

Weber State University
Annual Assessment of Evidence of Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: Criminal Justice—Master of Criminal Justice
Academic Year of Report: 2016/17 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)
Date Submitted: 11/15/17
Report author: Monica Williams

Contact Information:

Phone: 801-626-6231

Email: monicawilliams@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. We will indicate "Last Reviewed: [current date]" on the page.

Information is current; no changes required.

Information is not current; updates below.

Update:

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 it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

If the information is not current, please provide an update:

Information is current; no changes required.

Information is not current; updates below.

Update:

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> - if they are current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

If they are not current, please provide an update:

Information is current; no changes required.

Information is not current; updates below.

Updated Measurable Learning Outcomes

By the end of their study at WSU, students in this program will:

1. Critically analyze key issues, ideas, and/or concepts affecting the criminal justice system. (Critical analysis)
2. Design and/or implement empirically valid research related to criminal justice. (Research methods)
3. Model professional-level writing skills in academic and/or non-academic settings. (Writing)
4. Create and/or defend an evidence-based argument regarding criminal justice law, policies, or procedures. (Evaluation)

D. Curriculum

Please review the Curriculum Grid for your department or academic program displayed on the assessment site:

<http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed: [current data]”. No further information is needed.

If the curriculum grid is not current, please provide an update:

Information is current; no changes required.

Information is not current; updates below

Curriculum Map Format

	Department/Program Learning Outcomes			
	Critical Analysis	Research	Writing	Evaluation
Core Courses in Department/Program				
MCJ 6000 (Criminal Justice Statistics)		1, 2		
MCJ 6100 (Contemporary Criminal Justice)	1			
MCJ 6110 (Research Methods in Criminal Justice)		3	1, 2	
MCJ 6120 (Theories of Crime and Delinquency)	2			2, 3

1= introduced, 2 = emphasized, 3 = mastered

We encourage our students to take our core courses in a suggested order (i.e. 6100 and 6110 in their first semester in the program, and 6000 and 6120 during their second semester in the program); however, it is not mandatory. As such, we cannot control the sequence of student coursework. This provides a challenge for assessment purposes because we cannot easily anticipate, control for, or forecast where growth will occur within our students in meeting the program level learning objectives. The table above illustrates our goals for the levels of mastery we want students to have in their core courses, which will be assessed through a revised assessment plan. Part of this plan entails a rotating schedule of assessing core and elective classes to further evaluate the extent to which students are meeting our program level objectives. Please see section E. Assessment Plan below for further explanation.

E. Assessment Plan

Please review the Assessment Plan for your department displayed on the assessment site: <http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if the plan is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

The site should contain an up-to-date assessment plan with planning going out a *minimum of three years* beyond the current year. Please review the plan displayed for your department at the above site. The plan should 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.).

Please be sure to include your planned assessment of any general education courses taught within your department. This information will be used to update the General Education Improvement and Assessment Committee’s planning documentation.

MCJ Assessment plan

All of the department’s faculty will participate in data collection when they teach designated MCJ courses. The department’s assessment committee will oversee data collection and compile and report assessment data each year. To do so, the assessment committee will create rubric items to assess each of the program’s student learning outcomes and will then determine which courses to assess each academic year based on the rotation outlined in the next subsection. Each semester, the committee will notify those faculty whose courses will be included in the assessment, and those faculty will then embed the provided rubric items into specified written assignments in Canvas. The individual faculty members who teach those courses will use the assessment rubric items to score student work on a three-point scale including “does not meet expectations,” “meets expectations,” and “exceeds expectations.” Faculty members will choose whether or not the scores from the assessment rubric will factor into students’ individual grades on the assignments. The assessment committee will pull the scores from the rubrics and use them to determine whether the program is meeting its objectives according to the thresholds outlined in the evidence of learning grid in this report.

Identification and Rotation of Courses

Each year, we will assess each student learning outcome for the program using data from two courses, including at least one core course. Most outcomes will be assessed with one core course and one elective course; the only exception is the research methods outcome, which will be assessed with one core course each academic year. Elective courses will be rotated each year with one course serving as the assessment course in conjunction with a core course. The assessment committee has assigned courses to learning outcomes based on the fit between course objectives and program level learning outcomes. For each course, the committee has identified at least one course objective that informs the relevant program learning outcome. When the committee notifies faculty that their courses will be assessed in a given semester, it will also inform faculty members of the course objectives that will be the focus of the assessment activities so we can ensure that the assignments faculty use for assessment align with relevant course objectives and, by extension, with broader program learning outcomes.

