declined
 - none of the above
43. Organizational culture refers to:
- cultural activities at the work place
 - mission statements, organizational arrangements and values
 - the line worker's understanding of the organization
 - b and c
 - none of the above

44. Goldstein's (1977) definition of police corruption included which elements?
- Criminal activity by police officers
 - Racist actions by police
 - Misuse of Authority for personal gain
 - Police officer use of illegal drugs
 - None of the above
45. Unethical acts by criminal justice workers are:
- illegal by definition
 - some times illegal
 - violate established social norms
 - should be defined by departmental authority or law
 - b and d
46. Criminal Justice employees are prohibited from official actions that deny persons their constitutional rights by:
- federal law
 - state law
 - department policy
 - all of the above
 - none of the above
47. The term "Meat Eaters" in police corruption refers to:
- individual police officer corruption that is sustained over time
 - police corruption that may involve physical harm to others
 - police "shakedowns" of restaurants
 - all of the above
 - none of the above
48. The term "bureaucracy" refers to
- the problem with governmental red tape
 - the organization of government activities
 - only to the private sector
 - only to foreign countries
 - does not apply to police, courts or corrections
49. Leadership
- takes many forms
 - is inherited at birth
 - can be learned
 - a and c
 - none of the above
50. In most criminal justice agencies, pay, promotion and conditions of work are:
- subject to collective bargaining agreements
 - set by the executive of the agency
 - set by legislative law
 - individually arranged between the employee and the supervisor
 - is dependent on "who you know"

Short Essay Exam

Please complete this page and then proceed to the essay question on the next page.

1) Name: _____

2) Social Security Number: _____

3) Community college(s) where you completed your lower division
criminal justice courses: _____

4) Year you first attended community college: _____



CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACULTY SURVEY OF STUDENT WRITING

The purpose of this survey is to determine the nature and extent of writing assignments given to students in the Criminal Justice Division. The results of this survey will help clarify goals and objectives of the Division's assessment plan. Eventually, the Assessment Committee will also obtain faculty input on student writing effectiveness.

Please use the scantron to mark a response for each number. The number of questions which must be answered below depends on whether the faculty member teaches one, two or three preps and uses different assignments for each. Questions 1 through 9 below apply to your first prep, questions 10 through 18 apply to your second prep and questions 19 through 27 apply to your third prep.

Use the following scale for questions 1-9 below to indicate the extent to which you use any of the following types of assignments in your first course prep during a semester.

- A. Daily
 - B. Weekly
 - C. Bi-weekly
 - D. 1 - 5 times a semester
 - E. Never
-
- 1. In class writing to answer a question posed by the instructor
 - 2. Journals
 - 3. Reaction papers.
 - 4. Research papers.
 - 5. Case briefs.
 - 6. Essay exams.
 - 7. Essay assignments.
 - 8. Multiple drafting and revision of a paper.
 - 9. Progressive writing assignments.

Use the following scale for questions 10 - 18 below to indicate the extent to which you use any of the following types of assignments in your second course prep (if applicable) during a semester.

- A. Daily
- B. Weekly
- C. Bi-weekly
- D. 1 - 5 times a semester
- E. Never

- 10. In class writing to answer a question posed by the instructor
- 11. Journals
- 12. Reaction papers.
- 13. Research papers.
- 14. Case briefs.
- 15. Essay exams.
- 16. Essay assignments.
- 17. Multiple drafting and revision of a paper.
- 18. Progressive writing assignments.

Use the following scale for questions 19 - 27 below to indicate the extent to which you use any of the following types of assignments in your third course prep (if applicable) during a semester.

- A. Daily
- B. Weekly
- C. Bi-weekly
- D. 1 - 5 times a semester
- E. Never

- 19. In class writing to answer a question posed by the instructor
- 20. Journals
- 21. Reaction papers.
- 22. Research papers.
- 23. Case briefs.
- 24. Essay exams.
- 25. Essay assignments.
- 26. Multiple drafting and revision of a paper.
- 27. Progressive writing assignments.

