

Date Received _____

**CUH Program
Annual Assessment Report
Summary**

Directions: Please complete this form for your Program. Each box that is attached to each of the sections is designed to adjust to varying lengths. **Send the completed report form via e-mail to Larry Osborne.**

1. Program Information:

Division	Behavioral Sciences
Program	Criminology & Criminal Justice
Level	Undergraduate
Academic Year	2010-2011
Submitted by	Joe Allen
Phone/email	x4879; joseph.allen@chaminade.edu
Date Submitted	09/30/11

2. Outcomes Assessed and Program Evaluation.

Outcomes assessed for this AY	Assessment Process	Access to/Archive of Results
All Program Learning Outcomes (N=63 students)	Comprehensive/Exit Exam (75 items; multiple choice & true-false format)	Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site; raw data on Joe Allen's computer
Student Evaluation of CCJ Program (N=63 students)	Exit Survey (8 items; Likert scale format)	Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site; raw data on Joe Allen's computer
Student Evaluation of CCJ Program & Integration of Marianist Values (N=63 students)	Exit Survey (5 items; Likert scale format)	Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site; raw data on Joe Allen's computer

3. Results, concerns and discoveries. Make sure appropriate statistical notations are utilized (N size, mean, standard deviation, frequency distribution, etc). What conclusions or discoveries were made from these results?

Results & Discoveries			
1. Overall Comprehensive/Exit Exam Results (N=63): During the most recent assessment cycle, students achieved the highest correct response rate (75.5%) since direct assessment activities commenced in Fall 2005. Overall scores for students have increased each assessment for the past 4 assessment periods.			
2. Specific Comprehensive/Exit Exam Results (N=63): Most Recent Assessment Cycle			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students scored above 80% in the following courses: CJ 201, CJ 220, CJ 223, CJ 291, and CJ 432. • Students scored below 60% in the following courses: CJ 151. • Student performance improvement of >+5% was seen in the following courses: CJ 220 and CJ 270. • Student performance decreases of >-5% were seen in the following courses: none. 			
3. Feedback on CCJ Program (N=63): During the most recent assessment, the mean student rating of faculty/administration on all assessed items was 4.56 (on a scale of 1-5). The range of mean scores for the assessed items was between a low of 4.46 ('Academic advising for CCJ students was readily available and useful') to 4.77 ('CCJ faculty were well-qualified and knowledgeable in their subject areas').			
4. Feedback on CCJ Program & Marianist Values (N=63): During the most recent assessment, the mean student rating of the program's expression/support of the Marianist values of all items was 4.64 (on a scale of 1-5). The range of mean scores for the assessed items was closely clustered between 4.60-4.69.			
5. This is the first assessment cycle where data have been collected and analyzed by program type (e.g., DUG, AUP, and Online). The table below compares the percentages of correct responses by course and overall for DUG and AUP students. ^{1 2}			
	Course	DUG (N=43)	AUP (N=13)
	151	56.4%	63.2%
	201	90.3%	77.9%
	220	79.5%	87.5%
	223	92.2%	92.3%
	270	61.8%	68.1%
	291	92.3%	76.9%
	315	78.5%	67.0%
	375	76.0%	67.7%
	423	65.7%	60.3%
	424	59.6%	64.0%
	432	86.8%	86.2%
	451	73.4%	79.7%
	470	73.6%	65.5%
	491	70.0%	67.3%
	OVERALL	75.5%	73.4%

¹ Only 1 student indicated having solely taken online courses, so these data are not included here for comparison purposes.

² Seven students indicated having taken 'other style or mixture', so these data are not included for comparison purposes.

Conclusions & Concerns

1. Assessment of PLOs via comprehensive/exit exam show that the target rate of 70% was not met in the most recent cycle for the following courses: CJ 151, CJ 270, CJ 423, and CJ 424. These are the same courses that scored below the target rate during the last AY assessment. Despite CJ 270 still being in this group, significant improvement from the last assessment cycle was seen (from 23.8% to a current rate of 63.1%).
2. Student evaluation of the CCJ Program is solid as is their assessment of the program and its integration of the Marianist values.
3. Across program type (DUG/AUP), student results are similar, including: performance on the exit exam, feedback on the program and faculty, and assessment of the program in terms of Marianist values.
4. Assessment of PLOs continues to be limited to the comprehensive/exit examination and student feedback/assessment instruments.

4. Use of Results. Did the results lead to program changes? If so, describe the changes made. If not, describe why changes were not needed.

1. Assessment of PLOs via comprehensive/exit exam: only one course continues to score below 60%, CJ 151. No changes to the instrument was done and it is unknown if curriculum was changed to emphasize these learning outcomes. It is recommended that the exam items for this course be re-examined and revised by the lead instructor and/or the materials related to these specific learning outcomes will be further emphasized. Three other courses scored below the target rate of 70% (CJ 270, CJ 423, and CJ 424). All three of these courses though have continued to improve slightly from previous terms. Exam items will be re-examined for possible revision as there are 1-2 questions per course that show to be especially problematic for students.
2. Student evaluation of the CCJ Program & integration of the Marianist values: no program changes deemed necessary.
3. Assessment of PLOs up-and-beyond comprehensive/exit examination: additional direct assessment items have been added to the undergraduate and graduate assessment activities; these items have been collected for four terms. Scoring methodologies (e.g., inter-rater reliability) were examined for these past items. Modifications to rubrics ensued in order to correspond to program-/content-relevant materials. Items were also modified to emphasize these items. The new items and rubrics will be used in the upcoming year; at that time, scoring methodologies will be re-examined and data analyzed. It is hoped that these materials will serve as the basis of the department's data collection of such materials for use in assessment.
4. Assessment of AS: After the winter 2009 term, the AEOP did not collect exit material data on students who received their AS. In September 2011, the AEOP was informed of this and have once again begun to have students complete the materials.
5. Continued assessment of AEOP: In Winter 2010, teaching duties for the AEOP's CJ 490 was turned over to Joe Allen (the instructor for CJ 490 in the DUG program). This change should help to ensure that the exit materials delivered in the capstone course are consistently presented and that data collection is reliable.

5. Dissemination of results, conclusions, and discoveries. How and with whom were the results shared?

All assessment activities have been disseminated to CCJ faculty, CCJ Program Coordinator, Division Chair and the Provost via e-mail. Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site.