Weber State University
Biennial Report on Assessment of Student Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: Criminal Justice Undergraduate Program
Academic Year of Report: 2019/20 (covering Summer 2017 through Spring 2019)
Date Submitted: 15 Nov 2019
Report author: Brent Horn

Contact Information:
        Phone: 801-626-8843
        Email: brenthorn@weber.edu

A. **Brief Introductory Statement:**
   Please review the Introductory Statement and contact information for your department or academic program displayed on the assessment site:
   http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html - if this information is current, please place an 'X' below. No further information is needed.

   _X__   Information is current; no changes required.

   Update if not current:

B. Mission Statement
Please review the Mission Statement for your department or academic program displayed on the assessment site:
http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html - if the mission statement is current, please place an 'X' below.; If the information is not current, please provide an update:

   ___   Information is current; no changes required.

   Update if not current:
   New Mission Statement effective Spring 2019
   Provide the highest quality criminal justice academics in Utah through responsive and impactful higher education programs, scholarship, and service to the profession and community.

C. Student Learning Outcomes
Please review the Student Learning Outcomes for your academic program displayed on the assessment site:
http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html. In particular, review in light of recent strategic reporting and indicate any needed updates. If the outcomes are current, mark below.

_X__ Information is current; no changes required.

The Criminal Justice Department has developed a new set of Program Learning Objectives. However, the department is in the processes of developing the assessment protocol to accompany those PLOs. This protocol may require a number of curriculum changes and will take some time to implement. Therefore, we will introduce the new PLOs and assessment when both are ready to roll out to the students.

D-1. **Curriculum**
"A collection of courses is not a program. A curriculum has coherence, depth, and synthesis."
(Linda Suskie; presentation at NWCCU Assessment Fellowship, June 19, 2019)

Please review the Curriculum Grid for your department or academic program displayed on the assessment site:
http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html.

Core Courses in Department/Program	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5	Learning Outcome 6	Learning Outcome 7	Learning Outcome 8	Learning Outcome 9
CJ 1010	1	1	1	1	1		1		
CJ 1300	2								
CJ 1330		2					2		
CJ 2300			2						
CJ 3270				2					
CJ 3300					2				
CJ 3600						1, 2			
CJ 4165							2		
CJ 4200								2	
CJ 4980									1, 2
CJ 4995	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Note[a]: Define words, letters or symbols used and their interpretation; i.e. 1= introduced, 2 = emphasized, 3 = mastered

There are no changes to the current Curriculum Grid.

Additional Information (details about graduating student assessment):
The Criminal Justice Department's Scholarship and Alumni committee is investigating an exit survey for graduating students.
The Criminal Justice Department Assessment committee changed the name of the graduating student assessment course from a "capstone" course to an "assessment" course. It is also devising a new assessment protocol to accompany new PLOs adopted by the department in Spring 2019.

D-2. High Impact Educational Experiences in the Curriculum
In response to the recent USHE requirement that all students have at least 1 HIEE in the first 30 credit hours and 1 HIEE in the major or minor we are asking programs to map HIEEs to curriculum using a traditional curriculum grid. This helps demonstrate how and where these goals are accomplished.

Courses	Department/Program use of High Impact Educational Experiences							
	Career Dev Exp	Prjct Lrn	Team Lrn	Study Abroad				
CJ 2920—Short Courses, Workshops…	XXX							
CJ 4860—Criminal Justice Internships	XXX							
CJ 4830—Directed Readings and Special Projects		XXX						
CJ 4110—Physical Methods in FS		XXX	XXX					
CJ 4115—Friction Ridge Analysis		XXX	XXX					
CJ 4116—Friction Ridge Development		XXX	XXX					
CJ 4125—Research Methods in FS		XXX	XXX					
CJ 4920—Short Courses, Workshops…	XXX							
CJ 4950—Field Trips/Travel Study				XXX				

HIEEs include capstone courses or experiences, community-engaged learning, evidence-based teaching practices, internships, project-based learning, study abroad/away, supplemental instruction, team-based learning, undergraduate research, pre-professional/career development experiences.

Additional information (HIEE planning, assessment, or other information):

E. Assessment Plan
Please update the Assessment Plan for your department displayed on the assessment site: http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html. Keep in mind that reporting will be done biennially instead of annually; that should be reflected in your assessment plan. Please ensure that Gen Ed courses are assessed/reported at least twice during a standard program review cycle.

