

Report on the Project:

Assessing Graduate Level Program Learning Outcomes in the
Department of Criminology, Law and Society: Mentoring, Writing and Specialization

Submitted by Susan Coutin
Department of Criminology, Law & Society

May 17, 2013

I. Summary

The Department of Criminology, Law & Society assessed the quality of faculty mentorship provided to doctoral students and how well the program prepares these students to write for publications and grants, and to develop research publications. Our assessment activities included a review of the literature on mentoring, six focus group meetings with doctoral students at all levels of study, and a short questionnaire distributed to all faculty and doctoral students in the program. Results indicate that (a) generally, students are satisfied with mentoring, but greater attention could be paid to key transitions, such as the transition into graduate study, to dissertation research and writing, to a new mentor, and to employment after degree completion; (b) writing support could be improved, e.g., through additional courses and workshops on grant-writing and publishing; and (c) definitions of specialization differed. These findings will inform recommendations for program improvement.

II. Background

In Fall 2011, as part of a UC Irvine pilot program designed to develop graduate level program learning outcomes as a component of WASC assessment, the Department of Criminology, Law and Society formed a doctoral level Program Learning Outcomes Committee, consisting of three faculty (Susan Coutin, Geoff Ward, and Terry Dalton) and one doctoral student (Akhila Ananth in 2011-2012 and Matt Fritz Mauer in 2012-2013). Our committee studied documents regarding graduate level program learning outcomes, including two reports on best practices in graduate education produced by Yale and a Program Learning Outcomes template prepared by the UC Irvine Graduate Council. We then reviewed existing descriptions of the CLS doctoral program to cull our existing statements about the goals of our program. We consulted course syllabi, the CLS website, the Social Ecology Graduate Student Handbook, the Social Ecology school review documents, and the UCI catalog. After compiling the existing statements, we reviewed them for accuracy, redundancy, and omissions. We also sent a representative to the campus Program Learning Outcome Working Group meetings in order to ensure that our own process was consistent with that being adopted by other programs.

On February 13, 2012, the CLS PLO committee presented our PLO document to the CLS faculty. A full list of our learning outcomes is attached to this proposal. The CLS PLO committee recommended that the Department focus its initial program learning outcomes assessment on:

- Mentoring: How well is our doctoral program providing mentoring to our students? What approaches to mentoring are taken by different faculty and students? What are the strengths and limitations of each?
- Writing for Publication and Grants: How well does our doctoral program teach students to produce publishable work and submit competitive grant proposals?
- Scholarly specializations: How and when do our doctoral students develop specialized areas of research?

The draft PLO document and recommended initial assessment goals were unanimously approved by the CLS faculty. The CLS PLO committee subsequently developed an assessment plan, which was discussed at the April 30 CLS faculty meeting and unanimously approved by an 18-0 vote.

III. Assessment Activities

The PLO committee carried out three assessment activities: (A) a review of the literature on mentoring, (B) focus group interviews with our doctoral students, grouped by cohort, and (C) we added several questions to the evaluation forms that were distributed to faculty and doctoral students in preparation for our annual review of doctoral students. Each of these activities is described below.

(A) Literature review: During the 2011-2012 academic year, former PLO committee member Akhila Ananth compiled results from recent surveys of mentoring at UCI, and in 2012-2013, current committee member Matt Fritz-Mauer reviewed and summarized academic studies of mentoring

(B) Focus group interviews were conducted during the fall 2012 and winter 2013 quarters. The PLO committee met to develop a list of interview questions, which we revised further after conducting the first focus group interview. We were able to interview all but two of our first year Ph.D. students and a good cross-section of students from all of the other cohorts (years 2-6). Each focus group interview lasted two hours and yielded rich data. Every focus group interview was transcribed from notes taken during the interview. The notes do not contain identifying information. We then compiled all of the notes for further analysis, and identified a set of themes, which are listed below.

(C) Based on the themes that emerged in focus group interviews, we developed several follow-up questions to be incorporated into our annual review of doctoral students. We obtained paper copies of the answers to these questions from Graduate Director Susan Turner, and we compiled the results.

IV. Results

(A) Review of the Literature on Mentoring

(1) AGS Mentoring Survey: Although this survey was administered to the campus as a whole rather than to CLS in particular, it provides a rich source of data regarding mentoring issues on campus. Some of its key findings are:

- “Mentor-Advisor difference”: It is campus policy that students have both an academic advisor and a mentor to help them navigate their programs. About 25% of UCI graduate students did not know the difference between a mentor and advisor (Survey, p. 9).
- “Quarterly meetings with advisor”: 25% of students surveyed did not believe or are unsure if they are receiving regular feedback on their progress; only 35% feel they can contact a mentor for help at anytime; and only 31% feel they are receiving adequate mentoring.

