

Weber State University  
Biennial Report on Assessment of Student Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: **Master of Criminal Justice**

Academic Year of Report: 2022 and 2023 (covering Summer 2021 through Spring 2023)

Date Submitted: **November 10, 2023**

Report author(s): **McKenzie Wood**

Contact Information

Phone: 801-626-6714

Email: Mckenziewood@weber.edu

Additional contributors (include sections and contact information if feedback is desired):

Table of Contents

- [A: Mission Statement](#)
- [B: Student Learning Outcomes](#)
- [C: Curriculum Grid](#)
- [D: Program Contact Information](#)
- [E: Assessment Plan](#)
- [F: Student Achievement](#)
- [G: Evidence of Learning](#)
- Appendices
  - [A: Recommendations](#)
  - [B: Program Faculty](#)
  - [C: Questions](#)
- [Glossary](#)

The Institutional Effectiveness website hosts a page for each program that displays assessment reports and information. All available biennial assessment and program review reports are located at the bottom of the program's page on our site. As a part of the biennial report process, we ask that you please review your page for completeness and accuracy, and indicate below the changes that need to be made in sections A-E.

**Program page link:** [https://www.weber.edu/ie/Results/Criminal\\_JusticeM.html](https://www.weber.edu/ie/Results/Criminal_JusticeM.html)

**A. Mission Statement**

**Information is current; no changes required: Yes X**

Update if not current:

**B. Student Learning Outcomes**

(Please include certificate and associate credential learning outcomes)

**Information is current; no changes required: Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_**

Update if not current:

**C. Curriculum Grid**

(Please review your current curriculum grid and verify that at least one course has been identified for each outcome in which you expect your students to demonstrate the desired competency of a graduating student. This could be shown in a variety of ways: classroom work, clinical or internship work, a field test, an ePortfolio, etc. You may request access to the Google Sheet on our site if that is easiest, or we can make the updates. Please reach out to [oe@weber.edu](mailto:oe@weber.edu) if you wish to have access)

**Information is current; no changes required: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X**

Learning Outcome	Core Courses	Elective Courses
Critical Analysis	MCJ 6100: Contemporary Criminal Justice MCJ 6210: American Criminal Courts MCJ 6220: Contemporary Law Enforcement MCJ 6230: Contemporary Corrections	MCJ 6120: Theories in Crime and Delinquency MCJ 6150: Diversity Issues in Criminal Justice MCJ 6180: Contemporary Legal Issues
Research Methods	MCJ 6110: Research Methods in Criminal Justice	MCJ 6000: Criminal Justice Statistics
Writing	MCJ 6110: Research Methods in Criminal Justice	MCJ 6170: Juvenile Justice MCJ 6255: Great Thoughts in Criminal Justice
Evaluation	n/a	MCJ 6120: Theories in Crime and Delinquency MCJ 6130: Law and Social Control MCJ 6160: Criminal Justice Policy Analysis MCJ 6190: Legal Foundations in Criminal Justice

**Note:** Our required curriculum changed in Spring of 2022, so our curriculum grid now reflects our new curriculum catalog. We acknowledge this leaves some learning outcomes not assessed in our core courses, and we will revisit this curriculum grid in the future to ensure each outcome is assessed by core classes.

## IN TRANSITION

### D. Program and Contact Information

Information is current; no changes required: Yes X No

Brad Reynolds was the MCJ Director until Aug. 2023, McKenzie Wood took over as director in Aug. 2023.

### 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 should 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
- information about how the department/program faculty are engaged in the assessment review.

Information is current; no changes required: Yes X No

Update if not current:

## F. Student Achievement

Please come back to this section later. The dashboard is being updated and is not yet on Site Manager. OIE will send out an email when it is ready.

Percent and number of students completing degrees within 2 years of achieving 90+ credit hours (or just time to graduation for graduate programs) and a reflection on that metric.

Here are instructions on how to access this information:

1. Log into the eWeber portal
2. Search for, and select the app, "Report Gallery"
3. Agree to the FERPA warning
4. In the Report Gallery search for Program Review Undergraduate - you can enter that text into the search bar or you can scroll down the list of dashboards until you find it.
5. Select the tab at the top labeled "Time to Grad" at the top of the page.
6. Select your Program Unit and Program Level on the right side
7. Select Priority 1 under Priority

You should now be in the right settings for understanding your program's time to graduation. Please reflect on what you are seeing, discuss any highlights or concerns, and outline what initiatives the program is doing to address the numbers shown. If you require assistance or have questions, please email [oie@weber.edu](mailto:oie@weber.edu). You may use a screenshot of the information shown in the dashboard as a part of your report.

