

Program in Criminal Justice Studies

Assessment Report AY 2011/12

Introduction

The program in Criminal Justice Studies is transitioning to a new methodology for its assessment. In the past we relied on a multiple choice testing instrument. We are now moving toward an assessment process that examines students' work in our culminating field experience course.

680 Assessment

CJ 680: Culminating Field Experience is the Criminal Justice Studies required assessment class prior to graduation. In this course, students are asked to complete one of two tracks: (1) complete an 8-10/week internship, keep a field journal of this internship, and write a paper that examines this internship using a range of peer-reviewed and other sources on the topic; or (2) design, develop and conduct a field research using social scientific methods and write a paper on this project using a range of peer-reviewed and other resources. The requirements for the final paper are: 20-25 pages, double spaced; 15 sources, including 8 which must be peer reviewed, and demonstration of 80-100 hours of field or internship experience. All Criminal Justice Studies majors are required to complete this course prior to graduation, and are advised to take it in their senior year. CJ 680 is designed to assess whether students have mastered the following learning objectives designated in the criminal justice studies curriculum:

- Critically assess theories of criminality;
- Apply a multidisciplinary social science approach to the study of crime, law, and justice;
- Develop the skills to analyze legal briefs and case law, and to evaluate social scientific research;
- Apply theory and skills to field experiences.

The primary form of assessment is a range of assignments completed over the course of the semester and a final paper, which is assessed on the following criteria:

- Demonstration of substantive knowledge of peer-reviewed research on topic
- Mastery of disciplinary writing style
- Ability to conduct innovative and creative research or successfully complete a structured internship

- Ability to integrate primary and secondary sources
- Original contribution to the field of crime, law and justice

For assessment activities this past year, a sample of 10 pages from Spring 2012 were pulled and assessed with regards to these five dimensions. Below, these we report on this selection of papers. For Spring 2012, the papers were referenced with the following frequencies with respect to letter grades:

A	2 (papers 1-2)
B	3 (papers 3-5)
C	3 (papers 6-8)
D	1 (paper 9)
F	1 (paper 10)

1. Demonstration of substantive knowledge of peer-reviewed research on topic

Papers were assessed in this category based on the number of peer-reviewed sources used in the paper, usage of these sources in the text of the paper, and the range of sources used to substantiate depth of knowledge.

Paper 1 (57/60) used thirteen peer-reviewed sources in the final paper, made substantial references to each peer-reviewed source used, and utilized analytical concepts from the readings in the paper. Paper 2 (60/60) used a total of ten peer-reviewed sources in the final paper, and used these sources to set up the paper thesis, the research design, and to analyze the research results.

Paper 3 (49/60) used eight peer reviewed sources from a range of academic disciplines, including criminal justice, sociology, and psychology, and used these sources to develop thesis, methodology and discussion. Paper 4 (53/60) used nine peer reviewed sources from a range of disciplines including military science, political science, and criminal justice, and used these sources to develop the discussion and analysis of the topic. Paper 5 (50/60) used eight peer-reviewed sources from disciplines including criminal justice and criminology and used these sources to develop the research design and analysis of research results.

Paper 6 (47/60) used nine peer-reviewed sources from a range of criminal justice journals, and used these sources frequently throughout the paper to refer to important highlight concepts. Paper 7 (45/60) used ten peer-reviewed sources from a range of criminal justice, psychology and child development journals, and used these sources to demonstrate the need for the research conducted by the author. Paper 8 (43/60) used six peer-reviewed journals from the fields of medicine, criminal justice and psychology and used these sources to demonstrate issues in related to the topic addressed in the internship.

Paper 9 (40/60) used four peer-reviewed sources in the final paper and this was not used to structure the analysis or development of the paper. Paper 10 (30/60) used eight peer reviewed sources, but did not use these to develop or design a research project.

2. Mastery of disciplinary writing style

Papers were assessed in this category based on their ability to write an interdisciplinary social-scientific thesis related to the issues of law, crime and justice.