The courses assigned to each learning outcome will be as follows:

Learning Outcome	Core Courses	Elective Courses
Critical Analysis	MCJ6100: Contemporary Criminal Justice MCJ6120: Theories in Crime and Delinquency	MCJ6150: Diversity Issues in Criminal Justice MCJ6180: Contemporary Legal Issues MCJ6210: Seminar: Judicial Administration MCJ6220: Seminar: Contemporary Law Enforcement MCJ6230: Seminar: Contemporary Corrections MCJ6255: Great Thoughts in Criminal Justice
Research	MCJ6000: Criminal Justice Statistics MCJ6110: Research Methods in Criminal Justice	N/A
Writing	MCJ6110: Research Methods in Criminal Justice	MCJ6140: Technology and Innovation in Criminal Justice MCJ6170: Seminar: Juvenile Justice
Evaluation	MCJ6120: Theories in Crime and Delinquency	MCJ6130: Law and Social Control MCJ6160: Criminal Justice Policy Analysis MCJ6190: Legal Foundations in Criminal Justice

Timeline for Assessment

We will pilot our new assessment plan in spring 2018 with a smaller number of courses than will be in the full rotation. After that semester, we will evaluate any technical changes that need to occur before starting with the full assessment plan in the 2018-2019 academic year. The timeline for assessment for the next three academic years is as follows:

Academic Year	Learning Outcome	Core Courses	Elective Courses
2017-2018 (pilot)	Critical Analysis	MCJ6100	MCJ6220
	Evaluation	MCJ6120	MCJ6190
2018-2019	Critical Analysis	MCJ6120	MCJ6210
	Research Methods	MCJ6000	N/A
	Writing	MCJ6110	MCJ6140
	Evaluation	MCJ6120	MCJ6130
2019-2020	Critical Analysis	MCJ6100	MCJ6150
	Research Methods	MCJ6110	N/A
	Writing	MCJ6110	MCJ6170
	Evaluation	MCJ6120	MCJ6160

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

There are a variety of ways in which departments can choose to show evidence of learning. This is one example. The critical pieces to include are 1) what learning outcome is being assessed, 2) what method of measurement was used, 3) what the threshold for ‘acceptable performance’ is for that measurement, 4) what the actual results of the assessment were, 5) how those findings are interpreted, and 6) what is the course of action to be taken based upon the interpretation.

A. Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Learning Outcome 1: Analyze key issues, ideas, and/or concepts affecting the criminal justice system (Critical Analysis)	Measure 1: Issues, ideas, and/or concerns are critically considered, are clearly stated, and comprehensively described. Measure 2: Information from the course is incorporated with enough interpretation and/or evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are thoroughly questioned and/or analyzed. Measure 3: Analysis is in-depth, taking into account the complexities of the issue. Limits of the analysis, perspective, and/or	Measure 1: 75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 1. Measure 2: 75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 2. Measure 3: 75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 3.	Measure 1: No findings yet.	Measure 1: Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
	thesis are acknowledged.				
Learning Outcome 2: Create and/or defend an evidence-based argument regarding criminal justice, law, policies, or procedures (Evaluation).	Measure 1: Evaluation of arguments contains thorough and insightful explanation, reviews the logic/reasoning of arguments, examines feasibility of solution(s), and weighs impacts of solution(s). Measure 2: Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicates a deep comprehension of the problem/issue. Solution/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as ethical, logical, and cultural	Measure 1: 75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 1. 75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure.	Measure 1: No findings yet.	Measure 1: Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major					
Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement*	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
	dimensions of the problem/issue. Measure 3: Studies/reports used are appropriate to the topic and are from current and professional sources.	75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 3.			

*Direct and indirect: at least one measure per objective must be a direct measure.

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

The evidence of learning grid outlines our method of measurement and threshold for evidence of student learning for two program outcomes (critical analysis and evaluation). We will pilot our assessment plan in the spring 2018 semester with evidence from four courses that cover those two program outcomes. Upon completion of the pilot project, we will revise the measures if necessary and create the measures and thresholds for the other two program outcomes. All four program outcomes will be assessed starting in the 2018-2019 academic year.

b. Evidence of Learning: High Impact Practices (HIPs)

List the activities you have within your academic program that you consider to be high impact. For key elements of high impact practices, see: [Key Elements of High-Impact Practices](#).

If you cannot identify any HIPs occurring within your academic program, please indicate that. Are you planning to incorporate HIPs in the near future?

Our program does not currently include high-impact practices. We have no plans at this time to incorporate HIPs into the program.

c. Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses

(Area-specific EOL grids can be found at [http://weber.edu/oie/Complete Rubrics.html](http://weber.edu/oie/Complete_Rubrics.html); they can replace this page.)

