

Weber State University
Biennial Report on Assessment of Student Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: Master of Criminal Justice Program
Academic Year of Report: 2020/21 (covering Summer 2019 through Spring 2021)
Date Submitted: 11/15/21
Report author: Brad Reynolds

Contact Information:
Phone: 801.626.6146
Email: breyms@weber.edu

We have updated the Institutional Effectiveness website, which includes an update for each program page. All Biennial Assessment and Program Review reports will now be available on a single page. Please review your page for completeness and accuracy, and indicate on the list below the changes that need to be made. Access your program page from the top-level [results](#) page. Select the appropriate college and then your program from the subsequent page.

A. Mission Statement

Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

B. Student Learning Outcomes

(please note the addition of certificate and associate credential learning outcomes)

Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

C. Curriculum (please note, we are using Google Sheets for this section so that updates are easier to make)

 Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current (you may request access to the Google Sheet if that is easiest, or we can make the updates):

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	MCJ6110: Research Methods in Criminal Justice	MCJ6000: Criminal Justice Statistics
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

D. Program and Contact Information

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

Update if not current:

E. Assessment Plan

We have traditionally asked programs to report on outcome achievement by students at the course level. We are encouraging programs to consider alternative assessment approaches and plans that are outcome-based as opposed to course-based, though course-based assessment can continue to be used. A complete assessment plan will include a timeline (which courses or which outcomes will be assessed each year), an overall assessment strategy (course-based, outcome-based, reviewed juries, ePortfolio, field tests, etc.), information about how you will collect and review data, and information about how the department/program faculty are engaged in the assessment review.

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

Update if not current:

Academic Year	Learning Outcome	Core Courses	Elective Courses
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
2021-2022	Critical Analysis	MCJ 6100	MCJ 6210
	Research Methods	MCJ 6110	MCJ 6000
	Writing	N/A	MCJ 6200, 6255
	Evaluation	N/A	MCJ 6120, 6810

F. Student Achievement

- i. Percent of students completing degrees after 90 credit hours within 2 years and a reflection on that metric (this information can be accessed on the Program Review Undergraduate dashboard – tab labeled, ‘Time to Grad from 90CH – please reach out to oi@weber.edu if you need help with this metric). What department initiatives are in place to address this?

Additive Program Unit Percentages										
Data for the most recent three years reflect in-progress students and may change over time										
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
In 1 Year or Less	20%	44%	0%	9%	14%	13%	6%	28%	31%	4%
In 2 Years or Less	33%	56%	41%	27%	41%	33%	41%	56%	34%	4%
In 3 Years or Less	33%	67%	59%	45%	52%	53%	41%	56%	34%	4%
At Any Point	53%	67%	59%	55%	52%	53%	41%	56%	34%	4%
Has Not Graduated	47%	33%	41%	45%	48%	47%	59%	44%	66%	96%

Evidence of Learning

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>70% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Summer 2020).</p> <p>100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Fall 2020).</p> <p>Measure 2:</p> <p>90% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 2 (Summer 2020).</p> <p>100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 2 (Fall 2020).</p>	<p>Overall, students performed below an acceptable level on Measures 1 Summer 2020. Data from Fall 2020 indicate this isn't a perpetual problem.</p>	<p>More data will be collected to determine whether student performance in Summer 2020 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 3 (Summer 2020).</p> <p>100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 3 (Fall 2020).</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. Solution/hypotheses are sensitive to</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>82.35% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Fall 2020).</p> <p>Measure 2:</p> <p>100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 2 (Fall 2020).</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
	<p>contextual factors as well as ethical, logical, and cultural dimensions of the problem/issue.</p> <p>Measure 3:</p> <p>Studies/reports used are appropriate to the topic and are from current and professional sources.</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 3 (Fall 2020).</p>		
<p>Learning Outcome 3:</p> <p>Model professional-level writing skills in academic and/or non-academic settings. (Writing)</p>	<p>Measure 1:</p> <p>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:</p> <p>The written work includes an introduction and conclusion that clearly state and explain the thesis, position, or purpose of the work.</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>82.35% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 (Fall 2020).</p> <p>Measure 2:</p> <p>82.35% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 2 (Fall 2020).</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
	<p>Measure 3:</p> <p>The tone and style of writing is appropriate to a professional/academic and/or non-academic audience.</p>	75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 3.	Measure 3: 88.24% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 3 (Fall 2020).		
<p>Learning Outcome 4:</p> <p>Design and/or implement empirically valid research related to criminal justice. (Research methods)</p>	<p>Measure 1:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Measure 2:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Measure 3:</p> <p>Results are clearly and accurately discussed in the context of the</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 3:</p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 3.</p>	<p>Measure 1:</p> <p>100% 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 2 (Spring 2019).</p> <p>Measure 3:</p> <p>100% of students met or exceeded expectations on</p>	<p>Overall, students are performing at an acceptable level on Measures 1-3 based on Spring 2019 data.</p> <p>Note: data were also collected for this outcome Spring 2021, but the faculty member used the wrong rubric, making the data unusable.</p>	We will ensure that faculty are using the collect data collection methods to produce valid data.