Paper 1 demonstrated mastery of disciplinary writing style by using internship experiences as a basis for an analysis of how issues of race and class manifest themselves within the assessment process for bail hearings. Paper 2 demonstrated mastery of interdisciplinary

social scientific writing style by reporting on the results of the field project with a discussion of research design, other literature in the field, a paper thesis, and a discussion of the research results.

Paper 3 demonstrated mastery of disciplinary writing style through the use of the traditional organization of social science reports, including the use of literature review, methodology, and discussion sections. Paper 4 mastered disciplinary writing style by organizing the paper thematically based on issues that arose from the analysis of the internship field journal. Paper 5 demonstrated mastery of disciplinary writing style through the use of traditional social scientific paper sections, such as an abstract, methodology, and an organization of results into thematic sections.

Paper 6 demonstrated mastery of disciplinary writing style by using traditional social scientific sections in the paper, such as methodology. Paper 7 used the traditional components of introduction, methodology and discussion to organize the paper, and organized the results into themes that arose from the research. Paper 8 used traditional components, including discussion, introduction and conclusion, and used these to recount the results of the internship and library research.

Paper 9 failed to demonstrate mastery by the lack of organizational cohesion throughout the paper. Paper 10 did not demonstrate mastery because of failure to base final analysis on primary research experience either through structured internship or field research project.

3. Ability to conduct innovative and creative research either or successfully complete a structured internship

Papers were assessed in this category for their ability to design and conduct an innovative and creative research project or for their ability to complete an 8-10hr/week internship at a local crime, law and justice related agency.

Paper 1 conducted an internship at the local county jail in which the student interviewed individuals for an assessment of being “released on own recognizance” at bail hearings. Paper 2 developed a survey designed to test whether San Francisco and San Mateo county residents attitudes towards crime differed given the differences between these two cities in terms of the harsh prosecution of crimes.

Paper 3 conducted innovative and creative research by interviewing parole officers and parolees about the struggles that parolees faced reintegrating back into society when released from prison. Paper 4 demonstrated as successful completion of a structured internship by participating as an instructor in a class on military ethics under the direction of a lead instructor.

Paper 5 conducted innovative research by combining interviews with both formerly incarcerated men and women working in male-only prisons to understand the impact of females in a male-only prison.

Paper 6 completed a semester's long internship at a local county jail, and participated as a rehabilitative coordinator. Paper 7 completed ten open-ended interviews of mentors in several anti-delinquency programs in the bay area, and used this to assess how mentoring impacted the mentors as well as the mentees. Paper 8 completed a semester's long internship as a youth mentor inside juvenile hall.

Paper 9 conducted four brief open-ended interviews with friends who were connected to rehabilitation programs and the prison system. Paper 10 did not conduct an internship or any field research.

4. Ability to integrate primary and secondary source

Papers were assessed in this category in terms of the integration of primary and secondary sources in the overall structure of the paper.

Paper 1 integrated substantive notes from their field journal into the final paper, and used these notes to demonstrate and complicate themes in the scholarly literature cited. Paper 2 used a total of twenty-four sources, ten of which were peer reviewed, and the other fourteen which ranged from government literature, reports issued by community based organizations, newspaper articles, websites, and other sources.

Paper 3 used both primary and secondary sources, and primarily used secondary sources in the literature review and primary sources in the discussion and results sections. Paper 4 used substantial sections of field notes to demonstrate ethical dilemmas in the military and used peer reviewed articles to analyze the places where training often failed. Paper 5 used themes uncovered in peer-reviewed sources to analyze the answers of primary research respondents.

Paper 6 integrated several examples from fieldnotes based on the internship into the final paper, and used these as the basis for a discussion of the secondary peer-reviewed sources. Paper 7 used examples from interviews to demonstrate how mentoring benefits mentors as well, something that was substantiated in the paper through ample use of secondary research on mentoring. Paper 8 used examples from internship to demonstrate the trials and tribulations that youth face on the way to rehabilitation and used the discussion and literature review sections to discuss the problems faced by incarcerated youth in general.

Paper 9 used both primary and secondary sources in the paper, but did not effectively integrate them. Paper 10 failed to use any primary research in the final paper.

