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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Evaluative Information</th>
<th>Agency for Program Evaluation/Change</th>
<th>Assessment Feedback Loop</th>
<th>Feedback Loop Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Direct:  
Culminating paper/research project and presentation of findings.  
[st. test]  
[portfolios]  
[case study]  
[dept. exam]  
[etc.] | Full time Departmental faculty in consultation/cooperation with the EVP/DAA and CAP and Graduate Council | Departmental faculty meetings  
Curricular advisory Board meetings  
Program Reviews  
Faculty Integration conferences  
Chair review of faculty evaluations, communications from key informants, and survey results | During 2007 and 2008 the primary focus of our Department was implementation of the new online MSCJ in addition to our seat based MSCJ.  
In order to facilitate this new online program, our Department has developed two new courses for inclusion in the MSCJ curriculum. These courses were suggested by our most recent program review team.  
[specific changes in curriculum]  
[specific changes in pedagogy]  
[personnel changes]  
[creation of advising groups]  
[creation of new student orientation]  
[specific change in program adm. standards]  
[creation/revision of student handbook]  
[etc.] |
| Indirect:  
Program Assessment Instrument, a survey given to students in MSCJ 580.  
Curricular advisory Board  
Informal Alumni surveys  
Review of student evaluations of faculty for comments on the curriculum  
Program Reviews every five years  
Communications from key informants, including current students, public sector managers, and alumni.  
[surveys] | Full-time faculty Academic Assessment Committee  
EVP/DAA  
VP/AHE  
[etc.] | Regular faculty meetings  
Academic Assessment Committee meetings  
FICs  
[etc.] | [specific changes in curriculum]  
[specific changes in pedagogy]  
[personnel changes]  
[creation of advising groups]  
[creation of new student orientation]  
[specific change in program adm. standards]  
[creation/revision of student handbook]  
[etc.] |
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.

**SOURCES OF EVALUATIVE INFORMATION**

The Department's Capstone Course, MSCJ 580, is the primary site for gathering of Assessment information. This course was taught during the fall of 2007 and is currently being taught. 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 2007-8. 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.

During 2006, all CJAD and MSCJ programs were evaluated during the program review conducted each 5 years. The Review team issued several recommendations pertinent to the MSCJ, which are set forth below followed by the Department response.

ASSESSMENT 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 were generally favorable. The results are attached.

The vast majority of MSCJ students passed their courses with a grade of B or above during 2006. Grade records of Departmental faculty indicate a grade of "C" for a few students in selected courses. Students evaluated faculty in each Departmental course. These course evaluations provide additional guidance on curricular and pedagogical issues.
As earlier mentioned, the MSCJ program was reviewed during the Program Review in 2006. While the review was generally positive, the team made several recommendations regarding the MSCJ program and the curriculum. During the 2007-8 Academic years, the Department began working with its key constituents to implement many of the changes recommended in the Program review. Given that the Program has entered its 10th year, and is taking the Degree online, this is an ideal time to implement change. We have recently added two courses to the curriculum, MSCJ 530 and MSCJ 535. These courses were suggested as part of our recent program review.
Please do NOT put your name or any identifying marks on this exam.

This is an Instrument which our Department uses to assess our academic programs. It is designed to give the criminal justice faculty an idea as to student attitudes about the program. We consider these responses as we prepare curriculum, schedules, and activities for future terms.

Please respond as thoroughly as you can to each of the questions on the following pages.
PROGRAM: CURRICULUM

As you have now had an opportunity to review the program requirements for this degree, please provide your impressions of the courses offered in the MSCJ curriculum and try to address these areas:

Answer the questions below based upon your evaluation of your selected major.

1. Were the MSCJ core courses appropriate? Explain.

Student A: Yes, I felt they provided good information and were well designed.
B: Yes, I enjoyed writing intensive & teacher feedback in all the classes.
C: Yes, all courses were appropriate to the program.
D: Many of the classes were appropriate, as far as subject matter goes; however some of the classes lacked any challenges, they seemed more of just stuff to do versus actually learning anything substantial.
E: Yes, I believe that it covered areas essential to the management/organization of criminal justice agencies.