**Note:** There is no graduate level data available at this time in this dashboard.

## G. Evidence of Learning

There are a variety of ways in which you can choose to show evidence of learning, including the traditional Evidence of Learning Rubric, the updated Evidence of Learning worksheet, a narrative describing your assessments and evidence of student learning, or other tools such as ePortfolios, Signature Assignments, juried reviews, and so on, or a combination of any of these.

Whichever method you choose, please include:

1. Each learning outcome addressed in the course, and an interpretation of the outcomes as necessary to help outside reviewers understand the learning goals
2. The methods used to assess learning for each outcome – ideally, each outcome will be measured with at least two different methods, e.g., multiple quiz questions and a signature assignment, multiple exam questions and lab reports, course discussions and homework assignments, etc.

3. The threshold of acceptable performance – preferably a multi-stepped threshold, such as “80% of students will score 80% or better on the set of quiz questions” – and brief explanation for why that target was selected
4. The results of the assessment for each outcome. If possible, include specifics such as the number of students who meet, exceed, or fall short of the threshold.
5. A reflection on, or interpretation of, the findings. For example, if 100% of students correctly answer all quiz questions, might they need to be too easy?
6. A plan of action to address the findings, even if the threshold was met, and/or reflection on changes made as a result of (or in the interim since) the last biennial report.
7. How you plan to monitor and assess the success of changes you will make/have made (“close the loop”).

If individual faculty who provide data or participate in the assessment of these courses would like feedback or support from GEIAC or the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, provide their names and contact information here:

### **Types of Assessment**

- 1) Course-based assessment
  - a. This is the format we have traditionally suggested programs use for assessment. The familiar ‘evidence of learning worksheets’ are included in the template and can also be accessed from the IE website.
- 2) Outcome-based assessment
  - a. Moving from course-based to outcome-based assessment has the potential for programs to gather and reflect upon data that are more meaningful, and to connect assessment findings from throughout the program. The approach may be much easier for associates and certificate programs where only select students in classes are earning the credential. For more information email ([oiie@weber.edu](mailto:oiie@weber.edu))
  - b. Reporting options include:
    - i. A traditional evidence-of-learning [worksheet](#) with an outcome (across multiple courses) as the focus (instead of a course with multiple outcomes).
    - ii. A report that is more [narrative-based](#).
    - iii. Other tools such as an ePortfolio in which key or signature assignments have been identified by the faculty, and uploaded by the student with their reflection. The key or signature assignments are aligned to student learning outcomes. (ePortfolio is an excellent assessment tool for certificates and associate degrees.)
    - iv. There are other approaches such as juried reviews, physical portfolios, field tests, etc.
- 3) General Education course assessment needs to continue to be reported at the course level using either the [traditional template](#) or a more [narrative-based format](#). See the [Checklist and Template](#) page for area-specific worksheets as well.

## Evidence of Learning Worksheet: Courses within the Major

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”
<b>Learning Outcome 1:</b>  Analyze key issues, ideas, and/or concepts affecting the criminal justice system (Critical Analysis)	<b>Measure 1:</b>  Issues, ideas, and/or concerns are critically considered, are clearly stated, and comprehensively described.	<b>Measure 1:</b>  75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 1.	<b>Measure 1:</b>  100% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 1 in Summer 21, Fall 21, Spring 22, and Spring 2023. 83% of students met or exceeded expectations in Fall 2022.	<b>Measure 1:</b>  Students met the threshold of 75% of students meeting or exceeding expectations on measure 1.	No curricular or pedagogical changes are needed at this time	Due to differences in how faculty grade students on the outcome rubric (some faculty commonly use “exceeds” expectations while others only use “meets,”) a norming discussion among faculty is warranted for consistency in grading.
	<b>Measure 2:</b>  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.	<b>Measure 2:</b>  75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 2	<b>Measure 2:</b>  80% of students met or exceeded expectations on Measure 2 in Summer 2021, and 100% in Fall 2021. Spring 2022 had one class meeting the expectations at 100%, and another at 80%, and another at 83%, in Spring 2023 students meet the expectations at 100%	<b>Measure 2:</b>  Students met the threshold of 75% of students meeting or exceeding expectations on measure 1.	No curricular or pedagogical changes are needed at this time	

