

Weber State University
Annual Assessment of Evidence of Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: Criminal Justice
Academic Year of Report: 2015/16
Date Submitted: September 8, 2016
Report author: Dr. Bruce Bayley

Contact Information: Bruce Bayley
Phone: 801-626-8134
Email: bbayley@weber.edu

A. Brief Introductory Statement:

Please review the Introductory Statement and contact information for your department 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 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.

C. Student Learning Outcomes

Please review the Student Learning Outcomes for your department 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.

Measurable Learning Outcomes

- 1) Analyze the key issues affecting our criminal justice system
- 2) Synthesize and apply theoretical foundations
- 3) Discriminate between various methodological techniques and their use

D. Curriculum

Please review the Curriculum Grid for your department 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

Core Program Courses	Program Learning Outcomes		
	Analyze the key issues affecting our criminal justice system	Synthesize and apply theoretical foundations	Discriminate between various methodological techniques and their use
MCJ 6000 Criminal Justice Statistics	1	2	3
MCJ 6100 Contemporary Issues in Criminal Justice	3	2	1
MCJ 6110 Research Methods in Criminal Justice	1	2	3
MCJ 6120 Theories of Crime and Delinquency	2	3	1

1 = Introduced, 2 = Emphasized, 3 = Mastered

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

The plan is current, but in the process of being reviewed in modified.

Assessment plan:

No data were collected this past year as this program was undergoing its mandatory accreditation review. As such, we are currently reviewing our current assessment plan and once we have feedback from all parties involved in the accreditation review process, the program will integrate any relevant thoughts and recommendations. Below is a draft of our four-year implementation plan:

Problem Identified	Action to Be Taken
Issue 1: A more comprehensive assessment plan for the four core courses	Current 5 Year Program Review:
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: Discuss whether or not the faculty want to continue using our current assessment plan
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: If current assessment plan is deemed adequate by the faculty, discussions will begin on how best to revise our graduate assessment – if the faculty deems the assessment to be adequate, we will begin discussions on how best to align our data collection with the expectations of these larger assessments
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken: To be decided based upon the decisions made during Year 2
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken: To be decided based upon the decisions made during Year 3
Issue 2: Artifact collection	Current 5 Year Program Review:
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: Collaborate with the university so clear guidelines are provided on what type of artifacts are required (for example, we’ve never heard of the artifact examples provided in this template)
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: Design a plan for artifact collection
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken: Begin collecting required artifacts
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken: Continue collecting required artifacts

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

(this is a sample page for purpose of illustration only; a blank template can be found on the next page)

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
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 1.A: “Analyze the key issues affecting our criminal justice system”	Measure 1: Standardized exams and quizzes	Measure 1: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 1: Mean score: 86	Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to analyze the key issues affecting our criminal justice system	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
	Measure 2: Forum posts	Measure 2: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 2: Mean score 84	Measure 2: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to analyze the key issues affecting our criminal justice system	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
Learning Outcome 2.A: “Synthesize and apply theoretical foundations”	Measure 1: Research papers	Measure 1: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 1: Mean score 83	Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to synthesize and apply theoretical foundations	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
	Measure 2: Forum posts	Measure 2: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 2: Mean score 84	Measure 2: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to synthesize and apply theoretical foundations	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time

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
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 2.A: "Discriminate between various methodological techniques and their use"	Measure 1: Standardized exams and quizzes	Measure 2: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 1: Mean score 89	Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to discriminate between various methodological techniques and their use	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
	Measure 2: Research papers	Measure 2: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 2: Mean score 83	Measure 2: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to discriminate between various methodological techniques and their use	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time

Evidence of Learning Worksheet: 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
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
Learning Outcome 1.A: "Analyze the key issues affecting our criminal justice system"	Measure 1: Standardized exams and quizzes	Measure 1: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 1: Mean score: 86	Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to analyze the key issues affecting our criminal justice system	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
	Measure 2: Forum posts	Measure 2: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 2: Mean score 84	Measure 2: Students successfully demonstrated the	Measure 2: No curricular or

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
Students will...	Direct and Indirect Measures*				
				ability to analyze the key issues affecting our criminal justice system	pedagogical changes needed at this time
Learning Outcome 2.A: "Synthesize and apply theoretical foundations"	Measure 1: Research papers	Measure 1: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 1: Mean score 83	Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to synthesize and apply theoretical foundations	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
	Measure 2: Forum posts	Measure 2: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 2: Mean score 84	Measure 2: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to synthesize and apply theoretical foundations	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
Learning Outcome 2.A: "Discriminate between various methodological techniques and their use"	Measure 1: Standardized exams and quizzes	Measure 2: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 1: Mean score 89	Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to discriminate between various methodological techniques and their use	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
	Measure 2: Research papers	Measure 2: Overall score of 80 or better	Measure 2: Mean score 83	Measure 2: Students successfully demonstrated the ability to discriminate between various methodological techniques and their use	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time

b. Evidence of Learning: High Impact or Service Learning

This is an optional section. If you provide students with high impact or service learning opportunities you may briefly describe those opportunities and explain how you assess their impact on student learning. This [excerpt](#) from George D. Kuh provides a brief overview of high-impact practices.