5. Original contribution to the field of crime, law and justice

Papers were assessed in this category in terms of the contribution of their overall thesis and analysis to the field of crime, law and justice.

Paper 1 provided an innovative and original analysis of how the refusal to participate in pre-bail hearing assessment reports by some individuals contributed to the racial disparities in who was successful at the bail hearing. Paper 2 tested the “democracy in action” thesis to see if the punitive orientation of San Mateo County prosecutions relative to San Francisco reflected the views and attitudes of residents.

Paper 3 contributed the original perspective of those subject to the parole system, both as parolees and officers, of the challenges that parole presents in the lives of the formerly incarcerated. Paper 4 provided an innovative look at the problems present in teaching military ethics, and provided a social scientific analysis of the ways that often unintended emotions or contexts result in ethical lapses. Paper 5 provided an analysis of how gender impacts the everyday life of correctional officers by focusing on the experience of female correctional officers in male prison settings.

Paper 6 provided an innovative look at the workplace dynamics of rehabilitative programs in county jails. Paper 7 innovatively looked at the way that mentoring impacts the mentor, when often the question is only about how it impacts the mentee. Paper 8 provided an analysis of rehabilitation efforts from the perspective of the lives of incarcerated youth.

Paper 9 contributed an understanding of the need to look at what happens in prison to understand the effectiveness of rehabilitation. Paper 10 did not have an original contribution to the field.

Conclusion

This report reflects our new method for assessing the Program in Criminal Justice Studies. Assessment is a work in progress, and there are several questions that we will be addressing that we would appreciate feedback on:

- 1) What is an appropriate sample size of CJ 680 papers each year to assess
- 2) What is the best sampling strategy? Should we be selecting papers randomly or should we select them to reflect a wide variation, as we did in this report?

- 3) What is an appropriate strategy, given this approach to assessment, for examining trends over time in student progress in CJ 680?

San Francisco State University
Inventory of Program Assessment Activities, 2011-2012

Program: Criminal Justice Studies **College:** HHS **Date:** July 16, 2013

Program Mission: Drawing upon a rich urban environment, the multidisciplinary Program in Criminal Justice Studies explores the connections between law, crime and justice. The curriculum emphasizes critical thinking about the administration of justice, crime and delinquency, legal studies, and working with diverse communities. As part of the major, students participate in a culminating field experience at the end of their program. The Program is intended for a diverse group of students whose interests range from the local to the global, from street crime to terrorism, from municipal policing to international courts.

Measurable learning outcome	Place in curriculum where outcome is addressed	Academic year outcome was/will be assessed	Assessment/procedures Methods/strategies	Summary of findings about student learning	Use of findings for program improvement
<p>1. Differentiate between major criminal justice institutions</p> <p>2. Differentiate between criminal substantive law and criminal procedural law, and explain their respective roles within the criminal justice process</p> <p>3. Critically assess theories of criminality</p> <p>4. Analyze legal briefs and case law, and evaluate social scientific research</p> <p>5. Assess overall learning environment</p>	<p>1. CJ 300 (I&D), CJ 323 (D&M), CJ 330 (D&M)</p> <p>2. CJ 340 (I), CJ 400 (D), CJ 420 (D), CJ 430 (D), CJ 450 (D), CJ 451 (M), CJ 460 (M), CJ 475 (M), CJ 525 (M), CJ 530 (M)</p> <p>3. CJ 401 (I), CJ 405 (I), CJ 435 (I), CJ 461 (D), CJ 470 (D), CJ 485 (D), CJ 515 (M), CJ 520 (M)</p> <p>4. CJ 330 (I), CJ 335 (I), CJ 501 (D&M), CJ 502 (D&M), CJ 505 (M)</p> <p>5. Statement of program mission</p>	<p>2011-2012</p>	<p>Primarily, over the past year, we have relied on a qualitative assessment strategy dependent on final papers produced in the capstone course required of all majors, CJ 680. This course requires students to demonstrate the learning outcomes introduced, developed and mastered through courses in the curriculum. A report on the methods of assessment of these papers is attached.</p>	<p>See attached report.</p>	<p>In development</p>