(2) Overview of academic literature on mentoring (see appendices for full citations and article summaries)

Mentoring is generally defined as a relationship in which a more experienced person, the mentor, tutors, guides, and facilitates the development of a protégé’s career (Schrodt et al., 2003; Noy & Ray, 2012). It is well-established that successful mentoring relationships benefit the mentor, the protégé, and the organization (Tenenbaum et al., 2001). Graduate students consistently label mentorship as the single most important determinant of the quality of their graduate experience, and students who are mentored more frequently report higher levels of satisfaction with their academic program and more respect from faculty (Segura et al., 2011). Research shows that new academics who have mentors receive more promotions, have higher incomes, and report more career satisfaction (Schrodt et al., 2003; Noy & Ray, 2012).

Mentors fulfill many roles. They socialize protégés by teaching them rules and norms, help students discover a professional specialization, provide emotional support, help students obtain funding and publish papers, direct research, and facilitate their progress in the field (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; McGuire & Reger, 2003; Schrodt et al., 2003). Generally, the literature divides the kind of help provided by mentors into two distinct categories: instrumental help, and psychosocial help. Instrumental help “includes coaching, sponsorship, exposure, and opportunities for challenging assignments.” Psychosocial help “includes role modeling, empathizing, and counseling” (Tenenbaum et al., 2001). Tenenbaum, Crosby, and Gliner added one additional category to their survey on mentoring: networking help, which includes advisers helping protégés make connections in the field. Tenenbaum et al. found that networking help and instrumental help positively correlated with productivity (as measured by publications, posters, and conference talks), while psychosocial help positively correlated with satisfaction about graduate school and the mentoring relationship (Tenenbaum et al., 2001).

Naturally, students desire many things from their mentors, and often one mentor is unable to fulfill all of a student's wants and needs (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; McGuire & Reger, 2003). Scholarly research, as well as our own focus group research, shows that students will seek out one or more additional mentors in order to get what they need professionally, socially, emotionally, and academically (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; McGuire & Reger, 2003). Generally, protégés who perceive themselves to be more similar to their mentor "in outlook, values, or perspective" were "more likely...to report liking their mentor, being satisfied with their mentor, and having more contact with their mentor (Ensher & Murphy, 1997).

Unfortunately, not all mentoring relationships are created equal. Some students, especially non-white students, report less satisfaction with their mentoring relationships than others (Noy & Ray, 2012). Students of color (Asian Americans, African Americans, and Latinos) are less likely to feel that their mentors respect their ideas, and are more likely to feel marginalized (Noy & Ray, 2012). Additionally, many students (including those in our focus groups), reported feeling a divide between them and their mentors, based in large part on the uneven power dynamic. McGuire and Reger put forth one creative solution to the power-problem: mentoring relationships between students, where each person feels free to speak as equals (2003).

(B) Our analysis of the focus group results identified the following recurrent themes.

Mentoring

1. The majority of participants reported being satisfied overall with their mentorship experiences, even those who had to switch advisers one or more times.
2. Those students who reported having less than a perfect fit with their adviser generally stressed that they got what they needed from a group of people, rather than one person.
3. Students want their advisers to teach them how to do research and publish. Multiple students reported wanting a closer research-and-writing relationship.
4. Changing advisers is very difficult for students, who do not know how to navigate the terrain. The department should make a greater effort to (1) express that it is OK to switch advisers, and (2) assist students in doing so in a way that (hopefully) avoids awkward situations.
5. The department should attempt to identify mentoring styles amongst faculty, and then work to pair incoming students with faculty based not just on substantive interests, but on the kind of mentorship incoming students are looking for.

Writing

1. Across multiple focus groups, students expressed a desire to be told in greater detail what a final, publishable paper should look like. They felt it would be more efficient than the current system, where students write, advisers heavily edit, students rewrite, and the process repeats.
2. Many students stated that they were confused about/ignorant of the grantwriting process.
3. Words used to describe writing for publication included: nervous, confused, terrifying, soul crushing, intimidating, and frustrating. Multiple students felt that an organized class where students could read and critique other students' works-in-progress would be enormously helpful.

4. Several students criticized the department's emphasis on publishing. What about writing? What about ideas? What about quality > quantity?

Specialization

1. Students in nearly every focus group stated that comps interferes with specialization. Not only is the process of studying for comps very time consuming, but the (current) format of the test doesn't allow for specialization in reading. However, one focus group (which consisted of 1 student who took comps last year, and 3 students who took comps this Spring) stated that comps helped them specialize by broadening their knowledge of the field(s).
2. The department does a much better job of teaching quantitative methods than qualitative methods. However, improvement needed even in the area of quantitative methods.
3. Adviser encouragement/the ability to pick/choose TA classes were cited as factors which helped students find a specialization.
4. The transdisciplinarity of the department is one of its most attractive features...yet at the same time, the department feels divided along "crim" and "law and society" grounds.
5. While many students identified their specialization, others identified their research interests and expressed a belief that "specialization" doesn't occur until you go on the job market and fit yourself into a category.