A complete plan will include a list of courses from which data will be gathered and the schedule, as well as an overview of the assessment strategy the department is using (for example, portfolios, or a combination of Chi assessment data and student survey information, or industry certification exams, etc.), and plans for continuous improvement.

Assessment plan:

The current assessment is collected from CJ 4995. Students are given a 100 question exam covering material from the nine core courses in the program (CJ 1300, 1330, 2300, 3270, 3300, 3600, 4165, 4200 & 4980). CJ 4995 has a prerequisite of completion of the nine core courses. However, in an effort not to hinder student progress toward graduation, students are regularly granted registration exceptions to the prerequisites if they are registered for the remaining courses. Note: the prerequisite override is granted automatically for co-registration with one core, with chair approval for two cores, and rarely, in only the most extreme circumstances, for three cores. All students are required to take this course and it is graded CR/NC.

Students begin the course by taking a pre-test and reviewing refresher study material before taking the exam during the 3rd to 5th week. Assessment data is collected from this test only. Students pass if they achieve an aggregate score of 70% or better on the exam. Students that do not score a minimum of 70% are given a second opportunity to take the exam. After that, students must write a paper to earn credit for the course.

Learning outcome achievement standards are determined by correctly answering at least 8 of the 11 questions (~72%) on the exam for each of the nine areas. Percentage of students meeting or exceeding the minimum score are calculated for each PLO for each semester. The percentages from each semester are averaged and presented as an aggregate performance since the last report.

As mentioned previously, the department is in development of a new assessment strategy. We anticipate that implementation of this strategy will take some time as it will involve significant curriculum changes. At the writing of this report, the general philosophy will be to perform formative assessments in each of the core courses through a "signature assignment", with a summative assessment of performed during the students last semester in a high impact experience course (internship, research, etc.) through a guided reflection assignment at the end of the experience.

F. Report of assessment results for the most previous academic year:

There are varieties of ways in which departments can choose to show evidence of learning. This is one example. The critical pieces to include are 1) learning outcome being assessed, 2) method(s) of measurement used, 3) threshold for 'acceptable – that is, the target performance, 4) actual results of the assessment, 5) interpretation/reflection on findings 6) the course of action to be taken based upon the interpretation, and 7) how that action will be evaluated.

A. Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major
   (**this is a sample page for purpose of illustration only**; a blank template can be found on the next page)

Evidence of Learning Worksheet: **Courses within the Major – Copy as needed (see appendix for alternative format)**
Course: CJ 4995　　　　　　　　　Semester taught: SU17, F17, SP18, SU18, F18, SP19　　　Sections included: All

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major						
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Target Performance	Actual Performance	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results	"Closing the Loop"
Learning Outcome 1: Recognize the key historical, theoretical, and practical components of contemporary corrections.	Measure: Performance on the CJ 4995 exam	Measure: 70% of students score a minimum of 8 (72%) on outcome specific questions	Measure: 81.8% of students scored 8 or higher on questions related to CJ 1300. These scores were aggregated from n=144 students across all 6 semesters measured.	Measure: Students are performing at our level of expectation for this objective.	See note below table	See note below table
Learning Outcome 2: Identify the fundamental concepts of criminal law as they are applied in the courts.	Measure: Performance on the CJ 4995 exam	Measure: 70% of students score a minimum of 8 (72%) on outcome specific questions	Measure: 82.4% of students scored 8 or higher on questions related to CJ 1330	Measure: Students are performing at our level of expectation for this objective.	See note below table	See note below table

