Annual Department Assessment Report Format
2005 Calendar Year
Report Deadline: April 17, 2006

Department: CJAD
Name of Submitter: Barry R. Langford
Date: 4/26/06

1. Degree Program BA/BS-Criminal Justice  ☒ Undergraduate  ☐ Graduate

2. Assessment Instruments

☒ AM Form  ☒ MFT  ☐ Department Senior Test
☐ Portfolio  ☐ Survey  ☐ Other _____

3. Students Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHE</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Results of assessment:

A. Assessment of major form: My review of all submitted forms suggest that the vast majority of students in CJAD 495 are well equipped in the major content areas in Criminal Justice, and that they have the necessary skills to succeed in the job market. There are occasional instances where student enters CJAD 495 as deficient in one content area (typically corrections and/or juvenile justice), and a small percentage of students are weak in one or more communication skills. This is the first year using the slightly revised Assessment of Major form. A common program strength across the board is the depth and breadth of our curriculum, and the quality of our faculty. There were a few forms which mentioned program weaknesses that may merit further study. A few evaluators suggested that there is redundancy in a few areas of our curriculum. It was also suggested on a few forms that we need to emphasize writing and communication skills more often in our lower level courses, and that we need to emphasize technology more.
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B. Major Field Test

The national mean scaled score was a 152 Results from each site are provided below. Sites having at least five students taking the MFT also appear with a content subscore for each assessment area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Assessment Indicator</th>
<th>Mean Percent Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)Home campus day</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Law</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Police</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Court System</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methodology &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score at site: 154-</td>
<td>testing of 10 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)Home campus evening</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Law</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Police</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Court System</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methodology &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score at site: 157.3-</td>
<td>testing of 15 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)Orlando</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Law</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Police</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Court System</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methodology &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score at site: 152.6-</td>
<td>testing of 9 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)Orlando</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Law</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Police</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Court System</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methodology &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score at site: 147.5-</td>
<td>testing of 6 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>The Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score at site: 160-testing of 10 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean score at site: 160-testing of 15 students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>The Law</th>
<th>The Police</th>
<th>Corrections</th>
<th>The Court System</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Research Methodology &amp; Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson City</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score at site: 155-testing of 5 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean score at site: 157-testing of 9 students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>The Law</th>
<th>The Police</th>
<th>Corrections</th>
<th>The Court system</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Research methodology and Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score at site: 157-testing of 9 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean score at site: 149.6-testing of 8 students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>The Law</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Corrections</th>
<th>The Court System</th>
<th>Critical thinking</th>
<th>Research methodology and Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Leonard Wood</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score at site: 149.6-testing of 8 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean score at site: 154-testing of 5 students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>The Law</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Corrections</th>
<th>The Court System</th>
<th>Critical thinking</th>
<th>Research methodology and Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score at site: 154-testing of 5 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(10) St Louis
Theory 26.6
The Law 46.8
Police 42.2
Corrections 43.7
The Court system 50.8
Critical thinking 44.4
Research methodology and Statistics 27.9
Mean score at site: 145.4-testing of 10 students

(11) Online
Theory 40.5
The Law 63.3
Police 65.5
Corrections 63.7
The Court system 60.7
Critical thinking 59.7
Research methodology and Statistics 58.3
Mean score at site: 164.5-testing of 6 students

(12) Online
Theory 34.7
The Law 63.1
Police 61.6
Corrections 64
The Court system 66.3
Critical thinking 59.9
Research methodology and Statistics 51.3
Mean score at site: 163.4-testing of 7 students

(13) Online
Theory 31.0
The Law 64.1
Police 60.1
Corrections 58.9
The Court system 61.2
Critical thinking 55.2
Research methodology and Statistics 51.7
Mean score at site: 160-testing of 10 students

(14) Texas
Theory 29.1
The Law 55.0
Police 53.5
Corrections 54.6
The Court system 54.7
Critical thinking 47.7
Research methodology and Statistics 40.8
Mean score at site: 153.4-testing of 12 students
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(15) Colorado Theory 37.8
   The Law 54.8
   Police 49.3
   Corrections 49
   The Court system 61.1
   Critical thinking 54.8
   Research methodology and Statistics 36.2