(C) Compilation of answers to questions distributed with evaluation forms at the time of our Annual Review of Students

Successfully transitioning through program?

Yes: 46/47 (98%)

No: 1/45 (2%)

Published before entering the program?

Yes: 19 (40%)

No: 28 (60%)

Scholarly publication while in CLS?

Yes: 20 (43%)

No: 27 (57%)

Non-scholarly pub while in CLS?

Yes: 20 (43%)

No: 27 (57%)

In sum, the vast majority of the students feel that they are successfully transitioning through the program. Success in writing for publication is more mixed. Of the 5th, 6th, and 7th year students who completed this survey, 12 reported having produced a scholarly publication while in CLS and 8 reported not having produced such a publication. Note that there is some overlap between those who produced scholarly and non-scholarly (an unclear distinction) publications while in CLS but there are also many who only did one or the other.

V. Analysis and Recommendations

A. Mentoring: The Department of Criminology, Law and Society appears to be doing a good job mentoring doctoral students in that students generally felt satisfied with mentoring, in contrast to the data reported in the campuswide AGS Mentoring survey, which reported that only 31% of students surveyed felt they were receiving adequate mentoring. We should be pleased, given that studies of mentoring report that high quality mentoring is key to students' success. That said, there are several areas in which we can improve. CLS students expressed a need for greater support in (1) understanding expectations associated with graduate school and successfully transitioning to doctoral study (this issue was emphasized by our first year cohort), (2) transitioning from the structured years of coursework and comps to the more independent phase of dissertation research and writing (an issue emphasized by some of our more advanced students), and (3) being able to transition from one advisor to another, if necessary. Additionally, our literature review found that students of color may be less satisfied with the mentoring that they receive.

To address these concerns, we recommend the following:

- Hold a workshop for incoming students at which expectations associated with graduate school are made explicit and strategies for meeting those expectations are discussed. Our more advanced students would be a good resource for such an event.
- Develop more flexible and collective (group-oriented) mentoring opportunities
 - Consider creating a journal club or research seminar at which more advanced students can read and discuss journal articles, present their work-in-progress, and receive feedback.
 - Continue to develop the prosem series with mentorship interests in mind
 - Support student-to-student mentoring, for instance, through training mentors, having coffee hours or pizza lunches for this purpose
- Rename the 1st year advisors something like “first year advisor” or “interim advisor” and require students to select an on-going advisor at the end of their first year of study. The student may select the initial advisor or another faculty member. This process will hopefully normalize the understanding that it is okay for students to switch from their initial advisor to someone else, if appropriate.
- Hold a faculty-student mixer that is specifically for investigating research and mentoring possibilities. Such a mixer could be targeted to first and second year students.
- Participate actively in the Social Ecology HBCU initiative, campus DECADE programming, diversity committee activities, and other opportunities to make our departmental climate inclusive and supportive.
- Encourage use of the Individual Development Plan by CLS students and faculty, and continue to evaluate experiences and effectiveness.
- Ensure that mentoring provided by the department reflects the range of career opportunities and interests that our students have.

B. Writing: Students expressed a desire for more information about and support during their own efforts to publish and to write grants. We were struck by the fact that focus group participants found the publication process intimidating and did not appear to be well informed

about grant writing. As well, it appears that a number of students complete their degrees without publishing or receiving a grant. Our recommendations for addressing these concerns include:

- Continue to hold workshops and pro-sems on publishing and grantwriting
- Consider creating a course on publishing your first article, or on grant-writing. Students could be encouraged to take this course after they have finished the required coursework.
- The journal club or research seminar described above could also be a way of addressing such concerns.
- Encourage advisors and students to discuss and plan student publishing goals and to ensure that these are in alignment with students' career aspirations.

C. Specialization:

- The department is about to initiate a new comps process which may help to allay student concerns.
- Provide more advanced methods coursework in both quantitative and qualitative methods.
- Do an inventory of appropriate advanced methods coursework offered in the CLS department and in other departments, and circulate the resulting list of course offerings to our doctoral students.
- The “Crim” versus “Law & Society” divide is also a long-standing one, but ideally, we could do more to showcase or recognize student and faculty research that creatively draws on both criminology and law and society, as the ability to do so is one of the hallmarks of our doctoral program.
- Encourage advisors to talk to students about how to describe their own research specializations.
- As we implement and evaluate the new comps structure, we recommend being attentive to concerns about whether or not our pedagogical goals are well served by this structure.

Further assessment: The committee recommends continued conversations with faculty and graduate students about what we've learned, priorities and strategies for on-going evaluation (e.g., writing, exposing students to a variety of career options), and how best to proceed.

VI. Program Improvements

The PLO committee's report and recommendations were presented to the CLS faculty at its May 13, 2013 meeting. The CLS Chair and the Graduate Student Representatives agreed to organize a workshop on graduate expectations and strategies for success, to be held about four weeks into the Fall 2013 quarter. Faculty also agreed to tell their first year advisees that it is okay to change advisors, and to consider renaming first year advisors “interim advisor.” This point will also be reiterated during the orientation that the CLS department provides to new students.

