Undergraduate Program-Specific Student Learning Outcome and Success
Annual Report

I. **Program Information**

   Program/Department: *Criminal Justice program in the Behavioral Science Department*
   Department Chair: Christine Shane, Ph.D.
   Department Assessment Committee Contact: For the CJ program: Randall Grometstein, Ph.D.

II. **Program-Specific Student Learning Outcomes (Educational Objectives) Assessed During This Last Academic Year**
   List ALL Program-Specific SLOs first, and the assessment timeline (annual or bi-annual) for assessing each program SLO.

Program SLO Criminal justice program – both traditional and police concentration students	Expected Timing of assessment (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)
Criminal justice knowledge	Annual
Understanding of crime and crime causation	Annual
Critical thinking	Annual
Effective writing	Annual
Moral/ethical reasoning	Annual
Quantitative analysis	Annual

III. SLO Assessment

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the direct methods used to collect information assessing whether students are learning the core sets of knowledge (K), skills (S) and attitudes (A) identified as essential.

Dept. SLO #	Assessment description (exam, observation, national standardized exam, oral presentation with rubric, etc.)	When assessment was administered in student program (internship, 4th year, 1st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)
All 6 outcomes from Table II	CJ faculty members conduct a blind review (i.e., with student name removed) of student papers from CJ 4100 Colloquium and CJ 3140 Data Analysis. Review is conducted by faculty members who did NOT teach the course.	For Colloquium papers, 4th year; for Data Analysis, 3rd to 4th year	Sample -- one section of each course
	Papers are rated as follows: 1 – Does not meet standard; 2 – Meets standard; 3 – Exceeds standard.		
	Most recent assessment was conducted in the summer of 2016 and report was submitted in October 2016.		

IV. **Summary of Findings:** Briefly summarize the results of the assessments and how do these compare to the goals you have set?

Other than GPA, what data/ evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?
See Table III above. Student papers from the two capstone courses are reviewed.	The CJ faculty as a body meets to consider the evidence and write the assessment report.	In the years since we have been conducting assessments, the following changes have been implemented:
		Changing from a two-course quantitative sequence to a three-course quantitative sequence (i.e., by adding CJ 3135 Advanced Research Methods)
		Petitioning for the university to again provide access to SPSS to teach statistical tests of significance, which may occur as soon as the fall 2017 semester
		Agreeing as a faculty to assign more writing tasks in all CJ

		courses to give students the opportunity to practice
		Refining our assessment rubric for the 2017 assessment to be conducted over the summer of 2017
		With the fall 2017 semester, we will begin collecting assessment data from incoming freshmen to compare to assessment data for seniors, i.e., we will conduct a pre- and a post-test for a particular cohort of students
	AY 18-19	**Due to a faculty retirement, an impending faculty retirement, and the resignation of a faculty member, we have been unable to work on our projected plan to collect new types of data as described above. Please see fuller description in Section VII below.**

V.   SSC Data

Indicate a student success performance measure(s) that the department identified as a key measure that it wants to improve. Freshman retention, bottleneck courses, graduation rates, at risk student retention etc.

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score
Bottleneck course: MATH 1700 Statistics	Students who took our research methods sequence without having taken MATH 1700 – or without having passed it – did just as well as students who had passed it.	We have submitted an AUC proposal that – if approved – will allow CJ majors to take any MATH course, not just statistics; in the three-course quantitative sequence, we will teach students how to perform tests of statistical significance using SPSS or another software package.	
		In AY 18-19, we submitted AUC proposal 011 to allow CJ majors to take any MATH course, not just statistics; it was not approved.	
Bottleneck course: CJ 3145 Advanced Research Methods	Despite the addition of this second course to our research methods sequence, student performance in CJ 3140 Data Analysis failed to improve.	In AY 18-19, we submitted AUC proposal 010, and it was approved by AUC, effective fall 2019.	

VI.   Phase I Data
Indicate department success performance measure(s) that the department identified as a key measure that it wants to improve (from phase 1 data).
Number of graduates, number of majors, credit production, substitutions etc.

Department Performance Measure (data point from Phase 1)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score

VII. Activities and Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department Assessment Plan

Describe any changes in the assessment plan including new SLOs, new assessments.

During AY 18-19, we focused on curriculum redesign. About half of our majors are in the police concentration, and the Municipal Police Training Committee (MPTC), which is responsible for training new police officers, simplified its curriculum. This provided an opportunity for us to reduce the number of required courses for the police concentration, as well as to staff these courses more flexibly, since faculty credentials in courses required in the police concentration must be approved by the MPTC.

As noted above, we are suffering from faculty turnover in Criminal Justice. In AY 17-18, we were fortunate to hire a new faculty member, Dr. Lilian Bobea, who has just finished her first year with us (AY 18-19). However, Dr. Beth Walsh retired at the end of AY 17-18, so our net gain was zero. In the year just ended, AY 18-19, we learned that a junior faculty member, Dr. Phil McCormack, was leaving, and Dr. Marcel Beausoleil announced his upcoming retirement at the end of next year, AY 19-20. An intensive search this year (AY 18-19) resulted in the extension of offers to several candidates, and we are fortunate that one was accepted, by Dr. Dara Drawbridge, who will start teaching at FSU in AY 19-20. Still, at the end of next year (AY 19-20), we will still be operating with a net loss of faculty members. We hope that we will be allowed to conduct another search during the upcoming academic year.

In each of the past four or five semesters, a CJ faculty member has been on sabbatical, and this will continue to be true next year (AY 19-20). Sabbaticals have further eroded our ability to conduct assessment of student learning.

For the future, we will need to consider our approach to assessment as we consider the impact of changes to our curriculum and our staffing.