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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the M.S. in Criminal Justice is to engage students in generating and applying knowledge and information that is theoretically driven and policy relevant for the fields of criminal justice and criminology. This is accomplished by (1) engaging in research and scholarly activities to address issues of crime and justice affecting diverse populations in urban settings with M.S. students; (2) producing students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for leadership positions in public and private sector agencies that address crime and justice problems; and (3) collaborating with public and private agencies through education, training, and research ventures that enhance our understanding of, and response to, issues associated with crime and the administration of justice. Through these activities, the Department strives to promote basic principles of justice that enhance the criminal justice profession and benefit the community at large.

Goals
G 0: Critical thinking
Students will be critical thinkers with regards to issues of crime and criminal justice.

G 1: Develop knowledge
Students will be knowledgeable about crime and criminal justice systems and processes.

G 2: Preparation for leadership positions
Students will be prepared for leadership positions in public and private sector agencies that address crime and justice issues.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data (G: 0) (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to critically analyze crime and justice issues and/or information, utilizing theoretical, methodological, and statistical skill bases.

SLO 2: Apply research and statistical skills (G: 0) (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to apply acquired research and statistical skill bases to evaluate the quality of scholarly products and their contribution to the field of criminology and criminal justice.

SLO 3: Understand theory (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)

Strategic Plan Associations
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical knowledge base in criminology and criminal justice.

**SLO 5: Understand how systems & processes interact (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**
Students will be able to provide an integrated view of crime and criminal justice systems and processes and how the components interact and intersect to provide coordinated justice administration.

**SLO 6: Apply theory and terminology (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)**
Students will be able to apply learned terminology and theory to real-world situations that both relate to and expand outside the fields of criminology and criminal justice.

**SLO 7: Communicate effectively (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)**
Students will be able to effectively communicate, in oral and written form, their understanding and analyses of crime and justice issues as they apply their knowledge to real-world problems and questions.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Assessment Survey of Non-thesis students (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7)**
This is a 16 item faculty-rated assessment instrument used to evaluate non-thesis students' performance in the capstone course's final project. The items are rated on a 4 point scale, ranging from poor to excellent. The instrument is completed by members of the graduate committee shortly after the end of the course.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data**
The desired performance is to have 100% of students with an average score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) across the three items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better across the three items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) across the three items.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy. Students worked in teams. Two teams contained CJ students. Those two projects were scored by the graduate committee using the attached rubric. One team averaged a 3.7 on the items that comprised this measure. The other team averaged a 3 on the items that comprised this measure.

**Target for O2: Apply research and statistical skills**
The desired performance is to have 100% of students with an average score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) across the two items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better across the two items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) across the two items.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**
This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy. Students worked in teams. Two teams contained CJ students. Those two projects were scored by the graduate committee using the attached rubric. Both teams averaged 3.0 on the items that measured this outcome.

**Target for O3: Understand theory**

The desired performance is to have 100% of students with a score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) on the two items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better on the items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) on the items.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy. Since the course was not designed by a CJ faculty member, this outcome was not covered and these measures are not applicable this year.

**Target for O5: Understand how systems & processes interact**

The desired performance is to have 100% of students with a score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) across the two items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better across the two items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) across the two items.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy. Students worked in teams. Two teams contained CJ students. Those two projects were scored by the graduate committee using the attached rubric. Both teams averaged 3.0 on the items that measure this outcome.

**Target for O6: Apply theory and terminology**

The desired performance is to have 100% of students with a score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) across the three items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better across the three items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) across the three items.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy. Since the course was not taught by a CJ faculty member and did not focus on these issues, the measures for this outcome are not applicable.

**Target for O7: Communicate effectively**

The desired performance is to have 100% of students with a score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) across the four items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better across the four items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) across the four items.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Partially Met**

This year, the capstone course was offered by the department of Public Management and Policy.
Policy. Students worked in teams. Two teams contained CJ students. Those two projects were scored by the graduate committee using the attached rubric. Both teams averaged 3.5 on the items that measure this outcome.

M 2: Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7)
The Thesis knowledge assessment survey is a 21-item faculty-rated questionnaire that measures the degree to which students who defended their thesis successfully have met the student learning outcomes. The questionnaire is completed by the student's thesis supervisor. Items are based on a 4 point scale that ranges from poor to excellent. Thesis directors use the survey instrument to rate the thesis product on 21 different dimensions.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data
The desired performance is to have at least 100% of students with an average rating score of 2 or higher, 60% of students with an average rating of 3 or higher and 20% of students with an average score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Of the 5 students who completed theses this year, 100% averaged a 2 or better on the items that measure this outcome. 4 of the students (80%) averaged a 3 or better across the items that measure this outcome. 2 students (40%) averaged a 4 on the items that measure this outcome.

Target for O2: Apply research and statistical skills
The desired performance is to have at least 100% of students with an average rating score of 2 or higher, 60% of students with an average rating of 3 or higher and 20% of students with an average score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Of the 5 students who completed a thesis this year, 100% averaged a 2 or better on the items that measure this outcome. 4 of the students (80%) averaged a 3 or better on the items that measure this outcome and 3 (60%) averaged a 4 on the items that measure this outcome.