N/A

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

Under development pending the completion of our mandatory accreditation review and feedback.

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.

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

We agree with the assessment team's observation that online graduate students may not have a traditional interest in developing collaborative relationships with graduate faculty and fellow graduate students. To this end, department faculty voted two years ago to drop the thesis option from our curriculum. Faculty are still encouraged, however, to integrate collaborative assignments, such as discussion forums, within their curriculum to help foster a sense of community within the online environment from which students may share ideas and foster diversity of thought. These interactive assignments also allow graduate faculty to share their knowledge and expertise on a variety of criminal justice related issues.

Academic rigor has also been a point of contention among faculty for a number of years and was one of the first things to be enhanced once the program was moved to a fully online format. While we appreciate the thoughtful comments of the assessment team and their desire to ensure our program is meeting the needs of our target audience (working professionals in the field), we respectfully disagree with the need to reduce the level of academic rigor to less than traditional expectations. In doing so, faculty strongly believe the graduate experience will be degraded, the degree of graduate education will be minimized, and in the end, the quality and reputation of the program will be damaged.

Plan of Action: The program will continue to review the needs of our students to ensure the curriculum is both academically rigorous and professionally practical.

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

Curriculum within the graduate program has been the center of debate for a number of years and I'm sure will continue to be so. After numerous discussions, faculty have reached a consensus that the program should retain a traditional graduate level academic curriculum. While we agree cutting-edge techniques are an important aspect of such coursework and professors are encourage to integrate new and developing ideas within their classes, graduate faculty do not want to move away from a more traditional graduate program format. The general feeling among faculty is that cutting-edge policing techniques are part of the profession's in-service training and should not be a guiding philosophical paradigm for the program itself.

Plan of Action: Graduate faculty will explore ways to integrate cutting-edge criminal justice policies and techniques into their individual classes, while at the same time maintaining traditional graduate level rigor and expectations.

3-Explore ways to make the curriculum more interactive (e.g., use video conferencing tools to approximate a more traditional classroom environment) since both students and faculty indicated that they enjoy such interaction

We agree with the assessment team's recommendation that both the program and faculty should explore new ways to make our curriculum more interactive. Four years ago, the graduate program purchased new laptops for all graduate faculty that included a built-in camera and necessary software to allow professors to actively engage their students through video-conferencing and other forms of personalized online interaction. Graduate faculty have also been incentivized through increased pay to participate in on-going online training that not only makes them aware of new and developing technologies and techniques, but also ensures they are proficient in their use (both practically and pedagogically). We also maintain a strong partnership with WSU Online to optimize the technical competency of our faculty in the developmental structure and presentation of online coursework.

Plan of Action: The program and faculty will continue to work with WSU Online to find new and innovated methods of developing more interactive curriculum and program functionalities. As funding permits, the program will also provide faculty with any needed hardware or software updates to help accomplish these goals.

4-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

This is the second graduate program assessment review in a row to identify the need to better compensate our department secretary, Faye Medd, for her increased workload directly related to taking over all secretarial duties within the graduate program. Prior to Ms. Medd taking on these responsibilities, the graduate program had a part-time secretary making approximately \$10,000 a year (before taxes). After that position was terminated due to funding, Ms. Medd absorbed all secretarial duties related to the graduate program as part of her day-to-day undergraduate duties. Ultimately, after a few years of no additional compensation for this increased workload, Ms. Medd did receive a one percent raise in acknowledgement of her growing responsibilities (all college secretaries at the time received a two percent raise, while Ms. Medd received three percent). This raise equated to approximately an extra \$50 per month after taxes. Unfortunately, the additional compensation was well short of the money the program's part-time secretary was making for the same type of work (approximately an \$8000.00 deficit). It should also be noted that since Ms. Medd received the one percent raise, she has taken on the additional duties of reconciling the entire graduate budget, as well as all payments and reconciliation for the program's growing marketing plan. To the best of my knowledge, Ms. Medd is the only graduate secretary currently classified as an Administrative Specialist I (all other graduate secretaries are classified as level II or level III). As such, we strongly request that Ms. Medd have her position re-classified in recognition of the increased workload and responsibilities directly related to her work within the graduate program. She is an invaluable resource upon which the program is reliant.

Plan of Action: The Graduate Director will meet with the College Dean to discuss the need to have Ms. Medd's position reclassified to a higher pay scale.

5-Address faculty feelings about the graduate program – some faculty members do not feel enriched by participating in the graduate program

We acknowledge that some faculty members miss the traditional interactions often found in a face-to-face classroom environment. This, combined with the lack of collaborative faculty/student relationships that often take place in traditional graduate programs, may be the source of these sentiments. Due to the continual enrollment decline faced by the program five years ago, however, going back to a

traditional brick and mortar format is no longer a viable option. As such, an element of faculty enrichment mentioned in Recommendation 3 might be addressed by integrating more interactive components into a professor's online classroom. In addition, it will be necessary to query the faculty to find out exactly what is meant when they say professors don't feel enriched by participating in the graduate program. Plan of Action: Faculty will be surveyed to find out why some don't feel enriched by participating in the graduate program. Based upon those results, necessary adjustments will be explored as format and funding allow.