Regarding additional advanced methods courses, some faculty recalled that, in the past, when such courses have been offered, students have not enrolled in them in sufficient numbers. There was some support, though, for conducting an inventory of relevant advanced methods courses being offered both in Social Ecology and on the campus at large, and then making this inventory available to students. Such an inventory could also include professionalization courses, such as those focusing on publishing one's first article or grant-writing. George Tita, director of the

Masters in Public Policy, suggested that there is some opportunity to fund a grant-writing course that would be open to both CLS and MPP students. Likewise, there was support for continuing our proseminar series, incorporating topics that emerged during our PLO assessment, and for continuing to prioritize diversity initiatives, including the HBCU initiative and DECADE programming.

Several other recommendations required more planning and so were tabled for further discussion at the department's annual retreat, to be held in the summer. These include the idea of organizing research clusters or journal club meetings around particular topics, continuing to evaluate the comprehensive exam structure, mentoring students for alternative careers, enhancing our own curricular offerings, and transcending the divide between criminology and law and society. At that time, the PLO committee will also receive further direction from the faculty regarding the focus of future assessments.

VI. Appendices

Department of Criminology, Law and Society Program Overview

In the process of earning a Ph.D. in Criminology, Law and Society, students should meet the markers of the six main program learning outcomes, listed below.

To accomplish these outcomes, students must (1) pass required courses, (2) complete a second year project, (3) pass comprehensive examinations, (4) prepare and defend a dissertation proposal, and (5) prepare and defend a dissertation.

(1) Curriculum

The program requires students to pass eight required courses, one advanced methods course, and three elective courses with a B or higher grade. For a description of the following courses and others, please visit the course catalogue.

| Required Courses | Sample Advanced Method Options | Sample Elective Courses |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| SE 200 Seminar in Social Ecology | C222 Street Ethnography | C225 Consequences of Imprisonment |
| C201 Research Methods | C248 Geographic Information Systems | C232 Juvenile Delinquency |
| C228 Criminology/Micro | C251 Qualitative Criminological Analysis | C234 Anthropology of Law |
| C229Criminology/Macro | Anth208A Anthropological Fieldwork Methodology | C249 Law and Morality |
| C239A Law and Society I | SE266A Structural Equation Modeling | C252 Issues in Environmental Law and Policy |
| C239B Law and Society II | SE266B Applied Logistic Regression | C263 Eyewitness Testimony |
| SE 264A Data Analysis/Statistics I | Soc227A-B Seminar in Ethnographic and Qualitative Field Methods | C275 Special Topics in Criminology, Law and Society |
| SE 264B Data Analysis/Statistics II | U213 Advanced Qualitative Methods | C299 Independent Study |

In fulfilling required coursework, Students should know the:

- Multiple intellectual roots and contemporary expressions of the law and society field (Core knowledge)
- Development of criminological theory from its precursors to its present (Core knowledge)

- Implications of criminological and socio-legal theories for social action and public policy (Research Methods and Analysis)
- Issues related to the etiology of crime, the impacts of crime on society, and the social and cultural context of law (Core knowledge)
- Relationship between social regulations and the civil justice system (Core knowledge)
- Relationships and interactions between law, social structure, and cultural practices (Core knowledge)

(2) Second-year Project

Beginning in their first year, students initiate independent research projects under faculty supervision. Approaches to research vary widely and may include questionnaire and survey analysis, systematic field observation, computer simulation, archival research, ethnographies, historical research, and legal analysis. This project is further expanded on and completed during the second year. Each project is evaluated and approved by the advisor and one other faculty member.

Students may submit the written report of their second-year project as a Masters Thesis for an MA in Social Ecology. For the Ph.D. degree, however, an MA is not required.

In fulfilling this requirement, students should be able to:

- Produce scholarship that will typically be comparable in scope and format to articles that appear in leading journals within the field of criminology, and law and society (Scholarly Communication; Professionalization)
- Develop their own research projects and writing for an academic audience (Independent Research; Research Methods; Core Knowledge)

(3) Comprehensive Exams

Students take a written examination during their third year of study to demonstrate mastery of major theoretical, methodological, and substantive issues in criminology, law and society. This is a take-home examination, and includes two areas: criminology, and law and society. Completion of the comprehensive examination is required before the student can advance to candidacy for the Ph.D. Students must take the exams during their third year, and must pass them by the Spring quarter of their third year (adjusted for any leaves of absence).

In fulfilling this requirement, students should be able to:

- Demonstrate mastery of major theoretical substantive, and methodological issues in criminology, and law and society (Core Knowledge, Research Methods and Analysis)
- Produce written answers to exam questions that are clearly organized and structured (Scholarly Communication)

(4) Dissertation Proposal

During the fourth year of study, students develop and defend a proposal for dissertation research. The proposal is developed under the guidance of a faculty advisor, and clearly presents the research questions, theories methods that will inform the doctoral dissertation project. Once students complete the proposal, they must defend the proposal to a committee comprised of the faculty advisor and four other faculty members. Upon approval of the defense, they will advance to candidacy for the PhD. Students generally complete the proposal defense by the end of the fourth year.