Mean score at site: 154.8-testing of 8 students

(16) Home campus evening Theory 34.2
   The Law 64.2
   Police 58.4
   Corrections 60.6
   The Court system 65.0
   Critical thinking 61.2
   Research methodology and Statistics 61.6

Mean score at site: 162-testing of 5 students

(17) Online Theory 36.5
   The Law 61.0
   Police 58.8
   Corrections 60.3
   The Court system 59.5
   Critical thinking 58.2
   Research methodology and Statistics 48.5

Mean score at site: 160.3 testing of 6 students

(18) Alabama Mean score at site: 138 Content area sub score not provided-testing of 2 students

(19) Elgin, Illinois Mean score at site: 154.5 Content area sub score not provided-2 students tested

(20) Rolla Mean score at site: 172 Content area sub score not provided-testing of 1 student

(21) Orlando Mean score at site: 143 Content area sub score not provided-testing of 1 student
(22) Jefferson City Mean score at site: 171  Content area sub score not provided-
testing of 1 student

(23) Hancock Field Mean score at site: 173  Content area sub score not provided-
testing of 1 student

(24) Hancock Field Mean score at site: 143.5  Content area sub score not
provided-testing of 1 student

(25) Rolla Mean score at site: 165  Content area sub score not provided-
testing of 1 student

(26) Fort Leonard Wood Mean score at site: 158.5  Content area sub score not
provided-testing of 4 students

(27) San Luis Obispo Mean score at site: 156  Content area sub score not provided-
1 student tested

(28) Coast Guard Island, Cal Mean score at site: 168.2  Content area sub score not
provided-testing of 4 students

(29) San Luis Obispo Mean score at site: 170  Content area sub score not provided-1
student tested

(30) St Louis Mean score at site: 171  Content area sub score not provided-1 student
tested

(31) Marysville, Wa Mean score at site: 148.6  Content area sub score not provided-1
student tested

(32) New York Mean scaled score at site: 147  Content area sub score not provided-3
students tested

5. Faculty analysis of results (extent to which learning goals were met):
   Our learning goals are as follows:

   • To broaden the student’s understanding of and appreciation of the complex
     relationship between Police, Courts, and Corrections in the criminal justice system.
   • To empower students in advocating the need for reform when necessary.
   • To enhance the student’s understanding of the roles and functions of Police, Courts,
     and Corrections in the criminal Justice System and to heighten the student’s
     sensitivity to the limitations placed on these agencies.
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• To prepare students for entry level careers in the Criminal Justice field through the integration and synthesis of criminal justice coursework.
• To enhance knowledge and understanding of modern criminal justice practices

I believe our Assessment activities reflect that our program is meeting its designated learning goals. Our students continue to perform well on the MFT. We have enhanced our curriculum to include more Corrections type courses. Our test scores in this area have improved.

6. Recommendations for improvement:
The following sites had MFT scores below the National average: St Louis, Orlando, and Fort Leonard Wood. RECOMMENDATIONS: Continue to emphasize the importance of the MFT in CJAD 495. Review the faculty loads and course sequencing at troubled sites. Consider a Chair visit to troubled sites. Encourage faculty at troubled sites to attend FIC. We will closely examine the Assessment of Major forms next year for continuing signs of curriculum redundancy. We have a program review next year. We look forward to hearing input from our review teams.
Annual Department Assessment Report Format  
2005 Calendar Year  
Report Deadline: April 17, 2006

Department: SOWK

Name of Submitter: Barry R. Langford

Date: 4/26/06

1. Degree Program BSW  ☑ Undergraduate   ☑ Graduate

2. Assessment Instruments

   ☑ AM Form   ☐ MFT   ☐ Department Senior Test
   ☐ Portfolio   ☐ Survey   ☑ Other Paper and Final Field evaluation in
                     SOWK 495

3. Students Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Results of assessment:
The learning goals are as follows:

   1. Apply critical thinking skills within the context of professional social work practice.
   2. Understand the value base of the profession and its ethical standards and principles, and practice accordingly.
   3. Practice without discrimination and with respect, knowledge, and skills related to clients' age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation
   4. Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and apply strategies of advocacy and social change that advance social and economic justice.
   5. Understand and interpret the history of the social work profession and its contemporary structures and issues.
   6. Apply the knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice with systems of all sizes.
   7. Use theoretical frameworks supported by empirical evidence to understand individual
development and behavior across the life span and the interactions among individuals and between individuals and families, groups, organizations, and communities.

