

Date Received _____

**CUH Program
Annual Assessment Report
Summary**

1. Program Information:

Division	Behavioral Sciences
Program	Criminology & Criminal Justice
Level	Graduate
Academic Year	2012-2013
Submitted by	Joe Allen
Phone/email	x4879; joseph.allen@chaminade.edu
Date Submitted	10/1/13

2. Outcomes Assessed and Program Evaluation.

Outcomes assessed for this AY	Assessment Process	Access to/Archive of Results
All Program Learning Outcomes (N = 14 students)	Comprehensive/Exit Exam (52 items; multiple choice & true-false format)	Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site; raw data on Joe Allen's computer
Student Self-Assessment of Knowledge, Understanding, and Abilities (N = 14 students)	Exit Survey (70 items; Likert scale format)	Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site; raw data on Joe Allen's computer
Student Evaluation of MSCJA Program Advising & Faculty (N = 14 students)	Exit Survey (3 items; Likert scale format)	Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site; raw data on Joe Allen's computer
Student Evaluation of MSCJA Program & Integration of Marianist Values (N = 14 students)	Exit Survey (5 items; Likert scale format)	Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site; raw data on Joe Allen's computer

3. Results, concerns and discoveries. Make sure appropriate statistical notations are utilized (N size, mean, standard deviation, frequency distribution, etc). What conclusions or discoveries were made from these results?

Results & Discoveries																					
1. Overall Comprehensive/Exit Exam Results (N=14): During the most recent assessment, students averaged an overall score of 82.4%.																					
2. Specific Comprehensive/Exit Exam Results (N=12): Most Recent Assessment Cycle																					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students scored less than the targeted 70% rate in only one course, CJA 740. The below table displays the percentage of correct responses by specific course. 																					
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Course</th> <th>% Correct</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>604</td> <td>85.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>605</td> <td>85.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>606</td> <td>85.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>610</td> <td>82.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>612</td> <td>83.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>740</td> <td>64.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>766</td> <td>95.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>790</td> <td>86.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>82.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Course	% Correct	604	85.2%	605	85.0%	606	85.6%	610	82.0%	612	83.8%	740	64.0%	766	95.8%	790	86.0%	TOTAL	82.4%
Course	% Correct																				
604	85.2%																				
605	85.0%																				
606	85.6%																				
610	82.0%																				
612	83.8%																				
740	64.0%																				
766	95.8%																				
790	86.0%																				
TOTAL	82.4%																				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive/exit exam $\mu = 47.5/55.3$, $\sigma = 5.2$, $r = .824$. 																					
3. Student Self-Assessment of Knowledge, Understanding, and Abilities (N=14): During the most recent assessment, student knowledge self-assessment and ratings of the program were generally high across all items ($\mu = 4.38$). Overall average for specific items that were below 4.0 on the 1-5 scale were: “I have the ability to cope with problems in corrections.”(3.54), “I know the basic structure of law enforcement on the city level.”(3.56), “I know the basic structure of law enforcement on the county level.”(3.42), “I know the basic structure of law enforcement on the state level.”(3.70), “I understand the expertise required for positions in private security organizations.”(3.46), and “I understand the expertise required for positions in private correctional organizations.” (3.88)																					
4. Feedback on MSCJA Program (N=14): During the most recent assessment cycle, student ratings of faculty/administration were in line with previous periods. The mean for each assessed items was 4.54 or above, with the overall mean being 4.56. On the 5-point scale, the mean for ‘I found academic advising for MSCJA students readily available and useful’ was 4.24.																					
5. Feedback on MSCJA Program & Marianist Values (N=14): During the most recent assessment, student ratings of the program’s integration of the Marianist were in line with previous periods. The mean for each assessed items was 4.64 or above, with the overall mean being 4.72.																					

Conclusions & Concerns	
1.	Assessment of PLOs via comprehensive/exit exam show that the target rate of 70% was not met in the most recent cycle through the following course: CJA 740. The percentage of correct response for this course was 64.0%.
2.	Student evaluation of the CCJ Program is solid as is their assessment of the program and its integration of the Marianist values.
3.	Again, it is suggested that a more formalized 'trigger' be implemented for students to complete the exit materials. A number of students did not complete the exit materials due to clearance information not being forwarded to the assessment lead by the advisors in all cases. One potential way to remedy this situation is to expand the assessment activities to emulate that of the undergraduate experience. Given that the graduate students have half of their requirements as electives, a capstone course could be created and/or CJA 680 used in the meantime. Students would be required then to take this course in their last term. As it stands currently, the gravitas to complete the materials and perform well is dampened. One other possible avenue to improve this process would be to have the department handle all clearances once completed by faculty and their advisees. The department would then be the initiator of the exit assessment process.
4.	While the targeted 70% correct response rate is exceeded in all courses except one, it is recommended that exit exam questions be revisited to ensure some level of variance in CJA 766. It is recommended that the items for CJA 766 be examined to gauge that an appropriate level of difficulty exists. The scoring results are very high (95.8%) and in the last assessment cycle, the results were 98.6%.

4. Use of Results. Did the results lead to program changes? If so, describe the changes made. If not, describe why changes were not needed.

1.	Assessment of PLOs via comprehensive/exit exam: for courses where students scored less than 70% overall, the department will further examine if: (1) items need to be revised to better reflect student learning outcomes, (2) course delivery/instruction in these areas needs to be improved, and/or (3) student learning outcomes as measured by the current assessment items are in fact reflective of desired student learning programmatic outcomes.
2.	Assessment of PLOs via comprehensive/exit exam: Standard deviation and Alpha levels need to be watched. It is unsure if these are reflections of the instruments or student scoring anomalies. If future data are not to satisfactory levels in the future, the instrument may need to be re-examined.
3.	Student evaluation of the MSCJA Program & integration of the Marianist values: no program changes deemed necessary.
4.	Assessment of PLOs up-and-beyond comprehensive/exit examination: additional direct assessment items have been added to the graduate assessment activities; final products are being collected so that rubrics can be re-visited and scoring methodologies (e.g., inter-rater reliability) can be examined to ensure reliability and validity upon dissemination of data.
5.	Future assessment results will delineate between students who are on-ground and those who complete the program solely online. This will occur subsequent to uniform exit assessment completion rates.

5. Dissemination of results, conclusions, and discoveries. How and with whom were the results shared?

All assessment activities have been disseminated to CCJ faculty, CCJ Program Coordinator, Division Chair and the Provost via e-mail. Results posted to CUH WASC evidence online site.