In fulfilling this requirement, students should be able to:

- Conduct a thorough examination of the background and context of the problem being proposed for investigation and its current status (Core Knowledge)
- Specify in detail the proposed method for studying the problem (Research Methods and Analysis)
- Develop a compelling dissertation proposal that lays out the proposed research and explains how it will extend the existing knowledge base (Independent Research, Research Methods and Analysis)
- Address feedback from the advancement committee (Professionalism, Scholarly Communication)
- Defend the dissertation proposal to the advancement committee (Scholarly Communication)

(5) Dissertation

Once students have advanced to candidacy, they spend their remaining time at UCI completing data collection and analysis for their dissertation. Following the completion of the written dissertation, students must orally defend their dissertation to a committee comprised of the faculty advisor and two other faculty members. The dissertation defense usually occurs in the fifth or sixth year. Upon passage of the oral defense and approval of the committee, the student has completed all of the requirements of the PhD program.

In fulfilling this requirement, students should be able to:

- Identify and appropriately frame interesting and important research problems (Core Knowledge)
- Independently investigate such problems thoroughly and rigorously (Independent Research, Research Methods and Analysis)
- Write scholarly material of excellent quality (Scholarly Communication)
- Defend the dissertation project in an oral presentation to a committee of three faculty members and an open audience (Scholarly Communication)

Timeline for Completion

Students typically complete a PhD in Criminology, Law and Society in five or six years. While progress in the department varies, students usually follow the same timeline to completion.

| | Academic Year | Summer Following |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Year 1 | Take required courses Identify second year project Identify second year project and committee | Conduct research for second year project Possible TA-ship, GSR-ship or Fellowship |
| Year 2 | Finish required courses Take elective courses Complete second year project | Begin studying for comprehensive exams Possible TA-ship, GSR-ship or Fellowship |
| Year 3 | Finish elective courses Pass comprehensive exams Possibly work on converting the second year paper into a publication | Begin work on dissertation proposal Begin applying for outside funding Possible TA-ship, GSR-ship or Fellowship |
| Year 4 | Prepare and defend dissertation proposal (advance to candidacy) Possibly secure extramural funding | Work on dissertation Continue applying for extramural funding Possible TA-ship, GSR-ship, Fellowship, or teach a class |
| Year 5 and 6 | Complete and defend dissertation Apply for jobs | |

Students entering the program in Fall 2010 or later must advance to candidacy by the fall of the fifth year, and complete all requirements by the end of their seventh. The normal time to degree is six years.

Department of Criminology, Law and Society Doctoral Program Learning Outcomes and Definitions

1. *Core Knowledge*. Students should know the:
 - Multiple intellectual roots and contemporary expressions of the law and society field

- Development of criminological theory from its precursors to its present
 - Implications of criminological and socio-legal theories for social action and public policy
 - Issues related to the etiology of crime, the impacts of crime on society, and the social and cultural context of law
 - Relationship between social regulations and the civil justice system
 - Relationships and interactions between law, social structure, and cultural practices
2. *Research Methods and Analysis.* Students should be able to:
- Frame an empirical research question guided by theory
 - Be familiar with the range of research methodologies used by social scientists, including inductive and deductive methods
 - Examine the strengths and limitations of different research methodologies
 - Carry out methodologically sound research
 - Understand and follow research ethics
3. *Independent Research.* Students should be able to:
- Develop area or areas of research specialization
 - Produce scholarship that will typically be comparable in scope and format to articles that appear in leading journals within the field of criminology, and law and society
 - Develop their own research, in accordance with the standards of rigor in the field
 - Work collaboratively with other researchers and interlocutors
 - Supervise research assistants or student research projects
4. *Pedagogy.* Students should be able to:
- Draw on a range of pedagogical techniques, including, where appropriate on-line teaching
 - Address common classroom challenges
 - Design lessons and assignments
 - Lead discussions
 - Respond to diverse student learning needs
 - Effectively assess student work
 - Teach collaboratively
 - Mentor students
5. *Scholarly Communication.* Students should be able to:
- Produce writing appropriate for scholarly publication
 - Structure an argument
 - Review and cogently summarize relevant literatures

- Adopt an individual, authorial voice
- Organize and present research orally
- Use visual aids effectively during presentations

6. *Professionalism.* Students should be able to:

- Contribute to the profession, department, and university through service
- Publish their work
- Communicate with policy audiences
- Develop professional networks
- Present their work publicly
- Carry out research responsibly
- Collaborate with others
- Participate in conferences
- Edit and evaluate others' work
- Secure an academic or non-academic position in the profession
- Understand and adhere to appropriate norms of academic collegiality