Report due 11/15/2019

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major						
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Target Performance	Actual Performance	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results	"Closing the Loop"
Learning Outcome 3: Recognize the key historical, theoretical, and practical components of contemporary policing.	Measure: Performance on the CJ 4995 exam	Measure: 70% of students score a minimum of 8 (72%) on outcome specific questions	Measure: 90.6% of students scored 8 or higher on questions related to CJ 2300	Measure: Students are performing at our level of expectation for this objective.	See note below table	See note below table
Learning Outcome 4: Distinguish between the major theories of crime causation.	Measure: Performance on the CJ 4995 exam	Measure: 70% of students score a minimum of 8 (72%) on outcome specific questions	Measure: 60.1% of students scored 8 or higher on questions related to CJ 3270	Measure: Students are not performing at our level of expectation for this objective.	See note below table	See note below table
Learning Outcome 5: Distinguish between the various types, consequences, and theories of victimization.	Measure: Performance on the CJ 4995 exam	Measure: 70% of students score a minimum of 8 (72%) on outcome specific questions	Measure: 70.9% of students scored 8 or higher on questions related to CJ 3300	Measure: Students are minimally performing at out level of expectation for this objective.	See note below table	See note below table
Learning Outcome 6: Recall the fundamental concepts of social science statistics.	Measure: Performance on the CJ 4995 exam	Measure: 70% of students score a minimum of 8 (72%) on outcome specific questions	Measure: 58.0% of students scored 8 or higher on questions related to CJ 3600	Measure: Students are not performing at our level of expectation for this objective.	See note below table	See note below table
Learning Outcome 7: Distinguish between the	Measure: Performance on the CJ 4995 exam	Measure: 70% of students score a minimum of	Measure: 70.0% of students scored 8 or higher on	Measure: Students are minimally performing at out level of	See note below table	See note below table

Report due 11/15/2019

Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Target Performance	Actual Performance	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results	"Closing the Loop"
Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major						
key constitutional rights that impact the contemporary criminal justice system.		8 (72%) on outcome specific questions	questions related to CJ 4165	expectation for this objective.		
Learning Outcome 8: Distinguish between the major theories of ethics.	Measure: Performance on the CJ 4995 exam	Measure: 70% of students score a minimum of 8 (72%) on outcome specific questions	Measure: 64.0% of students scored 8 or higher on questions related to CJ 4200	Measure: Students are not performing at our level of expectation for this objective.	See note below table	See note below table
Learning Outcome 9: Recall the fundamental principles of social science research methodology.	Measure: Performance on the CJ 4995 exam	Measure: 70% of students score a minimum of 8 (72%) on outcome specific questions	Measure: 79.3% of students scored 8 or higher on questions related to CJ 4980	Measure: Students are performing at our level of expectation for this objective.	See note below table	See note below table

Additional narrative (optional – use as much space as needed):

Threshold issues: The test was originally designed to measure the student's aggregate performance of the 9 PLOs at a 70% level. When the data is problem out across the 11 questions, it becomes difficult to determine where that 70% threshold actually exists because it is straddled by 7/11 correct (62%) and 8/11 correct (72%). When considering the exam performance on a minimum score of 7, the percentages improve in all but one objective (PLO#9 does not change), and all 9 are above the 70% of students threshold level (PLO#4 is the lowest at 72.8% of students with 7 or higher).

Overall performance: When considering the data from the perspective of overall performance, students are performing better than from the standard method of presenting assessment data in the table above. Of the 144 students taking the exam, 74% of the students pass the exam on the first attempt. The majority of the students pass the exam on either the first or second attempt. Rarely do students that are unable to

pass the exam on two attempts complete the class in that semester. We looked at the number of PLOs successfully completed (8/11 questions correct) by students as a function of passing (>=70%) or not passing (<70%). Those that passed the exam in totality averaged 7.7 PLOs minimum score met out of the 9 or 85.5%, while those that failed only met the minimum score on an average of 3.1 PLOs or 34.4%. This difference is statistically significant (p<<<0.001). Thus, those that are passing the test with at least 70% in aggregate are exceeding our expectations for student performance. Those that do not pass the first time are not able to demonstrate PLO proficiency, but there are significant problems with the current assessment protocol.

Action plan/Use of the results/Closing the loop: The current PLOs and assessment strategy are inadequate and are currently being scrapped (as mentioned previously). Under the newly adopted PLOs to be implemented in the near future, content is only one of six objectives whereas currently it is all nine objectives. With respect to the aggregate content performance, students are performing well but struggling in a few of the most difficult topical areas in upper division course work. These areas are highly theoretical in nature or involve mathematics. Two of these four areas are also typically courses that a student might receive a prerequisite waiver to take concurrently with the assessment course. We will share the data with these instructors to they can evaluate their pedagogy.

Beyond sharing current data, we do not plan to address these issues since our efforts are directed toward developing a new assessment strategy to accompany new PLOs. Unfortunately, because we need to collect assessment data during the transition period, we will continue to use the exam and these measures until the new process and curriculum are ready to implement.