Use the following scale to indicate the amount of time you spend during a semester on the following activities:

- A. Never
 - B. 1 - 3 times per semester
 - C. 4 - 6 times per semester
 - D. 7 - 10 times per semester
 - E. In excess of 10 times per semester
28. Talking about correct writing techniques with my students.
29. Meeting with students on a one-to-one basis to discuss correct writing techniques.
30. Providing samples of correctly written assignments, projects and essay exams.
31. I believe it is important to cover plagiarism with my students when discussing writing assignments:
- A. Strongly agree
 - B. Agree
 - C. No opinion
 - D. Disagree
 - E. Strongly disagree
32. When discussing writing assignments with my students, I believe it is important to review the organization I expect for the project:
- A. Strongly agree
 - B. Agree
 - C. No opinion
 - D. Disagree
 - E. Strongly disagree
33. When discussing writing assignments with your students, I believe it is important to review the expected content of the project:
- A. Strongly agree
 - B. Agree
 - C. No opinion
 - D. Disagree
 - E. Strongly disagree
34. How often do you informally discuss student writing assignments with your fellow faculty members in the Criminal Justice Division?
- A. Never
 - B. At least once a semester
 - C. At least once a year

35. Have you been provided with any formal or informal training on the various types of writing assignments which could be utilized in teaching your classes?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
36. I believe that it is important to utilize a grading rubric when evaluating student writing assignments:
- A. Strongly agree
 - B. Agree
 - C. No opinion
 - D. Disagree
 - E. Strongly disagree
37. I believe it is important to discuss the grading rubric with my students before the writing assignment is completed:
- A. Strongly agree
 - B. Agree
 - C. No opinion
 - D. Disagree
 - E. Strongly disagree
38. In selecting writing assignments for your students, how often do you consider whether the assignment is susceptible to plagiarism?
- A. Always
 - B. Sometimes
 - C. Never

Using the below scale, indicate the extent to which the following conditions discourage you from giving more writing assignments:

- A. To a great extent
 - B. Somewhat
 - C. Not at all
39. Student resistance
40. Class size
41. Material does not lend itself to writing assignments
42. Teaching loads
43. I believe the number of writing assignments I give is adequate

FACULTY WRITING SURVEY RESULTS

Assessment/Academic Standards Committee
Spring 2008

Percent of Faculty Members Using Specific Writing Assignments/Activities			
<i>Type of Writing Assignment/Activity</i>	<i>1st Prep</i>	<i>2nd Prep</i>	<i>3rd Prep</i>
In-class writing assignments	67%	71%	63%
Journals	19%	16%	14%
Reaction Papers	33%	26%	50%
Research Papers	65%	53%	71%
Case Briefs	20%	26%	29%
Essay Exams	83%	74%	71%
Essay Assignments	71%	68%	86%
Multiple Drafting & Revision	48%	42%	43%
Progressive Writing	48%	47%	57%

Perceived Importance of Instructor Writing Practices	
<i>Instructor Writing Practice</i>	<i>Percent Strongly Agree or Agree</i>
Cover Plagiarism	95%
Review Organization	100%
Review Expected Content	100%
Utilize a Grading Rubric	95%
Discuss the Grading Rubric with Students	100%

Conditions that Discourage Faculty from Giving More Writing Assignments			
<i>Discouraging Condition</i>	<i>To a Great Extent</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Not at All</i>
Student Resistance			X
Class Size	X		
Material			X
Teaching Loads	X		

Other Findings:

- 90% of faculty indicate that they informally discuss student writing assignments with other CJ faculty members at least once a semester
- 81% of faculty indicate that they have been provided with informal or formal training on various types of writing assignments for their classes
- 71% of faculty indicate that they always consider an assignment's susceptibility to plagiarism when selecting writing assignments