Department of Criminology, Law and Society
Measuring and Evaluating Program Learning Outcomes

This table tracks the required and recommended means through which students in the Department of Criminology, Law and Society accomplish the six main program learning outcomes. It also tracks the ways that students' progress toward those outcomes are evaluated, both formally and informally. This table is intended to clarify the expectations placed on doctoral students and the markers of student progress in the program. As such, it serves as a guide for doctoral students and faculty mentors to ensure a productive working relationship and that students have adequate opportunities to contribute to the field and their careers.

| PLO | Program Elements (Required) | Program Elements (Recommended) | Evaluation Measures (Formal) | Evaluation Measures (Informal) |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| (1) Core Knowledge | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required and elective coursework • 2nd year project • Comprehensive exams • Advancement to candidacy meeting • Dissertation proposal • Dissertation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colloquia attendance • Grant-writing • Participation in supervised research | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st and 2nd year Review • Annual self-reviews • Evaluation and feedback from core instructors and advisors • Grades in courses • Meetings with advisor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation and feedback from mentors, committee chair and members • Meetings with advisor • Peer review of scholarship |
| (2) Research Methods and Analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coursework: Research Methods, Statistics A/B, and elective methods courses • Research for 2nd year project • Comprehensive exams • Dissertation proposal • Dissertation research | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colloquia attendance • Grant-writing • Applying for IRB approval | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st and 2nd year review • Office of Research review of grant proposals • IRB approval | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation and feedback by core advisors |
| (3) Independent Research | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd year project • Dissertation proposal • Dissertation research | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research assistantships • Conference presentations • Publications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review of scholarship • Feedback from advisor • Dissertation defense | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from audience at dissertation defense • Feedback from advisor |

(Table continues to next page)

Department of Criminology, Law and Society
Measuring and Evaluating Program Learning Outcomes (Continued)

| PLO | Program Elements (Required) | Program Elements (Recommended) | Evaluation Measures (Formal) | Evaluation Measures (Informal) |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| (4) Pedagogy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching assistantships • 2-day TA training | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer mentorship • Teaching associate-ships • Intra-departmental mentorship | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA evaluations • Completion of TA training • Annual review of graduate students | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance and feedback from course instructors during teaching assistantships |
| (5) Scholarly Communication | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required and elective courses • 2nd year project • “Advancement to candidacy” meeting • Dissertation proposal • Dissertation and dissertation defense | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practice job talks and conference presentations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual review of graduate students • Evaluation and feedback from core advisors • Peer review of scholarship • Grades in courses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation and feedback from core advisors • Questions and feedback from colloquium and conference attendees |
| (6) Professionalism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd year project • Dissertation proposal • Dissertation and dissertation defense | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizing reading groups • Research assistantships • Attendance at workshops, colloquia, and conferences • Service to department, university, or professional associations • Publishing experience • Editorial experience | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation and feedback from core advisors • Annual review of graduate students | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from committee chair and members |

Program Learning Outcomes Focus Group Questions

Introduction: Explain that our department is evaluating graduate level program learning outcomes as part of a broader assessment of graduate learning on campus. Our goal is to collect and analyzing information about the effectiveness of particular aspects of our graduate program, and then that information will be used to propose improvements, if needed. We have had a department committee working on this issue. The committee has had student representation. We have decided to focus our assessment on three areas: (1) mentoring (2) writing for publication and (3) developing a specialization. We selected these three areas as they are key to our students' success. Our goal is to assess the program, not particular faculty or students.

We will be taking notes during the focus group discussion, but will not record anyone's name in our notes or in any committee report that we prepare. Please be aware, of course, that anything you say will be overheard by the other focus group participants, so don't say things that you are not comfortable having others overhear. If there is anything that you would like to share anonymously, you can write it down on a short anonymous questionnaire that we will distribute at the end of our discussion

Global "expectations" question:

- What expectations did you have about graduate school before you entered the doctoral program, and what surprised you?

Mentoring

- Do you feel that you have a mentor?
- What do you hope to get from a mentor/mentoring relationship? What topics or skills have been the focus of the mentoring that you have received to date? Are there additional topics or skills about which you would like to be mentored in the future?
- How responsive is your mentor? Are you pleased with the level of communication in your relationship? If not, how could it be improved?
- On a quarterly basis, how much time do you spend with your mentor? Do you feel this is appropriate? (Too much? Too little?)
- How closely does your mentor oversee your work and your progression within the program?
- Do you feel as though your mentor advocates for you? (Awards, fellowships, networking and other professional opportunities).
- Is your mentor concerned with helping you in your career? What sort of career are you pursuing?
- Do you feel that you are in charge of your relationship with your mentor, that your mentor is in charge of this relationship, or that it is a mutually negotiated relationship?
- What expectations did you have about being mentored before you entered the program, and were those expectations met? How have your expectations changed over time?
- How comfortable do you think students feel changing advisers?
- Overall, how satisfied are you with the mentoring that you have received to date?