	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>Analysis is in-depth, taking into account the complexities of the issue. Limits of the analysis, perspective, and/or thesis is acknowledged.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 3</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>90% of students met or exceeded the expectation in Summer 21, 100% in one course in Fall of 2021, but only 64% in another course in Fall of 2021 met or exceeded expectations. 100% of students met or exceeded expectations in Spring of 2022 and Spring of 2023, and 83% in Fall of 2022.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>One class during Fall of 2021 did not have students meet the threshold for meeting or exceeding expectations. After closer review, it was found 5 out of 14 students did not meet or exceed the expectations.</p> <p>Fall 2021 was during the core of Covid-related fallout, it is likely this was just an aberration as opposed to a pattern that needs to be addressed.</p>	<p>More data will be collected to determine whether student performance needs to be addressed related to this outcome.</p>	
<p><b>Learning Outcome 2:</b></p> <p>Create and/or defend an evidence-based argument regarding criminal justice, law, policies, or procedures (Evaluation).</p>	<p><b>Measure 1:</b></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><b>Measure 1:</b></p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 1.</p>	<p><b>Measure 1:</b></p> <p>Students consistently scored between 87.5% and 100.00% for this measure, with the exception of a Theories of Crime and Delinquency course in Spring of 2023 when only 64.2% of students in this class met the measure expectations.</p>	<p><b>Measure 1:</b></p> <p>5 out of 14 students did not meet the expectations put out by this measure in the Theories of Crime and Delinquency course in Spring 2023. While this is alarming, more data needs to be collected to determine if this is an emerging trend or an outlier from the Spring 2023 semester.</p>	<p>Our department is implementing a new Masters “peer review policy where master’s courses will be reviewed on a periodic basis. We will consider adding this class to the upcoming peer-review list.</p> <p>Additionally, an instructor from the Social Work department will be teaching MCJ 6120 for the first time in Spring 2024. Data from that course will be analyzed to determine if results are similar to Spring 2023 results.</p>	<p>Continue designing our Masters “peer review” policy, and adding MCJ 6120 to the list of courses we will be reviewing.</p>

	<p><b>Measure 2:</b></p> <p>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 dimensions of the problem/issue.</p>	<p><b>Measure 2:</b></p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 2.</p>	<p><b>Measure 2:</b></p> <p>Students consistently scored between 92%-100% on this measure.</p>	<p><b>Measure 2:</b></p> <p>There are no indications this measure needs to be changed or altered.</p>	<p>No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time</p>	
	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>Studies/reports used are appropriate to the topic and are from current and professional sources.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 3.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>Students consistently scored between 87%-100% on this measure.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>There are no indications this measure needs to be changed or altered.</p>	<p>No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time</p>	
<p><b>Learning Outcome 3:</b></p> <p>Model professional-level writing skills in academic and/or non-academic settings. (Writing)</p>	<p><b>Measure 1:</b></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><b>Measure 1:</b></p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 1.</p>	<p><b>Measure 1:</b></p> <p>At least 92% of students are consistently meeting this outcome, with the exception of only 50% of students meeting this outcome in an experimental course (MCJ 6810) in Spring of 2022.</p>	<p><b>Measure 1:</b></p> <p>The majority of students are meeting or exceeding expectations for this outcome. There appears to be one outlier from this data from Spring of 2022.</p> <p>After closer review of the data, it appears the data may have been incorrectly entered (for example, instead of a “does not meet,” “meets” and “exceeds” category, it only gave options for “meets,” “exceeds,” and “blank.” There were only 4 students in the course, and while two met or</p>	<p>We will review data collection instructions with faculty, particularly new faculty as this experimental course was taught by a newer faculty, and monitor to limit this from happening again.</p>	<p>Use a department meeting to discuss norming strategies in grading, review MCJ assessment findings, and review assessment instructions.</p>