Report due 11/15/2019

c. <u>Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses</u>
(Area-specific EOL grids can be found at <u>http://weber.edu/oie/Complete_Rubrics.html</u>; they can replace this page.)

Course: CJ 1010   Semester taught:F17/SP18   Sections included: All

Additional narrative (optional – use as much space as needed):
No data will be provided here. A full report, including the data for this assessment period, was provided to GEIAC as part of the Social Science General Education renewal in September 2018. Since that report, we have not systematically collected assessment data for CJ 1010 as a department while transitioning to a new assessment protocol connected with the institutions GELO assessment of Signature Assignments.

Appendix A

Most departments or programs receive a number of recommendations from their Five/Seven-Year Program Review processes. This page provides a means of updating progress towards the recommendations the department/program is acting upon.

Date of Program Review: 2016-17	Recommendation	Progress Description
Recommendation 1-- Rotate and Incentivize Advising Duties	We suggest implementing an advising rotation.	2017-18: Department embarked on the development of a new advising program by creating a narrow advising committee of three faculty members.
		2018-19: Continued with new advising strategy. Recommended to Dean and Provost the need for resources to provide a rotating course release for Advising Committee members
		2019-20: Advising is continuing as designed
		2020-21
Recommendation 2-- Study the Likely Implications of an Online Bachelor's Program	See CJ Site Visit Report	2017-18: At the end of the program review year, the faculty had a discussion and held a vote. There was insufficient support from the faculty to implement an online BS program.
		2018-19: No action. The 18-19 Strategic Planning Report recognized that unstable program enrollments, declining night program enrollments, demand from students, and the potential threat from other USHE institutions required action during the coming year to create undergraduate online programs.
		2019-20: An Online Program committee is formed and investigating scheduling and policies for putting the CJ AS online

Report due 11/15/2019

		this year, and the CJ BS online in the near future.
		2020-21
Recommendation 3-- Create a Schedule of Adjunct Evaluation	Constructing a schedule of evaluation that incorporates all of the faculty members eligible and able to help may help diffuse this significant, yet important, responsibility.	2017-18: Formulated a department Teaching Improvement and Curriculum committee charged to conduct evaluations of adjunct faculty members. Committee developed the process for conducting the evaluations
		2018-19: First round of evaluations were conducted (3 in Fall and 3 in Spring)
		2019-20: Evaluations are continuing
		2020-21
Recommendation 4-- Writing Intensive and Oral Communication Designation	To help ensure this, we recommend that two core courses are selected as writing intensive and one core course is selected as an oral communication course in which succinct briefs or reports be delivered by students. These courses should demand more intense writing and oral communication assignments. The responsibility of teaching these courses should be shared by creating a teaching assignment rotation.	2017-18: No action
		2018-19: Department embarked on a mission/vision/values revitalization and long-term strategic plan. This plan included development of new Program Learning Objectives, one of which is to communication skills.
		2019-20: Department Assessment committee is mapping PLOs to course learning objectives. The discussion is communication intensive courses has not been addressed in this mapping process.
		2020-21
Recommendation 5-- Disassemble Forensic Science Degree	We recommend the forensic science degree be changed to a minor, emphasis, or certificate. In its current state, it should not exist as a major. Dr. Horn concurs with this recommendation.	2017-18: Forensic Science Fundamentals Certificate was developed but had hidden prerequisite issues at Faculty Senate.
		2018-19: The Certificate was revised and passed Faculty Senate. A

		concurrent proposal also passed Faculty Senate to disband the Forensic Science Concentration. The Certificate, current courses and faculty support the CSI concentration, and students in physical, life and health science majors who want lab careers.
		2019-20: no action
		2020-21: no action
Recommendation 6-- Recalibrate CJ 4995 Senior Capstone Course	See CJ Site Visit Report	2017-18: Faculty began discussions about revising the Program Learning Outcomes that would drive a change to the assessment course. The name of the course changed from "capstone" to "assessment", however the format is the same.
		2018-19: Department embarked on a mission/vision/values revitalization and long-term strategic plan. This plan included development of new Program Learning Objectives.
		2019-20: Preliminary design of a new assessment process has begun that will replace CJ 4995 and be congruent with the new PLOs and other USHE and WSU initiatives.
		2020-21

Additional narrative:

Appendix B

Please provide the following information about the full-time and adjunct faculty contracted by your department during the last academic year (summer through spring). Gathering this information each year will help with the headcount reporting that must be done for the final Five Year Program Review document that is shared with the State Board of Regents.

