

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2013 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT: Criminal Justice

DATE: March 13, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW: Undergraduate degree in Criminal Justice

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW: Deborah Worley, Bradley Myers, Kyle Thorson

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u>X</u> | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |

Comments:

The Assessment Plan, which has not been amended since its adoption in 2006, contains 12 goals and 39 objectives divided into five groups: 1) basic skills; 2) understanding of the criminal justice system and related theories; 3) understanding of criminal justice research; 4) appreciation for principles of justice; and 5) appreciation for diversity and good citizenship. The goals and objectives continue to use the somewhat vague terms of “appreciation” and “sensitive.” Although the goals and objectives are stated, some are not specific, using somewhat vague terms such as “demonstrate an appreciation for...” and “be sensitive to...”.

In addition to the program goals, please also consider UND’s institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to program goals.

- | | | |
|----------|---|--|
| <u>X</u> | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>X</u> | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) |
| <u>X</u> | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage) |
| <u>X</u> | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”) |
| <u>X</u> | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”) |
| <u>X</u> | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”) |
| ____ | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”) |
| <u>X</u> | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”) |

Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Although the goals do not necessarily implicate the essential study goals, the objectives under each of the learning goals are aligned with Essential Studies goals. More specifically, the criminal justice student learning goals specifically mention critical thinking; using skills to find, communicate and create information; and writing a clear and concise research paper. Moreover, there is a clear emphasis on encouraging students to “have an appreciation for diversity in American society” and “to have an appreciation for efforts to establish a more just society”.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES ____ | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> ____ |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES ____ | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |

Comments:

In the 2005-2006 Assessment Plan, the Department references two assessment methods: comparison of pre- and post-test scores and analysis of oral presentations. The pre-test is administered CJ 201 and the post-test is administered in CJ 401. The assessment methods are generally aligned with each topic area of student learning goals, but the assessment methods are not aligned with specific goals and objectives. No indirect means of assessment were reported.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <u>X</u>	NO ____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES <u>X</u>	NO ____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES <u>X</u>	NO ____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <u>X</u>	NO ____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____

Comments:

Results are reported for 10 of the Department's 12 goals. The results are reported for each goal and in the aggregate. However, the results reported clearly were not collected from the same cohort of students. In addition, it was not clear from the results, if any particular objectives were assessed. The Assessment Plan calls for a comparison of pre- and post-tests for a statistically significant increase, but the report does not indicate if such an analysis was done. The Assessment Plan also calls for students to achieve a median of 75% for each goal, which was only attained in 5 of the 10 goals assessed. No assessment results were reported for the analysis of oral presentations.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below.

_____ 1	Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
<u>X</u> 2	Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
_____ 3	Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
_____ 4	Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
<u>X</u> 5	Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
<u>X</u> 6	Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
_____ 7	Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
<u>X</u> 8	Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding results and the application of results to program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:

Because the results are reported solely in relationship to the goals, rather than the objectives, only some of the results can be clearly associated with the essential study goals. For example, the results assess Goal 1 of Part I, which calls for students “to be able to think critically and use abstract knowledge to help resolve concrete problems,” which is clearly aligned with essential studies goal 2. Objective 1.3, under Goal 1, which calls for students “to be able to question one’s own ideas, sentiments and actions,” which is more closely tied to essential goals 3” is not separately assessed..

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES <u>X</u>	NO ____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES <u>X</u>	NO ____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____

Comments:

The Department reports that in response to its assessment efforts it has implemented procedures designed to ensure that their students may not take the Capstone class until their last semester. (It should be noted, however, that Department reported this

change in their FY2007 and FY2010 reports as well). Continued underperformance by students has also induced the Department to add a laboratory component to the CJ 201 class.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- ☒ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☒ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☐ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☒ Results are reported.
- ☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.
- ☐ (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- ☒ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ☐ No results are reported.
- ☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
- ☐ (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Department of Criminal Justice continues to rely on the Assessment Plan that was submitted for the 2005-2006 academic year. The committee recommends that the Department update their assessment plan. Once again, as in 2007 and 2010, the Committee encourages the Department to consider broadening its use of assessment methods. The addition of a laboratory section of CJ201 shows that the Department has given careful consideration to why its previous efforts to address student underperformance have not yielded the hoped for results. Although it contains well-articulated goals appears to have been carefully constructed, the Department may want to revisit its Assessment Plan and the instrument used for the pre- and post-testing.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual report | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan (as posted) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Appendices (cited in annual report) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe) | |

Reviewer(s):	Name	Bradley Myers	Deborah Worley	Kyle Thorson
	Department	Law School	Educational Leadership	_____
	Phone Number	7-2228	7-3140	_____
	e-mail	myers@law.und.edu	deborah.worley@email.und.edu	_____

Section 1: Y Section 2: Q Section 3: Y Section 4: Y

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information reported and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in the 2013 Annual Report
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT: Criminal Justice

DATE: March 13, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW: Ph.D. in Criminal Justice

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW: Deborah Worley, Bradley Myers, Kyle Thorson

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |
| • If so, were goals well-articulated? | YES <u>X</u> | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |

Comments:

The Assessment Plan, which has not been amended since its adoption in 2006, contains 13 goals and 16 objectives divided into four groups that cover: 1) analytic and communication skills; 2) understanding criminological theories; 3) understanding statistics and research methods; and 4) appreciation for various criminal justice relevant concepts. Although the goals and objectives are stated, some are not specific, using somewhat vague terms such as “demonstrate an appreciation for...” and “be sensitive to...”.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES ____ | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES ____ | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |

Comments:

The 2005-2006 Assessment Plan identifies the comprehensive examination, the dissertation and its defense, and, for the three goals in the “Appreciation for Various Criminal Justice Relevant Concepts” section, course examinations, as the assessment methods. The assessment methods are generally aligned with each topic area of student learning goals, but the assessment methods are not aligned with specific goals and objectives. There does not appear to be any indirect assessment methods used, and all of the assessment seems to take place at the end of the program.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------|--------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | YES ____ | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES ____ | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | YES ____ | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES ____ | NO ____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |

Comments:

In the 2013 Annual Report, the Department indicates that 13 graduate students, but only one Ph.D. graduate. No assessment data are reported for any students. The report does say that Comprehensive exams have been given in two areas, but no summary of results is provided. The report makes reference to the growth of the doctoral program, but makes no discussion of how the students performed, nor why their doctoral students are not graduating..

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES _____ NO X QUALIFIED Y/N _____

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES _____ NO _____ QUALIFIED Y/N _____

Comments:

The 2013 Annual Report does not make any reference to actions taken in relation to the graduate program based on assessment.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- X A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- _____ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- _____ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- _____ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- _____ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- _____ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- _____ Results are reported.
- _____ Results are tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- _____ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- _____ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- _____ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- _____ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- X Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- _____ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- X No results are reported.
- X Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Department of Criminal Justice continues to rely on the Assessment Plan that was submitted for the 2005-2006 academic year. The committee recommends that the Department update their assessment plan to include additional means of assessment, with particular focus on incorporating formative means that assess student learning during their program rather than relying only on summative means that assess student learning at the end of their program. This approach would provide the Department with information that could be used to make adjustments to its program that could assist students in making progress towards graduation.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- X Annual report
- _____ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- _____ Other (please describe)

- X Assessment plan (as posted)
- X Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Bradley Myers	Deborah Worley	Kyle Thorson
	Department	Law School	Educational Leadership	_____
	Phone Number	7-2228	7-3140	_____
	e-mail	myers@law.und.edu	deborah.worley@email.und.edu	_____

Section 1: Y Section 2: Q Section 3: N Section 4: N

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13