

Weber State University  
Biennial Report on Assessment of Student Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: Master of Criminal Justice Program  
Academic Year of Report: 2018/19 (covering Summer 2017 through Spring 2019)  
Date Submitted: 11/15/19  
Report author: Brad Reynolds

Contact Information:

Phone: 801.626.6151  
Email: [breyns@weber.edu](mailto:breyns@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.

**Information is current; no changes required.**

Update if not current:

Introductory Statement is current.

Contact information should be updated:

Dr. Brad Reynolds

1299 Edvalson Street, Dept. 1206

Ogden, UT 84408-1206

**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:

**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.

**Information is current; no changes required.**

Update if not current:

## 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>.

Indicate in the curriculum grid where graduating student performance is assessed for each program outcome. In the ‘additional information’ section, please provide information about these assessments (e.g., portfolios, presentations, projects, etc.) This information will be summarized at the college and institutional level for inclusion in our NWCCU reporting on student achievement.

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
Research	MCJ6000: Criminal Justice Statistics MCJ6110: Research Methods in Criminal Justice	N/A
Writing	MCJ6110: Research Methods in Criminal Justice	MCJ6170: Seminar: Juvenile Justice MCJ6255: Great Thoughts in Criminal Justice
Evaluation	MCJ6120: Theories in Crime and Delinquency	MCJ6130: Law and Social Control MCJ6160: Criminal Justice Policy Analysis MCJ6190: Legal Foundations in Criminal Justice

Additional Information (details about graduating student assessment): There are no assessments for graduating students.

**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.

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

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.

Academic Year	Learning Outcome	Core Courses	Elective Courses
2019-2020	Critical Analysis	MCJ 6100	MCJ 6210
	Research Methods	MCJ 6000	N/A
	Writing	N/A	MCJ 6200, 6255
	Evaluation	N/A	MCJ 6250
2020-2021	Critical Analysis	MCJ 6100	MCJ 6150, 6180
	Research Methods	MCJ 6110	N/A
	Writing	MCJ 6130	MCJ 6170, 6250
	Evaluation	MCJ 6120	MCJ 6190

**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.

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
<p>Learning Outcome 1:</p> <p>Analyze key issues, ideas, and/or concepts affecting the criminal justice system (Critical Analysis)</p>	<p>Measure 1:</p> <p>Issues, ideas, and/or concerns are critically considered, are clearly stated, and comprehensively described.</p> <p>Measure 2:</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Measure 1:</p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 1.</p> <p>Measure 2:</p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 2.</p>	<p>Measure 1:</p> <p>100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Fall 2018).</p> <p>72% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Spring 2019).</p> <p>Measure 2:</p> <p>100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Fall 2018).</p> <p>100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Spring 2019).</p>	<p>Overall, students are generally performing at an acceptable level on Measures 1-3.</p>	<p>More data will be collected to determine whether student performance in Spring 2019 was an aberration or a pattern that needs to be addressed.</p>

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
	<p>Measure 3:</p> <p>Analysis is in-depth, taking into account the complexities of the issue. Limits of the analysis, perspective, and/or thesis are acknowledged.</p>	<p>Measure 3:</p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 3.</p>	<p>Measure 3:</p> <p>100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Fall 2018).</p> <p>100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Spring 2019).</p>		
<p>Learning Outcome 2:</p> <p>Create and/or defend an evidence-based argument regarding criminal justice, law, policies, or procedures (Evaluation).</p>	<p>Measure 1:</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Measure 2:</p> <p>Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicates a deep comprehension of the problem/issue.</p>	<p>Measure 1:</p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 1.</p> <p>Measure 2:</p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 2.</p>	<p>Measure 1:</p> <p>66% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Spring 2019).</p> <p>Measure 2:</p> <p>66% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Spring 2019).</p>	<p>Overall, students are performing below an acceptable level on Measures 1-2, and above expectations on Measure 3.</p>	<p>More data will be collected to determine whether student performance in Spring 2019 was an aberration or a pattern that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>It should be noted that these performance estimates were derived from a small number of students.</p>

