

Assessment and Accreditation Committee Recommendations

Program: **Criminal Justice**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee: Decision Date: **February 2016**

☒ Assessment plan revision is required for **February 1, 2017**

Program Review Submission Schedule

☒ External consultant **fall 2017**

☒ BOG Program Review ([assessment update](#) and [HEPC](#) summary document) **spring 2019**

Criminal Justice Assessment Update

The Criminal Justice program has shown tremendous progress in terms of its assessment work in years past. However, in the 2014 Program Review Assessment Update, the A&A Committee suggested that the program had lost momentum, and had in fact, reached a “plateau” in which all forward progress ceased. Unfortunately, it does not yet appear that the CJ program has outrun the plateau. However, it is understandable given the context of a leadership change in both the department chair and faculty assessment coordinator positions. Nevertheless, now is an opportunity for the CJ program to regain its momentum and continue its progress.

Student Learning Outcomes

The committee’s first concern regards the new student learning outcomes. It appears that there are five categories each with several components (total of 14). Consequently, it is unclear whether CJ will assess five categories or 14 components. If the plan is to assess 14, that’s entirely too much, but the five components are equally difficult to assess due to a lack of articulation. As of now, they are mere categories of outcomes (i.e., “Knowledge,” “Critical Thinking,” etc.). In order to assess criminal justice knowledge, for instance, it will be necessary to articulate what is actually being assessed. However, it may be unnecessary to do so to the level of specificity represented by the 14 components. In short, it seems most imperative to articulate what is actually represented by the five larger categories and begin assessing those.

General Studies Integration

The A&A Committee recommends a stronger integration of the self/cultural awareness general studies outcome. In the past, the committee has been lenient with coverage by allowing programs to pick and choose which GS outcome to integrate. However, now that the General Studies Assessment Committee has reduced the number of general studies outcomes from seven to three, it becomes preferable to move all programs in the direction of full integration. Therefore, it will be useful for the Chemistry program to consider ways (both in outcomes and measures) to support the GS self/cultural awareness outcome.

Assessment Measures and Location

In terms of the measures, the committee would like to see a more specific alignment of the measures to the outcomes. In addition, it does not appear that each outcome is addressed. In both cases, these appear to be issues that are perhaps offshoots of the over generalized outcome categories mentioned above. Once the outcomes are more clearly articulated, it may be easier to demonstrate the alignment to the measures.

The committee appreciated the thorough course map provided here, and we believe that is a valuable step toward getting a thorough alignment of measures to outcomes. However, it is not apparent that there is actual assessment of all that is displayed in the course map. That in and of itself is not a problem, but the committee would like to encourage the program to use the course map to navigate its next assessment moves.

It does appear that much of the assessment is end-loaded (capstone, major field test, etc.). In moving forward with the assessment system in the program, it may be necessary to set up some “milestones” or other key assessments throughout the program so as not to allow all the assessment work to happen at the end.

Timeline for Assessment Implementation

In the timeline section of the report, there seemed to be a confusion of purposes. That section should be an opportunity for your program to consider its short- and long-term goals related to assessment. What’s the 3-year plan for where to go next in terms of collecting and analyzing assessment data? Some plans are mentioned (i.e., exit interviews, what to do with the field test results, etc.); however, there is also mention of what is already happening in the program in that section (which seemed to be out of place). This is opportunity to plan out the next stages of assessment work. Finally, the implementation section appears very similar to what has been reported for the past five years (i.e., the hiring of Dr. Bell, the use of major field test results, etc.). Those were certainly good implementations of assessment; however, the committee would like to see what *current* ways the assessment data is being used to create programmatic changes.

Committee Membership

Steve Criniti, Chair; Craig Crow; Tifani Fletcher; Matthew Harder; Donna Lukich; Tammy McClain; Margaret Six; Paula Tomasik

Assessment and Accreditation Committee Recommendations

Criminal Justice	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
(A) Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful. →	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
(B) General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable. ←	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate GS SLOs into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs into program assessment.
(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO. ←	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
(D) Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated. →	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
(F) Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered. →	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

Committee Membership

Steve Criniti, Chair; Craig Crow; Tifani Fletcher; Matthew Harder; Donna Lukich; Tammy McClain; Margaret Six; Paula Tomasiak