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—Graduate Program   **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

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? **Graduate Program**	b. (1) What method(s)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?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
Objective 3: To demonstrate written and oral communication skills applicable to the field of criminal justice. 3.3 Organize written information.	A review of responses from student comprehensive examination.	Target for Achievement: Students will be assessed in each category in the following manner: 0 = does not meet expectation 1 = meets expectation 2 = exceeds expectation *Target*: 65% of students will receive a 1 or higher on this objective	Data were collected for organizing written information during Spring, 2016 through the completion of the comprehensive examination. A total of ten students completed the exam. Seventy percent/7 of students completing the exam met or exceeded the expectations of target for achievement. Students did meet the stated expectation.	Dr. Shannon Barton Shared during the January faculty meeting and will be shared during the first faculty meeting of the year.
Objective 4: To demonstrate critical thinking skills. 4.2 Apply a scientifically supported theoretical premise to current criminal justice issues.	A review of responses from student comprehensive examination.	Target for Achievement: Students will be assessed in each category in the following manner: 0 = does not meet expectation 1 = meets expectation 2 = exceeds expectation *Target*: 65% of students will receive a 1 or higher on this objective	Data were collected for organizing written information during Spring, 2016 through the completion of the comprehensive examination. A total of ten students completed the exam. Of those taking the exam, 60%/6 students met or exceeded the target for achievement. The target expectation was not met for	Dr. Shannon Barton Shared during the January faculty meeting and will be shared during the first faculty meeting of the year.

			this objective.	
Objective 6: Engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments. 6.2 Demonstrate ability to apply theories and best practices to real-world scenarios.	A review of responses from student comprehensive examination.	Target for Achievement: Students will be assessed in each category in the following manner: 0 = does not meet expectation 1 = meets expectation 2 = exceeds expectation *Target*: 65% of students will receive a 1 or higher on this objective	Data were collected for organizing written information during Spring, 2016 through the completion of the comprehensive examination. A total of ten students completed the exam. A total of 50%/5 of students met or exceeded the expectation. The target for this objective was not met.	Dr. Shannon Barton Shared during the January faculty meeting and will be shared during the first faculty meeting of the year.

* 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 (3.3, 4.2, and 6.2). These outcomes were assessed using the Graduate Comprehensive Examination. Written information was collected for Spring 2016 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 70% we are still far below the original expectation of 80%. We have failed to meet the expectations of applying theory and scientifically supported responses to a real world criminal justice issue.

Objective 3.3: Results from this assessment period indicate that students are meeting the expectations of oral communication. Faculty have committed to including more opportunities for writing throughout the curriculum providing detailed feedback throughout the process. Efforts will continue to focus on improvement in this area.

Objective 4.2: Results from the assessment indicate that students are not providing detailed scientifically supported evidence to apply the theory to explain a criminal justice issue. The faculty discussed the issues related to writing and application during multiple faculty meetings. Writing will continue to be a focus in the program. The hiring of two new faculty members should assist with alleviating the workload for grading.

Objective 6.2: Results from the assessment indicate that students are not providing detailed evidence to support the application the theory to a real world scenario. The faculty discussed the issues related to writing and application during multiple faculty meetings. Writing will continue to be a focus in the program. The hiring of two new faculty members should assist with alleviating the workload for grading.

During the 2016-17 academic year, faculty will continue to focus on collecting data on the above outcomes as well as Outcome 4.2. The departmental curriculum committee will be reviewing the Graduate Assessment document to determine whether the measures continue to accurately reflect the program.

Degree Program: MS in Criminology and Criminal Justice   Date: 8.19.16

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

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

				☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☐ Some data are being collected and analyzed. ☐ Some results are provided. ☐ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☒ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☒ Data are being collected and analyzed. ☒ Results are provided. ☒ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ 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. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. ☐ 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	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered about previous results or	☒ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. ☐ Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.	☐ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☒ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ☒ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ☐ These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ 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. ☐ Faculty and other important

	plans.	☐ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	Not specific… ☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. ☐ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. ☐ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☒ **Level 1 – Developing**	☐ **Level 2 – Mature**	☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. **Learning Outcomes**
   Two of the three learning outcomes assessed are specific, measurable, program-level outcomes. Can you revise the communication outcome so that it clarifies what you expect? At the least, it should indicate that you expect students to be proficient communicators.

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   The program uses a single direct measure, the comprehensive exam. However, I know very little about its contents, so it is difficult for me to gauge how appropriate it is to the related outcomes—and since you use it to assess three outcomes, it is all the more important that you clarify its appropriateness. I assume that you use three different rubrics to assess the results of a single artifact? As was the case with the undergraduate program, I think your performance standards are too low—even more so for a graduate program. I encourage you to set a higher standard and develop a detailed plan to help students achieve it.

3. **Results**
   Even though standards are low, students met only one out of three. Since what you measure via the comprehensive exam is not clear, the numerical results tell me little. What do the assessments reveal 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 identify very general plans for improving learning, including providing detailed feedback on oral presentations and hiring additional faculty so instructors can spend more time providing feedback. Given that there is substantial room to improve student performance, I hope to see more specific plans for improvement in next year's report.

   Thanks!