N/A

G. Summary of Artifact Collection Procedure

Artifact	When/How Collected?	Where Stored?
(i.e. Final Project Rubric) Written assignment rubric (used to evaluate a specified written assignment previously identified for each course; all assignments are linked to one or more program-level learning outcomes).	(i.e. end of semester) One to two courses per learning objective per year (total of 7 courses per year).	(i.e. electronic copies) Stored in the Assessment database in the shared rubric.

Summary Information (as needed): Please see assessment plan described in part E.

Appendix A

Most departments or programs receive a number of recommendations from their Five-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	Recommendation	Progress Description
Recommendation 1	Explore the idea that an online graduate student may differ from a graduate student that attends a traditional program so faculty expectations may need to be adjusted. Students seeking an online degree may not be looking for an opportunity to develop collaborative relationships with faculty and other students or the academic rigor of a traditional program;	2017 progress: Our faculty has begun and continues to hold discussions on the inherent differences between traditional and online graduate students and how to best to meet the needs of a graduate education in a virtual environment. We agree the academic rigor of our program should not be diluted due to its online format, and we continue to discuss the challenges of upholding this rigor in an online format.
Recommendation 2	Explore the appropriate curriculum for the target audience; a traditional curriculum may not attract target students (e.g., law enforcement) that may be looking to learn more cutting-edge policing techniques;	2017 progress: After discussing this issue and evaluating our strengths as a faculty, we have concluded that we can best serve students with a curriculum that mirrors more traditional graduate programs in criminal justice. We have committed to focusing on strong academic pedagogies rather an applied training curriculum, the latter of which our faculty has no interest in developing and lacks the technical expertise to develop and oversee.
Recommendation 3	Explore ways to make the curriculum more interactive (e.g., use video conferencing tools to approximate a	2017 progress: We encourage all of our faculty to complete the Master of Online Teaching

	<p>more traditional classroom environment) since both students and faculty indicated that they enjoy such interaction;</p>	<p>Certificate (newly renamed the eLearning Certificate) through WSU Online and to implement the lessons learned in the certificate program into their courses. At the time of the last program review, 6 of our 10 faculty had completed MOTC. Since that time, two additional faculty members completed the certificate program, resulting in 8 out of 10 faculty having gone through the program. Additionally, the MCJ program faculty continues to work with WSU Online and university media contacts to explore various ways to improve classroom and program interactivity.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4</p>	<p>Explore the possibility of compensating the department secretary for the additional graduate program duties – if she is working beyond her current classification, her classification and corresponding salary should be adjusted;</p>	<p>2017 progress: The department secretary has had her position re-classified from Administrative Specialist I to Administrative Specialist II with a minimal pay increase (pay increases are dictated by WSU Human Resources and out of our control).</p>
<p>Recommendation 5</p>	<p>Address faculty feelings about the graduate program – some faculty members do not feel enriched by participating in the graduate program;</p>	<p>2017 progress: A faculty survey was administered by the graduate director to gauge levels of faculty enrichment and what could be done to improve faculty satisfaction within the program. The results of the survey were mixed and provided no clear direction. As such, we continue to discuss the faculty’s investment in the program as an ongoing agenda item in our monthly department meetings as</p>

		well as through informal conversations in person and via email. Future actions on this recommendation will also be contingent upon the results of our action items and discussions relating to recommendations 6 and 7 below.
Recommendation 6	Since the University administration has a stake in the MCJ program's survival, they should consider offering incentives (such as a course reduction) for teaching in the graduate program in an effort to maintain morale and job satisfaction;	2017 progress: This recommendation will not be addressed until the faculty have responded to recommendation 7 below.
Recommendation 7	Faculty should assess the MCJ program again in 24 months and decide whether they want to continue offering the program and the University administration should abide by their decision.	2017 progress: No action taken.

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 2016-17	
Headcount	10
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)	9
Full-time Tenured	6
Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track)	3
Part-time and adjunct	
With Master's Degrees	
Full-time Tenured	
Full-time Non-Tenured	1
Part-time and adjunct	
With Bachelor's Degrees	
Full-time Tenured	
Full-time Non-tenured	
Part-time and adjunct	
Other	
Full-time Tenured	
Full-time Non-tenured	
Part-time	
Total Headcount Faculty	10
Full-time Tenured	6
Full-time Non-tenured	4
Part-time	

Please respond to the following questions.

- 1) Based on your program's assessment findings, what subsequent action will your program take?

We are currently in the process of revising our assessment process, so we have no findings at this time. We will pilot our new assessment plan in the spring and will be able to report on preliminary data from the pilot in the next annual report.

- 2) We are interested in better understanding how departments/programs assess their graduating seniors or graduate students. Please provide a short narrative describing the practices/curriculum in place for your department/program. Please include both direct and indirect measures employed. Finally, what were your findings from this past year's graduates?

We do not have a comprehensive summative assessment of our graduating graduate students in place at this time.