				exceeded the expectations, two were in the “blank” category, which ended up with a total of only 2 “meeting or exceeding” expectations.	
	<p><b>Measure 2:</b></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><b>Measure 2:</b></p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 2.</p>	<p><b>Measure 2:</b></p> <p>At least 82% of students are consistently meeting this outcome, with the exception of only 50% of students meeting this outcome in an experimental course (MCJ 6810) in Spring of 2022.</p>	<p><b>Measure 2:</b></p> <p>The majority of students are meeting or exceeding expectations for this outcome. There appears to be one outlier from this data from Spring of 2022. After closer review of the data, it appears the data may have been incorrectly entered (for example, instead of a “does not meet,” “meets” and “exceeds” category, it only gave options for “meets,” “exceeds,” and “blank.” There were only 4 students in the course, and while two met or exceeded the expectations, two were in the “blank” category, which ended up with a total of only 2 “meeting or exceeding” expectations.</p>	<p>We will review data collection instructions with faculty, particularly new faculty as this experimental course was taught by a newer faculty, and monitor to limit this from happening again.</p>

	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>The tone and style of writing is appropriate to a professional/academic and/or non-academic audience.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 3.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>100% of students are consistently meeting this outcome, with the exception of only 50% of students meeting this outcome in an experimental course (MCJ 6810) in Spring of 2022.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>Almost 100% of students are meeting or exceeding expectations for this outcome. There appears to be one outlier from this data from Spring of 2022. After closer review of the data, it appears the data may have been incorrectly entered (for example, instead of a “does not meet,” “meets” and “exceeds” category, it only gave options for “meets,” “exceeds,” and “blank.” There were only 4 students in the course, and while two met or exceeded the expectations, two were in the “blank” category, which ended up with a total of only 2 “meeting or exceeding” expectations.</p>	<p>We will review data collection instructions with faculty, particularly new faculty as this experimental course was taught by a newer faculty, and monitor to limit this from happening again.</p>	
<p><b>Learning Outcome 4:</b></p> <p>Design and/or implement empirically valid research related to criminal justice. (Research methods)</p>	<p><b>Measure 1:</b></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><b>Measure 1:</b></p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 1.</p>	<p><b>Measure 1:</b></p> <p>Over 90% of students meet or exceed the expectations on Measure 1.</p>	<p><b>Measure 1:</b></p> <p>Our students are meeting the threshold for this measure, however, there is only one class in the curriculum to measure this outcome.</p>	<p>We will look at our curriculum and determine if this learning outcome can be assessed by any other classes outside of Research Methods.</p>	<p>This outcome has the least amount of data of all the outcomes. We will consider revisiting our curriculum guide to determine if there are other classes that can assess this outcome.</p>

	<p><b>Measure 2:</b></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><b>Measure 2:</b></p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 1.</p>	<p><b>Measure 2:</b></p> <p>Over 90% of students meet or exceed the expectations on Measure 2.</p>	<p><b>Measure 2:</b></p> <p>Our students are meeting the threshold for this measure, however, there is only one class in the curriculum to measure this outcome.</p>		
	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>75% of students meet or exceed expectations on Measure 1.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>Over 80% of students meet or exceed the expectations on Measure 3.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3:</b></p> <p>Our students are meeting the threshold for this measure, however, there is only one class in the curriculum to measure this outcome.</p>		

Additional narrative (optional):

All of our outcomes are measured by direct measures. In the future, the program director plans on working with individual faculty to determine what the direct measures look like (essay, exam, short assignment, etc.). We also plan on revising our curriculum grid to ensure all core classes are associated with an outcome. Furthermore, we plan on looking at indirect outcomes to provide us with broader assessment. We are considering tying indirect outcomes to our newly established advising and possibly developing an exit survey for graduating students.

