

## Program Learning Outcomes Report Summary 2018

The following table summarizes the assessment of PLOs for the 2018 program for assessment cycle (year). 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.

<b>Program</b>	Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice
<b>Assessment Period</b>	Summer 2017 through Spring 2018
<b>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</b>	<p>PLO 2: Develop professional competencies in criminal justice, including an understanding of the various components of the field.</p> <p>PLO 6: Apply principles of Christian ethics in response to ethical dilemmas and issues within the field of Criminal Justice.</p>
<b>Closing the loop (from the last time these same PLOs were assessed)</b>	<p>PLO 2: N/A First time they were reviewed</p> <p>PLO 6: N/A First time they were reviewed</p>
<b>Standards of Success</b>	<p>PLO 2: 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 6: 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>
<b>Evidence</b>	<p>PLO 2: The artifact is the Capstone Assignment, Part 3 from CRJU340 Critical Issues in Criminal Justice.</p> <p>A total of 14 student artifacts were assessed, pulled from 15 students who took the course. The 14 students represent 100% of the BSCJ students who took the course.</p> <p>PLO 6: The artifact is the Signature Assignment (part 3) from CRJU 350 Criminal Justice Ethics.</p> <p>A total of 16 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. One student did not complete the assignment.</p>
<b>Assessment Tool</b>	<p>PLO 2: 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 received 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 6: 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 received 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>
<b>Assessors</b>	<p>Dr. Patricia Drown Mr. Mark Murtha Dr. Brant Himes</p>
<b>Results</b>	<p>PLO 2 Response Table for PLO 2 indicates 14 artifacts were assessed.</p> <p>15 artifacts were collected, one was used for the interrater reliability exercise, leaving 14 to be assessed.</p> <p>Of the 14 assessments, the assessors differed on five, requiring a tie-breaker assessor, Dr. Brant Himes.</p> <p>The result was that 12 artifacts passed, and 2 failed, for a success rate of 85.71%.</p> <p>The program achieved its aggregate standard for success for this PLO (80%).</p> <p>PLO 6 Response Table for PLO 6 indicates 15 artifacts were assessed.</p> <p>16 artifacts were collected, one was used for the interrater reliability exercise, leaving 15 to be assessed.</p> <p>Of the 15 assessments, the assessors differed on one, requiring a tie-breaker assessor, Dr. Brant Himes.</p> <p>The result was that 13 artifacts passed, and 2 failed, for a success rate of 86.6%.</p>

	<p>The program achieved its aggregate standard for success for this PLO (80%).</p>
<b>Discussion of Results</b>	<p>PLO 2 The assessors recommend a review of the appropriateness of the assignment, as it appears too narrow in scope for the focus of the PLO.</p> <p>A significant discrepancy between the assignment description/requirements as laid out in the course shell and the scoring rubric in the syllabus were discovered. Review and alignment between the course shell assignment description/requirements and the syllabus is warranted.</p> <p>Completing an assessment two years after the data was generated leads to the data being dated and corrupted. Any program improvement related to the assessment is already two years old, and most likely not very relevant.</p> <p>PLO 6 N/A Since the PLO passed, no changes are recommended</p>
<b>Proposed Changes</b>	<p>PLO 2 Ultimately, the assignment may be revised to better fit the focus of the PLO.</p> <p>If not revised, a review and alignment between the course shell assignment description/requirements and the syllabus is warranted.</p> <p>PLO 6 N/A Since the PLO passed, no changes are recommended</p>
<b>Rationale for Proposed Changes</b>	<p>PLO 2: A new assignment/artifact may be more appropriate in addressing the scope of the PLO.</p> <p>The second proposed change will lead to a more seamless grading of the assignment due to a better consistency between the syllabus grading rubric and the assignment description/requirements in the course shell.</p> <p>Relatedly, the proposed change will lead to more seamless artifact assessment</p> <p>PLO 6 N/A Since the PLO passed, no changes are recommended</p>
<b>Financial Resources</b>	<p>PLO 2: Moderate Course Revision</p>



<b>Required</b>	PLO 6: NA, no changes are recommended
<b>Annual Learning Report Approved</b>	Approved by the Educational Effectiveness Committee on May 12, 2021
<b>Follow Up (Closing the Loop for PLOS assessed in previous assessment cycle)</b>	N/A While this report was to have been completed at the end of the 2018 academic year, it was not completed until the end of the 2020 year. Prior to 2020, no PLO assessment for the program occurred.