Writing for Publication and Grants

- What was your first writing-for-publication experience like?

- What did you learn during your first writing-for-publication experience?
- If you have not yet published/applied for a grant, what do you think the process is like?
- What are your publishing/grantwriting goals?

Specialization

- What does “specialization” mean to you? At what point do you have a “specialization,” as opposed to an “interest” or a “project”?
- Do you have a specialization? What is it?
- When did you develop your specialization?
- Do you think specialization matters to your success as a student and beyond? Why or why not?
- Have your research and teaching experiences helped you develop a specialization? Why or why not?
- What aspects of the program have helped you in finding a specialization? What aspects of the program hindered you in finding one?
- Do you have suggestions about how we could better help students to develop a specialization?

Thank you very much for taking the time to talk with us! If you have additional thoughts, feel free to give them to one of the committee members. You can do so anonymously by leaving an envelope in one of our boxes, if that would be preferable. We also would like to take a moment to distribute a short questionnaire, so if you have anything that you would like to tell us that you did not want to state publicly, please use it to convey those thoughts.

Questions incorporated into the Annual Review of Students:

Preamble

"This year the CLS Department is participating in a campus-wide initiative evaluating what students learn in graduate study and identifying ways that programs can be improved. As you may know, we have already done focus group interviews with a number of our doctoral students as part of this effort. The annual review of students presents us with an opportunity to glean a bit more information. We would therefore appreciate your response to these questions."

Questions For Students:

1. Do you feel that you are successfully transitioning through the program?

Yes ___ No ___

2. Some students publish before entering graduate school, some publish during their graduate studies, and some do not publish while graduate students. Can you please answer the following questions so that we can gauge publishing patterns in our program?

2a. Did you publish before joining the program?

2b. Have you published a scholarly paper while in this graduate program (i.e., academic article or book chapter)?

2c. Has your writing been published in another form or venue while in this graduate program (e.g., blog, book review essay, editorial, technical report)?

3. In a sentence or two, what problems or issues do you see your work addressing (i.e., what scholarly contribution)?

For Faculty:

1. In a sentence or two, what problems or issues do you see this advisee's work addressing (i.e., what scholarly contribution)?

Summary of Key Academic Articles on Mentoring

An Examination of Academic Mentoring Behaviors and New Faculty Members' Satisfaction with Socialization and Tenure and Promotion Processes

Schrodt, Stringer Cawyer, Sanders (2003)

This article defines mentorship as “[a] communication relationship in which a senior person supports, tutors, guides, and facilitates a junior person’s career development.” The authors examined mentoring relationships among new faculty members in order to examine whether the benefits found in the context of business organizations (more promotions, higher incomes, more career satisfaction) hold true in academia. 259 participants (all of whom had completed a master’s or PhD since 1993, and all of whom were faculty) responded to a 5-point Likert survey designed to evaluate five factors of academic mentoring behavior:

1. Research Assistance (working on projects with mentees, evaluating their work, increasing their visibility within the communication discipline)
2. Protection (from individuals/situations that could negatively impact careers)
3. Collegiality (socializing together inside/out of work environment)
4. Promotion (offering specific strategies for achieving career goals, advice on achieving tenure/promotion)
5. Friendship (providing encouragement and support as mentors develop trusting relationship with mentee)

To measure satisfaction with academic socialization, the authors used another 5-point Likert survey that measured 3 aspects of academic socialization:

1. Sense of *ownership*;
2. Extent to which respondent had received *adequate information* about research, teaching, and service expectations;
3. Report sense of *connectedness* to others in the department.

Conclusions: New faculty who were mentored felt more connected to their department, received more information about tenure/promotions, service, teaching, and research expectations, reported higher levels of satisfaction with academic socialization, were more loyal to their department, and felt more like insiders than outsiders.

Graduate Students' Perceptions of Their Advisors: Is there Systematic Disadvantage in Mentorship?

Shiri Noy & Rashawn Ray (2012)

Noy and Ray analyzed data from the Survey on Doctoral Education and Career Preparation, a cross-sectional study of advanced doctoral students in 11 disciplines at 27 universities. Traditionally, white men have been the dominant group in academia, and the authors were interested in examining how female students and students of color experience mentoring. In particular, the authors wanted to examine how women of color feel about their mentoring relationships.