Faculty Headcount	2017-28	2018-19
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)		
Full-time Tenured	6	6
Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track)	3	3
Part-time and adjunct	0	0
With Master's Degrees		
Full-time Tenured	0	0
Full-time Non-Tenured	3	3
Part-time and adjunct	18	18
With Bachelor's Degrees		
Full-time Tenured	0	0
Full-time Non-tenured	0	0
Part-time and adjunct	1	1
Other		
Full-time Tenured	0	0
Full-time Non-tenured	0	0
Part-time	0	0
Total Headcount Faculty		
Full-time Tenured	6	6
Full-time Non-tenured	6	6
Part-time	19	19

Please respond to the following questions.

1) First year student success is critical to WSU's retention and graduation efforts. We are interested in finding out how departments support their first-year students. Do you have mechanisms and processes in place to identify, meet with, and support first-year students? Please provide a brief narrative focusing on your program's support of new students:

   a. Any first-year students taking courses in your program(s).

      We do not have any special support programs addressing any first-year students in our programs.

   b. Students declared in your program(s), whether or not they are taking courses in your program(s)

      We do not have any special support programs addressing new, declared students in our program but we are working on a program to identify and contact those students.

2) A key component of sound assessment practice is the process of 'closing the loop' – that is, following up on changes implemented as a response to your assessment findings, to determine the impact of those changes/innovations. It is also an aspect of assessment on which we need to improve, as suggested in our NWCCU mid-cycle report. Please describe the processes your program has in place to 'close the loop'.

Since we are in the middle of a major change with regard to assessment, closing the loop has become less of a priority than creating a new loop. As part of the new assessment protocol, mechanisms and a timeline for using the data will be included.

Glossary

Student Learning Outcomes/Measurable Learning Outcomes
The terms 'learning outcome', 'learning objective', 'learning competency', and 'learning goal' are often used interchangeably. Broadly, these terms reference what we want students to be able to do AFTER they pass a course or graduate from a program. For this document, we will use the word 'outcomes'. Good learning outcomes are specific (but not too specific), are observable, and are clear. Good learning outcomes focus on skills: knowledge and understanding; transferrable skills; habits of mind; career skills; attitudes and values.
- Should be developed using action words (if you can see it, you can assess it).
- Use compound statements judiciously.
- Use complex statements judiciously.

Curriculum Grid
A chart identifying the key learning outcomes addressed in each of the curriculum's key elements or learning experiences (Suskie, 2019). A good curriculum:
- Gives students ample, diverse opportunities to achieve core learning outcomes.
- Has appropriate, progressive rigor.
- Concludes with an integrative, synthesizing capstone experience.
- Is focused and simple.
- Uses research-informed strategies to help students learn and succeed.
- Is consistent across venues and modalities.
- Is greater than the sum of its parts.

Target Performance (previously referred to as 'Threshold')
The level of performance at which students are doing well enough to succeed in later studies (e.g., next course in sequence or next level of course) or career.

Actual Performance
How students performed on the specific assessment. An average score is less meaningful than a distribution of scores (for example, 72% of students met or exceeded the target performance, 5% of students failed the assessment).

Closing the Loop
The process of following up on changes made to curriculum, pedagogy, materials, etc., to determine if the changes had the desired impact.

Report due 11/15/2019

Continuous Improvement
An idea with roots in manufacturing, that promotes the ongoing effort to improve. Continuous improvement uses data and evidence to improve student learning and drive student success.

Direct evidence
Evidence based upon actual student work; performance on a test, a presentation, or a research paper, for example. Direct evidence is tangible, visible, and measurable.

Indirect evidence
Evidence that serves as a proxy for student learning. May include student opinion/perception of learning, course grades, measures of satisfaction, participation. Works well as a complement to direct evidence.

HIEE – High Impact Educational Experiences
Promote student learning through curricular and co-curricular activities that are intentionally designed to foster active and integrative student engagement by utilizing multiple impact strategies.

Report due 11/15/2019