

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: _Criminology and Criminal Justice **Contact Name and Email** __Shannon Barton sbarton1@indstate.edu_____

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? (Undergraduate)</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>Objective 3: To demonstrate written and oral communication skills applicable to the field of criminal justice. 3.2 Provide information orally</p>	<p>Senior group presentations in CRIM 427 Dynamics of Crime & Delinquency</p>	<p>65% of students will achieve a score of 1 (meets expectations) or higher in this category.</p>	<p>Data were collected for oral communication during Spring, 2016 term only. A total of 69.6% met or exceeded the expectation of presenting oral communication (N=23). These results indicate we are meeting the established expectations</p>	<p>Dr. Shannon Barton Shared during the January faculty meeting and will be shared during the first faculty meeting of the year.</p>
<p>Objective 3: To demonstrate written and oral communication skills applicable to the field of criminal justice. 3.3 Provide written information.</p>	<p>Senior thesis in CRIM 427 Dynamics of Crime & Delinquency</p>	<p>65% of students will achieve a score of 1 (meets expectations) or higher in this category.</p>	<p>Combined, 66.0% of students met or exceeded the expectations of written communication skills thus students met the expectations of the department (N=47). Overall, the Fall cohort performed better than the Spring cohort (68.2%/15 and 64%/16 respectively) with the Spring section not meeting writing expectations.</p>	<p>Dr. Shannon Barton Shared during the January faculty meeting and will be shared during the first faculty meeting of the year.</p>

<p>Objective 4: To demonstrate critical thinking skills.</p> <p>4.3 Develop a policy based on scientifically supported research.</p>	<p>Senior thesis in CRIM 427 Dynamics of Crime & Delinquency</p>	<p>65% of students will achieve a score of 1 (meets expectations) or higher in this category.</p>	<p>Combined, 59.6% of students met or exceeded the expectation of applying a scientifically based policy to a criminal justice problem (N=47), thus students did not meet the expectations established. Overall, the Spring cohort performed better than the fall (72%/18 and 45.5%/10 respectively)</p>	<p>Dr. Shannon Barton Shared during the January faculty meeting and will be shared during the first faculty meeting of the year.</p>
---	--	---	--	--

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

During the 2015-16 academic year, the department of criminology and criminal justice assessed three outcomes (3.2, 3.3, and 4.3). These outcomes were assessed using the senior thesis and a group presentation in CRIM 427 Dynamics of Crime and Delinquency. Written information was collected for both terms while oral information was collected for Spring only. Faculty voted to reduce the level of expectations from 80-65% approximately 2 years ago. As results indicate, while we have met the expectation of writing by 66% we are still far below the original expectation of 80%. These findings are similar for oral communication skills as well at 69.6%.

Outcome 3.2: Results from this assessment period indicate that students are meeting the expectations of oral communication. Faculty have committed to including more opportunities for individual and group presentations throughout the curriculum. Results from focus groups indicate that students typically do not present in any classes other than their foundational studies communications courses. Efforts will continue to focus on improvement in this area.

Outcome 3.3: The primary effort for data collection has occurred in CRIM 427 Dynamics of Crime and Delinquency. The results show the writing abilities of students still remain inconsistent between terms. As a faculty, we voted to alter our curriculum to include more writing intensive courses earlier in the curriculum. Beginning Fall, 2016, all students will be required to complete CRIM 316 Criminal Justice Reports & Records with a C or better as a prerequisite to enrolling in CRIM 396 Research Methods and CRIM 427 Dynamic of Crime and Delinquency. This course is designed to address the needs of student writing and citation. We anticipate this change will result in the improvement in writing skills for students in the next two to five years.

Outcome 4.3: Data were collected from the senior thesis completed in CRIM 427 Dynamics of Crime and Delinquency. The results indicate that students are not meeting the expectations of applying research driven policies to criminal justice issues. As noted, however, the Spring cohort performed better than the Fall. One explanation for this improvement was the incorporation of developmental assignments allowing students to complete their final project in sections rather than a total paper. This allowed the faculty member to provide feedback for student improvement. To address these problems, the faculty have committed to incorporating more policy driven research projects in CRIM 396 Research Methods. In addition, faculty has proposed to modify the curriculum to include CRIM 375 Victimology as a required course in the major. This proposal will be put forward during the 2016-17 academic year.

During the 2016-17 academic year, faculty will continue to focus on collecting data on the above outcomes as well as Outcome 4.2. With the modifications of the current curriculum, the departmental curriculum committee will review the current Assessment measurements and outcomes and modify as appropriate.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BS in Criminology and Criminal Justice Date: 8.18.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were

				assessed in this cycle.
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.

				<input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process. <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed. <input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important

	plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 – Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary		

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. Learning Outcomes

The three learning outcomes are quite broad. Can you make them more specific? Two of those assessed in the graduate program can serve as models, including “Apply a scientifically supported theoretical premise to current criminal justice issues.”

2. Measures & Performance Goals

The program uses two direct measures, the thesis and a group presentation. Both are appropriate to the outcomes they assess, and the latter is a high-impact practice. Keep in mind that you will need to develop an indirect assessment method as well. What specific knowledge and skills do these measures assess? Next year, be sure to summarize them, and share the rubrics you’re using via the college’s Blackboard site. Last, I understand the rationale for decreasing the program’s performance standards, but I would encourage you to reconsider: Right now, you’re suggesting that it’s all right that one-third of your students are not meeting expectations. Why not set a higher standard and develop a really detailed plan to help students achieve it?

3. Results

Students met the standards set for two of the three artifacts assessed. Numerical results are clearly detailed. But what do they tell you specifically about what students know and can do well/less well?

4. Engagement & Improvement

One faculty member is responsible for collecting, analyzing, and sharing assessment results with the larger faculty, which appears to happen regularly. Part Two shows that the faculty use these results to plan general means of improving learning, including making curriculum revisions that require students to complete writing-intensive courses earlier and earn at least a C in an important prerequisite course. One reason why knowing exactly what students can do well/less well is that it ensures they understand what their problem is and enables you to develop specific, measurable action plans that may make a difference.

I look forward to hearing more about the results of your efforts to improve student learning!