

Program Learning Outcomes Report Summary 2019

The following table summarizes the assessment of PLOs for the CRJU program for assessment cycle 2019. 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 (CRJU)
Assessment Period	2019 Academic Year
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	<p>PLO 1: Demonstrate the ability to integrate biblical concepts and principles with discipline-specific topics and domains.</p> <p>PLO 3: Demonstrate effective written communication skills</p>
Closing the loop (from the last time these same PLOs were assessed)	<p>Previous Assessment Cycle:</p> <p>PLO 1: N/A First time they were reviewed</p> <p>PLO 3: N/A First time they were reviewed</p>
Standards of Success	<p>PLO 1: 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 3: 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>Evidence</p>	<p>PLO 1: The artifact is the Faith Integration Essay from CRJU370 The Adjudication Function.</p> <p>A total of 11 student artifacts were pulled from 14 students who took the course. Three students did not complete the assignment. The 14 students represent 100% of the BSCJ students who took the course.</p> <p>PLO 3: The artifact is the Week 4 Response Paper from CRJU 380 Professional Writing</p> <p>A total of 20 student artifacts were pulled from 22 students who took the course. Two students did not complete the assignment. The 22 students represent 100% of the BSCJ students who took the course.</p>
<p>Assessment Tool</p>	<p>PLO 1: 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 3: 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>PLO 1 and PLO 3:</p> <p>Dr. Craig Brewer, Assistant Dean Mr. Gary Clifford, assessor Mr. Mark Murtha, assessor Dr. Brant Himes, assessor Dr. John Washatka, report writer</p>
Results	<p>PLO 1: Response Table for PLO 1 indicates 10 artifacts were assessed.</p> <p>11 artifacts were collected, one was used for the interrater reliability exercise, leaving 10 to be assessed.</p> <p>Of the 10 assessments, the assessors differed on two, requiring a tie-breaker assessor, Dr. Brant Himes.</p> <p>The result was that 10 artifacts passed, and none failed, for a success rate of 100%.</p> <p>The program met its aggregate standard for success for this PLO (80%).</p> <p>PLO 3: Response Table for PLO 3 indicates 19 artifacts were assessed.</p> <p>20 artifacts were collected, one was used for the interrater reliability exercise, leaving 19 to be assessed.</p> <p>Of the 19 assessments, the assessors differed on three, requiring a tie-breaker assessor, Dr. Brant Himes.</p> <p>The result was that 16 artifacts passed, and three failed, for a success rate of 84.21%.</p> <p>The program met its aggregate standard for success for this PLO (80%).</p>
Discussion of Results	<p>PLO 1: N/A Since the PLO passed, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>In addition, the assessment for 2019 was completed in 2021, in anticipation of completing a BSCJ program review in 2021.</p> <p>The results of the 2019 assessment may be dated, as changes may have occurred in the assignment used for the artifact assessment after the 2019 academic year.</p>



	<p>The assessment results indicate what was going on only in 2019.</p> <p>PLO 3: N/A Since the PLO passed, no changes are recommended.</p> <p>In addition, the assessment for 2019 was completed in 2021, in anticipation of completing a BSCJ program review in 2021.</p> <p>The results of the 2019 assessment may be dated, as changes may have occurred in the assignment used for the artifact assessment after the 2019 academic year.</p> <p>The assessment results indicate what was going on only in 2019.</p>
Proposed Changes	<p>PLO 1: N/A Since the PLO passed and the assessment itself is dated, no changes are recommended</p> <p>PLO 3: N/A Since the PLO passed and the assessment itself is dated, no changes are recommended</p>
Rationale for Proposed Changes	<p>PLO 1: N/A Since the PLO passed and the assessment itself is dated, no changes are recommended</p> <p>PLO 3: N/A Since the PLO passed and the assessment itself is dated, no changes are recommended</p>
Financial Resources Required	<p>PLO 1 and 3: N/A Since the PLO passed and the assessment itself is dated, no changes are recommended</p>
Annual Learning Report Approved	<p>Approved by the Educational Effectiveness Committee on April 13, 2022</p>
Follow Up (Closing the Loop for PLOS assessed in previous assessment cycle)	<p>PLO 2</p> <p>The 2018 assessment report was approved by the EEC May 12, 2021.</p> <p>Not enough time has elapsed for changes to be considered and scheduled into future plans.</p> <p>In addition, it is anticipated that the BSCJ program review will address the 2018 assessment findings/proposed changes.</p> <p>PLO 6: N/A Since the PLO passed, no changes are recommended</p>