In analyzing this data, Noy and Ray outlined six mentoring “types”:

1. **Affective:** Therapist. Perceived to care for students' overall well-being; sensitive to needs of students, provide emotional support, show concern for students' professional and personal lives.
 - a. Research indicates that women seem to prefer the "affective" type of mentor (Collins, 1983; Rose, 2005).
2. **Instrumental:** Fits classic ideas of professor as professional mentor, grad student as apprentice. Pays special attention to demands of grad training (funding, publishing, networking, conducting research, teaching). Don't view advising as a one-way street; seek input and feedback from students.
3. **Intellectual:** Provides feedback, assesses students' progress, directs research training, advises on research matters. Fits idea of research professors who focuses on publishing, guides students re: research. Limit involvement to professional, academic capacity. Less of a guide than instrumental advisor, more of a monitor.
4. **Available:** "Open door." Available to help with research, discuss program progress.
5. **Respectful:** Whether advisor respects students' ideas. "Respect of ideas is perhaps the most important currency in academia and plays a substantial role in graduate progress, letters of recommendation, and future job prospects."
6. **Exploitative:** Professors who use students as a source of labor, make excessive demands on their time, treat them as indentured servants.

Note: While these "types" are outlined separately, it seems obvious that one mentor could be more than one "type" depending on the situation.

Conclusions: Students of color were 24% less likely than whites to report believing that their adviser treats them with respect. Additionally, they reported less instrumental support. Women of color were especially disadvantaged in mentoring relationships, as white women were more likely to report a more instrumental and respectful primary adviser.

Mentoring Relationships in Grad School

Tenenbaum, Crosby, and Gliner (2001)

The authors surveyed 189 graduate students at UC Santa Cruz in order to compare the kind of help they received from their mentors to the students' productivity (measured by publications). The authors also include some information on the literature on mentoring, noting that the help provided by mentors has generally been divided into two categories:

- 1) Instrumental help – includes coaching, sponsorship, exposure, and opportunities for challenging assignments; and
- 2) Psychosocial help – includes role modeling, empathizing, and counseling.

The authors also evaluated a third category:

- 3) Networking help – includes mentors protégés make connections in the field.

Conclusions: Students who received more networking help and more instrumental help were more productive. Those students who received more psychosocial help were more satisfied, both with graduate school and with their mentoring relationship. Finally, gender was not an important factor, although men published with their advisers more than women did.

Faculty-Student Mentor Program: Effects on Academic Performance and Retention

Campbell & Campbell (1997)

While this research focused on undergraduate students, it highlights the importance of mentoring relationships in an academic setting. Researchers used a matched-pairs design in which 339 mentored undergraduates were compared to 339 nonmentored undergraduates.

Conclusions: The undergraduates with mentors had a higher GPA than nonmentored students (2.45 vs. 2.29), completed more units per semester (9.33 vs. 8.49), and had a lower rate of dropout (14.5% vs. 26.3%). No differences were found on factors like “supportiveness” and “fostering of professional development.” Race was not shown to be a clear factor, but some evidence that African-Americans preferred having African-American mentors.

Feminist Co-Mentoring: A Model for Academic Professional Development

McGuire & Reger (2003)

McGuire and Reger were graduate school friends who decided to mentor each other. While acknowledging that traditional mentoring relationships benefited both mentor and protégé, the authors were also critical of the power imbalance inherent in most of these relationships. This power imbalance may actually stifle the creative growth of the protégé, because “faculty mentors too often attempt to ‘clone’ themselves by controlling their students’ research agendas and discouraging students from incorporating new areas, methods, or data sources into their work.” This problem is especially relevant for minorities.

Instead, the authors advocate “feminist co-mentoring” as an addition to traditional mentoring. Such a relationship:

- Has an equal balance of power;
- Seeks to integrate emotion into academic professional expertise;
- Values paid and unpaid work;
- Emphasizes an egalitarian, cooperative relationship.

In this case, McGuire and Reger devoted 1-2 hours every two weeks to their relationship. They’d speak to each other about any and all stresses and concerns, both personal and professional, give each other feedback and advice, and share knowledge and resources. The authors reported that this was a beneficial experience, a helpful supplement to their normal mentoring relationships, and recommended similar student-student pairings for other graduate students.

Effects of Race, Gender, Perceived Similarity, and Contact on Mentor Relationships

Ensher & Murphy (1997)

The authors examined the effects of similarity, both real and perceived, as well as the amount of contact between mentor and protégé on the quality of mentoring relationships. The participants were 104 summer interns (ages 16-22) and their volunteer mentors who participated through a summer internship program designed to reduce youth joblessness in Los Angeles. While not in the context of graduate school, I thought the findings from this study were interesting/relevant.

All protégés were paired with same-sex mentors. Protégés were randomly assigned to either same-race mentors or different-race mentors. Published surveys were given to mentors and protégés, and the quality of the relationship was measured by liking, satisfaction, intended continuation of the relationship, and degree of psychosocial and instrumental functions experienced by the protégés.

Conclusions: Ultimately, race had no impact on amount of contact nor protégé level of satisfaction. However, the more likely protégés were to perceive themselves as being similar to their mentors in outlook, values, or perspective, the more likely they were to report liking their mentor, being satisfied with their mentor, and having more contact with their mentor.

Liking, perceived similarity, and psychosocial and instrumental support all significantly contributed to protégés' satisfaction with their mentor. Likelihood of continuing relationship predicted by perceived similarity and degree to which mentor provided career support.