8. Analyze, formulate, and influence social policies.
9. Evaluate research studies, apply research findings to practice, and evaluate their own practice interventions.
10. Use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and communities.
11. Use supervision and consultation appropriate to social work practice.
12. Function within the structure of organizations and service delivery systems and seek necessary organizational change.

The Department’s Culminating experience course, SOWK 495, was taught twice during 2005. Students evaluated faculty in each Departmental course. Students were assessed in this course through submission of papers and participation in a field placement with an evaluation submitted by a Field Instructor. All students passed SOWK 495. Weaknesses in the program were observed on goals 6, 8, 9, 10. Strengths in the program were observed on goals 2, 3, 4, 5, 7. Goal 4 was the strongest area assessed across all 16 students.

5. Faculty analysis of results (extent to which learning goals were met):
   Assessment activities for SOWK are nearly at an end. The faculty feels that learning goals were met, but acknowledges the aforementioned weaknesses in certain areas under the SOWK program. The faculty look forward to conversion to a HUMS degree.

6. Recommendations for improvement:
   (1) Convert to HUMS
   (2) Emphasize more writing in HUMS courses
Department: CJAD

Name of Submitter: Barry R. Langford

Date: 4/26/06

1. Degree Program MSCJ-Criminal Justice □ Undergraduate  □ Graduate

2. Assessment Instruments
   □ AM Form  □ MFT  □ Department Senior Test
   □ Portfolio  □ Survey  □ Other Paper/Presentation in MSCJ 580

3. Students Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Results of assessment:

The Master of Science in Criminal Justice (MSCJ) is designed primarily for practitioners in the field of criminal justice interested in developing and/or enhancing administrative skills. The program is also designed to meet the analytical and theoretical needs of students who will continue with doctoral or law studies. The degree emphasizes four foundational areas: trends in criminal justice, policy development and analysis, research design, and ethics in criminal justice. Understanding derived from these courses provides graduate students a solid foundation for dealing with the many critical issues confronting the contemporary criminal justice administrator. Courses are structured in a hands-on format encouraging maximum student interaction while at the same time encouraging the development of useful action skills.

In addition, the Department has developed the following Program learning goals for graduates of the MSCJ program:

(1) To acquire increased skills in writing in a criminal justice context.
(2) To acquire increased and improved skills in public speaking.
(3) To enhance managerial decision making, communication, and organizational skills.
(4) To obtain real-world critical thinking/problem solving skills as they relate to criminal justice and public policy.
(5) To gain knowledge about recent developments and trends in criminal justice.
(6) To learn how to apply experience and research to the development of public policy and acceptable criminal procedure.
(7) To gain knowledge of comparative criminal justice policy and procedures and possible applications in an American criminal justice setting.

The Department's Capstone Course, MSCJ 580, was taught during the fall of 2005. As a culminating experience course, it requires students to refine their writing skills through submission of numerous critical thinking based writing assignments and student presentation of findings regarding same.

During this course the Department administered a Program Assessment Instrument, which requested the students to submit answers to 10 questions designed to assess the quality of the MSCJ program.

Additionally, all of the Departmental courses were taught in 2005. All of these courses conducted individualized assessment activities designed to measure the Program's achievement of its objectives. These Assessment activities referenced by the Program learning goal furthered are listed below.

(1) To acquire increased skills in writing in a criminal justice context.

Assessment: Writing is stressed throughout the MSCJ curriculum. MSCJ 500 and MSCJ 580 have writing as the primary focus. All remaining MSCJ courses require writing and submission of research papers, case studies, and essay examinations.

(2) To acquire increased and improved skills in public speaking.