Target for O3: Understand theory
The desired performance is to have at least 100% of students with an average rating score of 2 or higher, 60% of students with an average rating of 3 or higher and 20% of students with an average score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met
Of the 5 students who completed theses this semester, all 5 (100%) averaged a 2 or better on the items measure this outcome. 4 of the 5 (80%) averaged a 4 on the items that measure this objective.

Target for O5: Understand how systems & processes interact
The desired performance is to have at least 100% of students with an average rating score of 2 or higher, 60% of students with an average rating of 3 or higher and 20% of students with an
average score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 5 students who completed a thesis this semester, 3 out of the 3 who received scores on this item (100%) received a score of 4. Two students were scored as N/A for this item.

**Target for O6: Apply theory and terminology**

The desired performance is to have at least 100% of students with an average rating score of 2 or higher, 60% of students with an average rating of 3 or higher and 20% of students with an average score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 5 students who completed a thesis this year, 5 (100%) averaged a 2 or higher on the items that measure this outcome on the thesis assessment rubric, as scored by faculty. Four of the students (80%) averaged a 4 on the items that measure this outcome.

**Target for O7: Communicate effectively**

The desired performance is to have at least 100% of students with an average rating score of 2 or higher, 60% of students with an average rating of 3 or higher and 20% of students with an average score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

Of the 5 students who completed a thesis this year, all 5 (100%) scored a 2 or higher on the item that measures this outcome. 4 of the 5 (80%) scored a 4 on this item.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Develop Embedded Measures in Core Courses**

The current assessment of non-thesis students in the Masters program is based solely on indicators derived from the capstone course. Later this year, we will begin to work with faculty who teach core courses to develop measures that can be embedded in at least three of these courses and ways in which these measures can be retrieved, stored and analyzed by the graduate coordinator. Data on thesis students will be collected as well.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** end of Fall semester 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate committee and faculty who teach statistics, methods and theory

**Develop Rubric for assessing non-thesis students**

While our students continue to meet or exceed our target levels for learning outcomes, assessment of outcomes based on the revised capstone course suggested the need for a more
reliable assessment tool than what is currently being used. The rubric will focus on the same learning outcomes as have already been established, but will provide more detail for assigning numerical scores. Once the rubric has been developed multiple members of the graduate committee can assess final papers in the capstone course in order to provide increased reliability.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** end of Spring semester 2010  
**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate committee

**Re-design the instrument used for assessing thesis students**

Faculty have noted that the current instrument used to evaluate the thesis students does not seem to work well, leading to several items that cannot be rated (resulting in missing data for some items), and consequently low reliabilities for outcome measures. Further, the low numbers of students that we have completing theses and the low number of items that are being answered by faculty (missing data) make it difficult to reach our very high performance targets. As suggested by the GAC we have set up a tiered target and our targets are being partially met, but some of the higher targets are not being met. This may be the result of small sample sizes (low reliability and missing data). We plan to revise the thesis instrument this year, with those limitations in mind.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
| Measure: Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students | Outcome/Objective: Apply research and statistical skills  
| | Apply theory and terminology | Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data | Understand how systems & processes interact | Understand theory  
**Implementation Description:** We have revised the thesis targets. This year, we will revise and pilot the new instrument.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate committee

**Students are now writing a literature review in their first year in the program**

This is the first time in several years that we have not met our achievement target for this outcome. The analysis shows that the students were weakest on the item "The student is comfortable with his or her ability to write about crime and justice issues. Last year our required course "Crime and the Criminal Justice System" was re-vamped to require students to work extensively on writing a literature review on a criminal justice topic and I believe that this will strengthen their writing skills in this area. The two students that did not perform well on this outcome took the course before the changes were made.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Changes were made to the course and implemented in Fall 2010 for last year's cohort.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty teaching CRJU 7010
Course changes
Both CRJU 7010 and CRJU 8980 will have increased focus on problem identification, problem solving, identifying stakeholders, and mapping and planning CJ processes. This will help students be better prepared for the capstone experience.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment Survey of Non-thesis students | Outcome/Objective: Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data | Understand how systems & processes interact

Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors for CRJU 7010 and CRJU 8980
Additional Resources: None

Edit Capstone Rubric
Add a not applicable option, since not all of the items are assessed for each student's project. Add an assessment of problem solving, identifying stakeholders, and planning to assess leadership. These options are required now that the capstone is no longer being offered by CJ faculty members and is instead being taught by a member of the PMAP faculty.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment Survey of Non-thesis students | Outcome/Objective: Apply research and statistical skills | Apply theory and terminology | Communicate effectively | Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data | Understand how systems & processes interact | Understand theory

Projected Completion Date: 03/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No changes to the assessment process were made this year. We anticipate changes may be made to accommodate changes to our capstone course delivery. It is now being offered through a cross-listed course with PMAP, which will necessitate changes to our non-thesis capstone assessment process.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes
and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Much of the work we have done to create successful thesis track students worked as intended. The objectives for thesis students were all met this year. We plan to focus on the capstone students next. This is particularly important, since our capstone course is now cross-listed with PMAP and is being taught by a faculty member in that unit.