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

To-date, graduate faculty receive the following for teaching in the graduate program: 1) extra pay when teaching a graduate course overload, 2) the ability to teach a graduate course in-load (at the discretion of the Department Chair), 3) extra pay per course taught for completing the Masters of Online Teaching Certification, 4) \$750 per academic year for teaching in the graduate program during that academic year, 5) upgraded technology, such as laptops, at no cost to the faculty member - as funding allows, and 6) technology grants to be used at the professor's discretion for additional technology related to teaching in the graduate program - as funding allows. Currently, the graduate budget cannot absorb the costs of offering a course reduction per professor during a given academic year (such costs could be in the range of \$45,000 - \$50,000 per year if all graduate faculty members were given a course release). In addition, the current graduate budget cannot absorb the costs of paying graduate faculty when a graduate course is taught in-load (professors now have the option of teaching overload for extra pay or teaching in-load with no additional pay - they do not have the option of teaching in-load with pay). Teaching a graduate course in-load with pay would place an undue burden on the graduate budget as the graduate program often has to cover the cost of hiring an adjunct professor to teach the undergraduate course displaced by the graduate professor teaching his/her graduate course in-load (teaching a graduate course in-load means an undergraduate course is not being taught by the professor and is often replaced by an adjunct professor at graduate program cost).

Plan of Action: The Graduate Director will meet with the College Dean to discuss what additional incentives might be available for teaching in the graduate program in an effort to maintain morale and job satisfaction.

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

We agree with the assessment team's recommendation and will re-evaluate the graduate program's status in 24 months. If the decision is to terminate the program, we acknowledge the Department of Criminal Justice is legally obligated to offer graduate coursework for an additional three years or until the last active graduate student has graduated.

Plan of Action: Graduate faculty will following the assessment team's recommendation and re-evaluate the program's status in 24 months.

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.

R411 Data Table					
Department or Unit—Master of Criminal Justice					
	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Faculty					
Headcount					
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)	6	8	7	8	7
Full-time Tenured	2	3	3	4	3
Full-time Non-Tenured	3	4	4	4	4
Part-time	1	1	0	0	0
With Master's Degrees	3	3	2	0	1
Full-time Tenured	0	0	0	0	0
Full-time Non-Tenured	1	0	1	0	1
Part-time	2	3	1	0	0
With Bachelor's Degrees	0	0	0	0	0
Full-time Tenured	0	0	0	0	0
Full-time Non-Tenured	0	0	0	0	0
Part-time	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Full-time Tenured	0	0	0	0	0
Full-time Non-Tenured	0	0	0	0	0
Part-time	0	0	0	0	0
Total Headcount Faculty	9	11	9	8	8
Full-time Tenured	2	3	3	4	4

Full-time Non-Tenured	4	4	4	4	4
Part-time	3	4	2	0	0
FTE (A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition)					
Full-time (Salaried)	.11	0	0	0	0
Teaching Assistants					
Part-time (May include TAs)	1.53	2.03	1.94	2.68	1.93
Total Faculty FTE (MCJ faculty are borrowed from the undergraduate program)	1.64	2.03	1.94	2.68	1.93
Number of Graduates					
Certificates	-	-	-	-	-
Associate Degrees	-	-	-	-	-
Bachelor's Degrees	-	-	-	-	-
Master's Degrees	16	12	14	8	1
Doctoral Degrees	-	-	-	-	-
Number of Students—(Data Based on Fall Third Week)					
Total # of Declared Majors	25	33	21	18	22
Total Department FTE*	25.38	26.21	15.00	16.63	12.88
Total Department SCH*	609	629	360	399	309
*Per Department Designator Prefix					
Student FTE per Total Faculty FTE	15.47	12.91	7.73	6.20	6.67
Cost (Cost Study Definitions)					
Direct Instructional Expenditures	73,247	69,597	76,404	144,388	97,332
Cost Per Student FTE	4,735	5,391	9,884	23,288	14,593
Funding					
Appropriated Fund	57,521	54,655	60,000	113,388	76,345
Other:					
Special Legislative Appropriation					
Grants of Contracts					
Special Fees/Differential Tuition	15,726	14,942	16,404	31,000	20,897
Total	73,247	69,597	76,404	144,388	97,332

Please respond to the following questions.

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

We are waiting for our mandatory accreditation review to be completed. Once done, we will review our current assessment plan, as well as relevant comments related to assessment given throughout the review process, and make any necessary adjustments.

- 2) We are interested in better understanding how departments/programs assess their graduating seniors. Please provide a short narrative describing the practices/curriculum in place for your department/program. Please include both direct and indirect measures employed.

Under review and development – see #1 above.