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
	research question, and limits of the study's findings are identified and discussed in relation to the research question and methods.		Measure 3 (Spring 2019).		

Note: if you cannot download templates directly from this document, please visit our [template page](#) for downloads.

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 enacting.

Date of Program Review: 2020-2021	Recommendation	Progress Description
Recommendation 1	The reviewers suggested creating either formal or informal emphasis areas to cater program needs to our diverse study body. We presently serve students who are in the field and seeking advancement through higher education as well as a smaller group of students who are interested teaching criminal justice and/or continuing to a PhD program. We agree that the curriculum needs to be updated.	We will revise our curriculum to conform more closely with current trends in academic criminal justice.
		As part of this process, we will identify suggested “paths” for students based on their goals.
Recommendation 2	The reviewers suggested having a formal advising schedule to help students navigate the program. Formal advising would also help us to identify student needs and guide them toward an appropriate recommended path toward completing the degree (i.e., practitioner track, academic/scholarly track).	We agree that formal advising will have numerous benefits and will implement formal scheduled advising for each student completing their first semester in the program.
Recommendation 3	The reviewers suggested having some strategy meetings to address program size and growth. This includes advocating with campus administration for more resources, including a faculty line, to meet long-term needs.	Three meetings have taken place. First, the faculty met in March 2021 to discuss optimum class sizes. Second, the program director and department chair met with the college dean to discuss these issues. Third, the director, chair, and dean also met with

		the provost on 3/15/2021 to ask for a budget reallocation to create another faculty line. These conversations are ongoing and will be revisited through strategic planning reports.
Recommendation 4		The reviewers recommend that we consider utilizing teaching and/or graduate assistants. At the same time, the reviewers prefaced this recommendation with the acknowledgement that our ability to address this item may be contingent on funding.
Recommendation 5	The reviewers recommend that we identify a small group of qualified individuals who could serve as adjuncts in the program. We agree with this recommendation.	As of 2020, we have been utilizing a faculty member from the sociology department to teach a course once a year. Recently, a member of the social work department faculty has also taught in our program. This seems to be working well, and the director will work on identifying other university faculty who may be interested in teaching in an adjunct capacity in the program.
Recommendation 6	The reviewers suggested that we explore the possibility of cross listing some of our courses with other disciplines.	With the creation of the new master of social work degree within the college, we have the opportunity to potentially pursue such a partnership. So far, one meeting has taken place and all stakeholders remained open to the idea. We will continue this conversation to see if cross listing courses will be manageable and beneficial to both programs.
		We are interested in some interdisciplinary collaboration with other masters programs

		on campus, and would like to meet with some of the program directors and/or department chairs to explore the possibility of team teaching courses or other types of collaborations.
Recommendation 7	The reviewers expressed concern that the MCJ program is too reliant on overload teaching to staff the program.	The department chair developed a plan and presented it to the provost and other stakeholders on 3/15/2021 to reallocate program budget toward a new faculty line. Doing so would allow for more courses to be taught as part of faculty load, while also continuing to allow for some overload opportunities. These conversations are ongoing and will be revisited through strategic planning reports.
Recommendation 8	The reviewers suggested that the department would benefit in a number of ways from having alumni data.	At present, and historically, we have not kept track of our graduates, but recognize the advantages of having these data. Collecting alumni data is a long-term goal of the undergraduate program, and whatever mechanisms are put in place to do so can be utilized for both programs.

Additional narrative:

Our program review occurred 2020-2021. As such, progress toward completing recommendations is in the planning stages.

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	2018-18	2019-20	2020-21
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)			
Full-time Tenured	6	6	6
Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track)	3	3	2
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			8
Full-time Tenured			6
Full-time Non-tenured			2
Part-time			

Please respond to the following questions.

- 1) Review and comment on the trend of minority students enrolling in your classes (particularly lower-division, GEN Ed) and in your programs.
- 2) What support (from enrollment services, advising, first-year transition office, access & diversity, etc.) do you need to help you recruit and retain students?
- 3) We have invited you to re-think your program assessment. What strategies are you considering? What support or help would you like?

We recently adopted a new assessment scheme for the program and are not considering any revisions or changes at this time.

- 4) Finally, we are supporting our Concurrent Enrollment accreditation process. Does your program offer concurrent enrollment classes? If so, have you been able to submit the information requested from the Concurrent Enrollment office? Staff from OIE will reach out to you in the next few months to assist in finalizing that data submission as well as gather information for concurrent Gen Ed assessment.

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.

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. Please see <https://weber.edu/weberthrives/HIEE.html>