Assessment: Public speaking is stressed throughout the MSCJ curriculum. All MSCJ courses require the student to deliver at least one individual oral presentation during the eight week session. Many departmental courses require two or more presentations. Additionally, the class discussion among working professionals, which is inherent in all Graduate courses, helps to further the above skills.

(3) To enhance managerial decision making, communication, and organizational skills.

Assessment: Students are required to take MSCJ 532- Organizational Behavior and MSCJ 526-Human Resource Management and Theory. Both of these courses deal exclusively with the above issues. All remaining courses enhance communication skills through requiring oral and written work, and the demands of Graduate school enhance organizational skills.
(4) To obtain real-world critical thinking/problem solving skills as they relate to criminal justice and public policy.

Assessment: MSCJ 501- Current Issues and Future Directions in Criminal Justice and MSCJ 524- Criminal Justice Policy Development and Evaluation, are required foundational courses. Both of these courses involve the critical evaluation and analysis of current and future criminal justice policies. The remaining curriculum promotes critical thinking and problem solving skills through reading, writing and speaking requirements on pertinent topics.

(5) To gain knowledge about recent developments and trends in criminal justice.

Assessment: MSCJ 501 focuses exclusively on recent developments and trends in Criminal Justice. All remaining MSCJ courses are designed to examine recent developments and trends in the particular content area, and all students are encouraged to present the most current information in their chosen field.

(6) To learn how to apply experience and research to the development of public policy and acceptable criminal procedure.

Assessment: MSCJ 524 requires students to analyze policy proposals and to distinguish between policy and procedure. Remaining MSCJ courses consider current policy issues on an as needed basis.

(7) To gain knowledge of comparative criminal justice policy and procedures and possible applications in an American criminal justice setting.

Assessment: MSCJ 525- Comparative Criminal Justice Systems-focuses exclusively on Comparative World Criminal Justice Systems. Many topics in this course involve an overt or subtle comparison of other World Justice systems with the American system.

RESULTS:
All students enrolled in MSCJ 580 completed the course successfully. The current Instructor for MSCJ 580, Dr. Wayne Anderson, preserves copies of the final research papers for review if necessary.

The results from the MSCJ Program Assessment Instrument(attached) are generally favorable. Students are generally satisfied with the faculty and the institution. Most students offered multiple constructive suggestions regarding the curriculum and course sequencing. One or more students have expressed a desire for new courses in the following areas: (1) A dedicated Constitutional Issues course as part of the MSCJ core; (2)More Corrections based courses and less emphasis on Law Enforcement courses;(3)More courses blending theory and practice such as Policy Development.Additionally, a few students have suggested that the MSCJ curriculum is too repetitive in certain areas(ex Organizational Behavior and Human Resource management)Finally, several students have relayed suggestions about the course sequencing in the MSCJ program(ex offer core courses more often)
The vast majority of MSCJ students passed their courses with a grade of B or above during 2005. Grade records of Departmental faculty indicate a grade of "C" for a few students in selected courses. A few faculty have indicated more borderline grade decisions between B and C in numerous courses.

Students evaluated faculty in each Departmental course. These course evaluations provide additional guidance on curricular and pedagogical issues.

5. Faculty analysis of results (extent to which learning goals were met):
   Our learning goals are as follows:

   1. To acquire increased skills in writing in a criminal justice context.
   2. To acquire increased and improved skills in public speaking.
   3. To enhance managerial decision making, communication, and organizational skills.
   4. To obtain real-world critical thinking/problem solving skills as they relate to criminal justice and public policy.
   5. To gain knowledge about recent developments and trends in criminal justice.
   6. To learn how to apply experience and research to the development of public policy and acceptable criminal procedure.
   7. To gain knowledge of comparative criminal justice policy and procedures and possible applications in an American criminal justice setting.

   I believe our Assessment activities reflect that our program is meeting its designated learning goals. Our students continue to perform well in the classroom and in the work and professional environment. Four recent or May 2006 Graduates have or will matriculate in additional graduate degree programs.

6. Recommendations for improvement:
   1. Revise MSCJ curriculum as necessary to reduce redundancy and provide more currency. We will look forward to guidance through the Program Review process.
   2. Inject more rigor into MSCJ courses to stimulate exceptional students.