## 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
<b>Recommendation 1</b>	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.	<p>We revised our core courses (changing from 3 core courses to 5 core courses) to be more on trend with academic criminal justice programs.</p> <p>We identified two suggested “pathways” for students (academic or practitioner) to guide them in their selection of elective courses based on their academic or career goals.</p>
<b>Recommendation 2</b>	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).	Beginning Fall of 2023 we have implemented an “advising week” for students. Students are able to meet with an advisor prior to registering for the next semester courses. Students new to the program are specifically targeted for this advising.
<b>Recommendation 3</b>	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.	<p>Prior meetings have taken place to discuss optimum classes sizes, budget reallocation, or creation of a new faculty line. Formal and informal conversations continue on these topics.</p> <p>The department has secured and allocated funding for MCJ specific-scholarships (both for incoming students and current students), in hopes of attracting students to the program and reducing attrition.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 4</b></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Program Director is active on the University Graduate Council where subcommittees have been tasked with benchmarking and reviewing Teaching Assistant and Research Assistant models to determine their impact and feasibility in graduate programs across Weber State.</p> <p>The department is exploring options for how Directed Readings can be used to offer research experience or personal mentorship to students.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 5</b></p>	<p>Reviewers recommend that we identify a small group of qualified individuals who could serve as adjuncts in the program. We agree with this recommendation.</p>	<p>We have two faculty from outside departments who occasionally or consistently teach in our program (specifically, Statistics and Mental Health in Criminal Justice). This has worked well, and should the need arise, the director will work on identifying other university faculty who may be interested in teaching in an adjunct capacity in the program.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 6</b></p>	<p>The reviewers suggested that we explore the possibility of cross listing some of our courses with other disciplines</p>	<p>Our department is currently in formative discussions with the Social Work Department regarding collaboration between the Master of Social Work and Masters of Criminal Justice programs. We expect these conversations to continue.</p> <p>Masters of Social Work students are currently taking our classes as electives for their degree.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 7</b></p>	<p>Reviewers expressed concern that the MCJ program is too reliant on overload teaching to staff the program.</p>	<p>The department chair developed a plan and presented it to the provost and other stakeholders on 3/15/2021 to reallocate program budget towards a new faculty line. Doing so would allow for more courses to be taught as part of faculty load, while also</p>

		continuing to allow for some overload opportunities. While this faculty line was not awarded, another line was awarded to replace a faculty who departed in Spring 2021. It is expected that the replacement faculty will contribute to teaching in the MCJ program.
<b>Recommendation 8</b>	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.

## 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	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
<b>With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)</b>				
Full-time Tenured	6	6	5	5
Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track)	3	2	3	2
Part-time and adjunct				
<b>With Master's Degrees</b>				
Full-time Tenured				
Full-time Non-Tenured				
Part-time and adjunct				
<b>With Bachelor's Degrees</b>				
Full-time Tenured				
Full-time Non-tenured				
Part-time and adjunct				
<b>Other</b>				
Full-time Tenured				
Full-time Non-tenured				
Part-time				
<b>Total Headcount Faculty</b>				
Full-time Tenured				
Full-time Non-tenured				
Part-time				

## Appendix C

### Please respond to the following questions.

- 1) Looking back at your previous biennial report where you identified strategies for improvement, what progress has been made in implementing improvements?

An MCJ advising week has been implemented to help students remain on track towards graduation. Department budget was offered a faculty line that resulted in a one-year visiting professorship (with the visiting professor teaching in the MCJ program). This line will revert to a full tenure-track line, and the department has goals to ensure the new hire will be proficient at teaching MCJ courses. Discussions toward an interdisciplinary degree (MCJ and Masters of Social Work) have continued. The MCJ director is working with the graduate council to explore models for student research and teaching assistants.

- 2) Please take a few minutes to review the new DFWI dashboard in the Report Gallery. This dashboard allows you to see the percentage of students in each course who earn a D+, D, D-, E, W, UW, or NC grade. The data can be filtered by several parameters. Reflect on the DFWI rates overall and of your underserved minority students versus your Caucasian students:
  - a. What are you seeing?
  - b. What concerns you?
  - c. What additional data could be beneficial?

**Note:** There is no graduate level-data available at this time in this dashboard.

- 3) We have invited you to re-think your program assessment. What strategies are you considering? What support or help would you like?

We are considering the following strategies for rethinking our program assessment:

1. Having a department meeting devoted to discussing faculty grade norming and consistency.
2. Revisiting our curriculum grid to ensure all outcomes are assessed by core classes.
3. Inviting faculty to share the essays/exams/assignments they use to assess the MCJ outcomes.
4. Consider indirect assessment methods (exit surveys, student interviews/advising, etc.)

As we address our assessment deficits the following would be helpful: 1) increased compensation for graduate director; 2) Training related to indirect assessment methods.



## 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>