2. Were the courses taught with good sequencing, at the appropriate level and with appropriate rigor? Explain.

Student A: Yes, they flowed in a good sequence and at the appropriate level.
B: Took out of sequence, but looking back would highly recommend taking in sequential order. Think very appropriately set up.
C: Mostly. Some courses seemed a bit elementary for graduate course work, as well as same assignments.
D: Often there was not a set sequence because classes were not offered everytime and you had to take them out of order and when you could.
E: Yes, the only negative is some courses only offered once a year.

3. Should any courses be deleted or modified? Explain.

Student A: Two instructors should not teach or provide input to a class. Conflicts of information.
B: Did not like my topics. Two teachers taught w/differing opinions on what I should place in my paper. Eventually, I got docked for the miscommunication.
C: No
D: I think the coursework in all the classes should be reviewed and modifications made.
E: Research design should more prepare the student to understand statistics and how to conduct an original research paper.
4. Should any courses be added? Explain

Student A: None that I can think of.
B: More on forensics possibly.
C: Add statistics
D: Maybe more specialized classes, such as the Juvenile Justice class.
E: Maybe statistics for purposes of conducting research

5. Any other comments, observations or recommendations:

Student A:
B: 
C: Certain instructors were more consistent in their grading practices (Dr. Lyman) when his scoring criteria contradict each other from person to person and class to class. We do talk with each other and it is extremely obvious. It is also obvious that Dr. Lyman grades based on personal opinions rather than ability and quality of work.
D: 
E: 

Please rate the overall quality of the program courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O Poor</th>
<th>O Needs Improvement</th>
<th>O Average</th>
<th>O Very Good</th>
<th>O Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Student A: Very Good
B: Very good
C: Average
D: Average
E: Very good

PROGRAM: DELIVERY

Please address the delivery mechanisms for the Criminal Justice Program.


Student A: Yes, they were perfect for our class sizes.
B: Yes, enjoyed computer lab use and all the powerpoint, videos, and media setup.
C: Mostly. Sometimes there was "technology" problems but not anything excessive.
D: Classroom size and space was adequate
E: Yes

7. Were you appropriately challenged in your courses? Explain.

Student A: Yes, the instructors challenged us to think outside the box.
B: Yes, 8 weeks is quick
C: No, this program has made me challenge myself much less than I had in previous degree programs. I know that I can hand in poor quality work and GENERALLY still get a decent grade.
D: Several courses lacked challenges. When compared to some other undergraduate work, there are a few classes that need improving.
E: Yes

8. What is your preferred delivery mechanism (straight lecture, PowerPoint, seminar style, etc.)? Explain.

Student A: A combination was very helpful.
B: Favorite part was the trip to old prison and new prison in human resource management.
C: Powerpoint and hands-on
D: Powerpoint or seminar. It is thought provoking to discuss issues with classmates.
E: Any and all that are conducted to the subject

9. Other comments, observations, recommendations:

Student A:
B:
C:
D:
E:

Please rate the overall quality of the program delivery:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student A: Very good
B: Very good
C: Average
D: Needs Improvement
E: Very good
10. Provide a 1-3 paragraph narrative of your overall experience with the program and offer constructive criticism and suggestions for improvement

Student A:
B: I enjoyed the variation within the program and teachers. I had a great experience aside from one class. Loved feedback and teachers who encouraged deep thought and group interaction. I learned a lot through writing APA style and so many papers. Even though I do not currently have a job in law enforcement/social services, I gained so much insight into the criminal justice area.

Great speakers brought into class, field trips to local police depts. And prisons. I think I got a lot of knowledge from Columbia College and paid a fair amount for the classes taken.

Improvements would just be to make sure all the professors are on the same page grading wise. Some were majorly from over the content and no room for errors. Others were more concerned that we learned what was being taught and could write about/test out and make sense to ourselves and others in the program or out of who may be interested.

C: Overall, I have enjoyed the program and do feel I have learned a lot. I have met a lot of interesting people.

D:
E: I have been out of the masters program for sometime, but I am completing my final class so it is hard to remember class specifics.

Overall, I have enjoyed the course work and have found it challenging in a good way. I have and continue to learn new information in the program.