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
	<p>Solution/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as ethical, logical, and cultural dimensions of the problem/issue.</p> <p>Measure 3: Studies/reports used are appropriate to the topic and are from current and professional sources.</p>	<p>Measure 3: 75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 3.</p>	<p>Measure 3: 100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Spring 2019).</p>		
<p>Learning Outcome 3: Model professional-level writing skills in academic and/or non-academic settings. (Writing)</p>	<p>Measure 1: Information is organized in a logical and easy to understand format that makes effective use of transitional statements between ideas. The writing is mostly free of punctuation and spelling errors.</p> <p>Measure 2: The written work includes an introduction and conclusion that clearly</p>	<p>Measure 1: 75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 1.</p> <p>Measure 2: 75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 2.</p>	<p>Measure 1: 100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Fall 2018).</p> <p>Measure 2: 100% of students met or exceeded expectations on</p>	<p>Overall, students are generally performing at an acceptable level on Measures 1-3.</p>	<p>We will continue to collect data on these measures to validate these results.</p>



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
	state and explain the thesis, position, or purpose of the work.  Measure 3:  The tone and style of writing is appropriate to a professional/academic and/or non-academic audience.	75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 3.	Measure 1 (Fall 2018).  Measure 3:  100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Fall 2018).		
Learning Outcome 4:  Design and/or implement empirically valid research related to criminal justice. (Research methods)	Measure 1:  Research design and methods for data collection and analysis are clearly explained and analyzed for their strengths and weaknesses in relation to the research question.  Measure 2:  Specific research question(s) and/or aims of the study are clearly stated and described in the context of previous studies relevant to criminal justice.	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 1:  100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Spring 2019).  Measure 2:  100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Spring 2019).	Overall, students are performing at an acceptable level on Measures 1-3.	We will continue to collect data on these measures to validate these results.

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
	Measure 3:  Results are clearly and accurately discussed in the context of the research question, and limits of the study's findings are identified and discussed in relation to the research question and methods.	Measure 3:  75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 3.	Measure 3:  100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Spring 2019).		

## 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	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;	2018/19 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;	2018/19 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	2018/19 progress:

	<p>conferencing tools to approximate a more traditional classroom environment) since both students and faculty indicated that they enjoy such interaction;</p>	<p>We encourage all of our faculty to complete the Master of Online Teaching 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 9 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>2018/19 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>2018/19 progress: No further action on this item has been taken since the last annual assessment report.</p>
<p>Recommendation 6</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>2018/19 progress: No further action on this item has been taken since the last annual assessment report.</p>

	in the graduate program in an effort to maintain morale and job satisfaction;	
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.	2018/19 progress: During a faculty meeting in 2018 the faculty voted to continue the MCJ program.

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	2017-18	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		
With Master's Degrees		
Full-time Tenured		
Full-time Non-Tenured		
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		
Full-time Tenured		
Full-time Non-tenured		
Part-time		

**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).  
[This response was solicited after the original submission of 'n/a', when it was suggested that first year grad students would benefit from something as well – this is Brad's follow-up response:]  
I think it would be a good idea to do something formal, like an orientation. As is, we email new students documents of expectations, best practices, and such when they are admitted to the program. They also take MCJ 6100 as their first class, so that might be an opportunity to do something uniform like a "first year" experience. One of the considerations is the online format of the program, so we'd have to be creative in terms of what the process would look like, but like I said, I like the idea.
  
- 2) Students declared in your program(s), whether or not they are taking courses in your program(s)

Not applicable.

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'.

The program has been working with Gail Niklason of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Graduate Council to ensure assessment expectations have been met and the current data collection format/procedures meets or exceeds university expectations - the current assessment plan has been approved by Gail and the Grad Council. This academic year is the first year we are collecting data on our new program objectives. As such, no changes will be implemented at this time with respect to our assessment findings. We will continue to collect data and identify any patterns that emerge. We also have our five year program review next year. These data will inform that review process.