

BSCJ Program Learning Outcomes Report Summary 2020

The following table summarizes the assessment of PLOs for the BSCJ program for assessment cycle 2020. This process is conducted regularly as part of the annual learning results assessments, which measure two or three PLOs for each program each year. This summary report is to be submitted to the EEC upon its completion.

Program	Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice
Assessment Period	2020
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	<p>PLO 4: Utilize appropriate research concepts and processes in the analysis of criminal justice issues, practices, and trends.</p> <p>PLO 5: Demonstrate critical thinking and creative problem-solving skills.</p>
Closing the loop (from the last time these same PLOs were assessed)	<p>Previous Assessment Cycle:</p> <p>PLO 4: N/A First time they were reviewed</p> <p>PLO 5: N/A First time they were reviewed</p>
Standards of Success	<p>PLO 4:</p> <p>Artifact Proficiency Standard: Each artifact is considered to have met the proficiency standard if two out of the three categories (or if all categories) of measurement achieve at least a “satisfactory” rating according to the artifact assessment rubric</p> <p>Aggregate Achievement Standard: Eighty percent of artifacts will meet the ‘Satisfactory’ level as measured by the ‘Direct Assessment’ rubrics developed for each assessment.</p> <p>Percentage benchmarks at U.S. universities used to measure competency range from 70-80 percent. Hence, a benchmark of 80% is consistent with major universities committed to academic excellence.</p> <p>PLO 5:</p> <p>Artifact Proficiency Standard: Each artifact is considered to have met the proficiency standard if two out of the three categories (or if all categories) of measurement achieve at least a “satisfactory” rating according to the artifact assessment rubric</p> <p>Aggregate Achievement Standard: Eighty percent of artifacts will meet the ‘Satisfactory’ level as measured by the ‘Direct Assessment’ rubrics developed for each assessment.</p> <p>Percentage benchmarks at U.S. universities used to measure competency</p>

	<p>range from 70-80 percent. Hence, a benchmark of 80% is consistent with major universities committed to academic excellence.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>PLO 4: The artifact is the Week 7 response paper from CRJU490 Criminal Justice Capstone/Senior Project</p> <p>A total of 13 student artifacts were assessed, pulled from 15 students who took the course. The 15 students represent 100% of the BSCJ students who took the course. Two students did not complete the assignment.</p> <p>PLO 5: The artifact is the Final assignment from CRJU 450 Forensics, Final Assignment.</p> <p>A total of 13 student artifacts were assessed, pulled from 17 students who took the course. The 17 students represent 100% of the BSCJ students who took the course. Four students did not complete the assignment.</p>
<p>Assessment Tool</p>	<p>PLO 4: A standardized rubric was created using the assignment rubric as a template. The assessors developed the rubric after creating a draft and then participating in an interrater reliability exercise.</p> <p>Each artifact was evaluated according to the various elements of the rubric. Bullet points within the rubric that most closely corresponded to the artifact being assessed, as determined by the assessor, were selected by the assessor. The artifact was determined to have passed if the majority of the selected bullets were either in the "Satisfactory" or "Mastered" column, and two out of the three assessment categories receiving a passing "grade."</p> <p>The electronic version of the rubric included formulas to calculate, and response tables to show pass rates of the PLO by both individual artifact proficiency and aggregate achievement.</p> <p>PLO 5: A standardized rubric was created using the assignment rubric as a template. The assessors developed the rubric after creating a draft and then participating in an interrater reliability exercise.</p> <p>Each artifact was evaluated according to the various elements of the rubric. Bullet points within the rubric that most closely corresponded to the artifact being assessed, as determined by the assessor, were selected by the assessor. The artifact was determined to have passed if the majority of the selected bullets were either in the "Satisfactory" or "Mastered" column, and two out of the three assessment categories receiving a passing "grade."</p>

	<p>The electronic version of the rubric included formulas to calculate, and response tables to show, pass rates of the PLO by both individual artifact proficiency and aggregate achievement</p>
Assessors	<p>Mr. Mark Murtha Dr. Patricia Drown Dr. Brant Himes</p>
Results	<p>PLO 4 Response Table for PLO 4 indicates 12 artifacts were assessed.</p> <p>13 artifacts were collected, one was used for the interrater reliability exercise, leaving 12 to be assessed.</p> <p>Of the 12 assessments, the assessors differed on two, requiring a tie-breaker assessor, Dr. Brant Himes.</p> <p>The result was that 9 artifacts passed, and 3 failed, for a success rate of 75%.</p> <p>The program failed to achieve its aggregate standard for success for this PLO (80%).</p> <p>PLO 5 Response Table for PLO 5 indicates 12 artifacts were assessed.</p> <p>13 artifacts were collected, all were assessed since no interrater reliability exercise was conducted</p> <p>Of the 13 assessments, the assessors differed on three, requiring a tie-breaker assessor, Dr. Brant Himes.</p> <p>The result was that 11 artifacts passed, and 2 failed, for a success rate of 85%.</p> <p>The program achieved 85 its aggregate standard for success for this PLO (80%)</p>
Discussion of Results	<p>PLO 4 Students need direction in recognizing and accessing scholarly, peer-reviewed articles, rather than popular sources, before they can proceed to appropriate analysis.</p> <p>Students need direction and guidance related to scholarly writing.</p> <p>PLO 5</p>

	N/A Since the PLO passed, no changes are recommended
Proposed Changes	<p>PLO 4 Provide direction in recognizing and accessing scholarly, peer-reviewed articles, rather than popular sources, before they can proceed to appropriate analysis.</p> <p>Provide direction and guidance related to scholarly writing.</p> <p>Alignment between assignment requirements and assignment rubrics should be reviewed to address whether the assignment rubric was grading assignment requirements.</p> <p>PLO 5 N/A Since the PLO passed, no changes are recommended</p>
Rationale for Proposed Changes	<p>PLO 4 PLO results indicated that students appear to have a general understanding of the assignment requirements, but the assignment directions appear to lack the specificity and details required. A review of the assignment requirements and rubric should create clearer direction.</p> <p>The PLO results indicate the students are lacking general scholarly research skills, as well as writing skills. Improving scholarly research skills and writing skills should improve PLO assessment results.</p> <p>PLO 5 N/A Since the PLO passed, no changes are recommended</p>
Financial Resources Required	0
Annual Learning Report for BSCJ Approved	Approved by the Educational Effectiveness Committee on March 10, 2021
Follow Up (Closing the Loop for PLOS assessed in previous assessment cycle)	NA. This the first year any of the BSCJ PLOs have been assessed.