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.
   a. (Student) - Core Courses gave me the basics that I needed for to moving forward into the major. Additionally, some classes like research design can be used in "real" life (job).
   b. (Student) - Yes, I felt they covered many good areas of criminal justice, but left Research projects open-ended enough to allow students to research areas of their own interests.
   c. (Student) - Yes, all were very organized and detail oriented.
   d. (Student) - Yes, a wide range of subjects were covered that are important in the criminal justice system today.

2. Were the courses taught with good sequencing, at the appropriate level and with appropriate rigor? Explain.
   a. (Student) - Yes. All classes challenged me not only to divulge into new topics and areas but also to meet the professors personally to learn more about criminal justice teaching.
   b. (Student) - In seat courses are only offered once a year so I took many courses out of sync. The two courses that I feel really need to be in correct sequencing are research design and capstone-mine were. All courses were writing intensive, which I enjoyed. This allowed me to research many topics.
   c. (Student) - Yes, the classes were taught at an appropriate level and all had different learning areas.
   d. (Student) - Yes, each level of courses built upon what you had previously learned while reinforcing information that has already been taken in. Sometimes felt as if there was too much to do but was able to complete.
3. Should any courses be deleted or modified? Explain.
   a. (Student) – Not that I can think of.
   b. (Student) – I dislike that idea of adding police or corrections-based courses- not everyone in criminal justice works for a prison or police department.
   c. (Student) – No, all classes are fine the way they are.
   d. (Student) – Courses were fine.

4. Should any courses be added? Explain
   a. (Student) – No.
   b. (Student) – Criminology courses. This would give students interested in sociological aspects more courses to study and learn from. Research design must stay! I would like to see more focus on statistics and research – for those interested in that area.
   c. (Student) – No. All classes are fine.
   d. (Student) – Would have liked a course on forensics.

5. Any other comments, observations or recommendations:
   a. (Student) – It would be great if more courses were offered for semester. Unfortunately, I understand the logistics of number of classes/ number of students.
   b. (Student) – Focus more on Stats. Add more sociological aspect courses.
   c. (Student) – No.
   d. (Student) – BLANK
Please rate the overall quality of the program courses:

- Poor
- Needs Improvement
- Average
- Very Good
- Excellent

Student A: Excellent
Student B: Very Good
Student C: Excellent
Student D: Excellent

PROGRAM: DELIVERY

Please address the delivery mechanisms for the Criminal Justice Program.

   a. (Student) – Yes. They provided adequate space and good technical equipment.
   b. (Student) – Yes, had all technological necessities, plenty of seating, etc. Only criticism is that many times they were too cold.
   c. (Student) – Yes, most of the classes were in the same rooms.
   d. (Student) – Yes, always enough space.

7. Were you appropriately challenged in your courses? Explain.
   a. (Student) – Yes. Instructors were very good at properly challenging questions to which there was no easy answer. They make me think more broadly and challenged my thought process.
   b. (Student) – Yes. I enjoyed the research aspect of the courses, being allowed to choose my own topics. Of all the courses, research design was most challenging, but I learned the most from the business-courses.
   c. (Student) – Yes. Most classes had papers due that research was needed.
   d. (Student) – Yes.

8. What is your preferred delivery mechanism (straight lecture, PowerPoint, seminar style, etc.)? Explain.
   a. (Student) – Combination of lecture, Powerpoint, and instruction-based discussions.
   b. (Student) – I prefer an integrated style. Powerpoint, seminar, discussion, projects, small groups, etc. Make it more interactive for the student.
c. (Student) – PowerPoint.
d. (Student) – I liked a combination of lecture, powerpoint, and group discussion.

9. Other comments, observations, recommendations:

a. (Student) – Overall, this is an excellent program with very qualified instructors.
b. (Student) – Too much dependence on straight lecture. In four-hours long courses, it makes for a VERY long course.
c. (Student) – No.
d. (Student) – BLANK

Please rate the overall quality of the program delivery:

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

Student A: Very Good
Student B: Average
Student C: Excellent
Student D: Excellent

10. Provide a 1-3 paragraph narrative of your overall experience with the program and offer constructive criticism and suggestions for improvement

a. (Student) – This has been a very challenging experience. I learned a lot about criminal justice – obviously – but the interaction of the instructors and other students added a dimension of learning that can only be gained through in-seat classes. Again, it would be great if we could have more CJ students and give the college more opportunities to expand the curriculum.
b. (Student) – I enjoyed the program and learned a lot from it. The business­ geared courses were fantastic for anyone – regardless of whether they are a supervisor or ever will be. The research component of the program
really gave students the opportunity to develop independent learning and researching skills allowed them to expand on topics of their individual interest and further honed writing skills. Lectures could be a little more engaging- lecture based can be dry. It is difficult for the in-seat program to have a wider selection of courses since it is so small but I would like to see more criminology and theory based courses that would help researchers.

c. (student) – My overall experience in the program has been great. I have had many different areas where I have learned about. It has also helped me to determine what field I want to go in.

d. (Student) – My overall experience with the program is satisfactory. I feel that I have been challenged and have learned things that I may not have not otherwise explored – I found that I prefer in seat classes and if I had on disappointment it would be the amount and timing/scheduling with the professors and found that they go out of way to help students when you need it. If I had it to do all over I would choose Columbia College again.
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 2009 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 2009-10. 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 2009-10. 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 and 2008-9 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 is entering its 13th year, and has taken 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, and they have been approved and have been being taught since Fall 2009. Additionally, we are proposing several more curriculum changes in this year’s faculty governance process. These changes are a result of lengthy discussions in departmental faculty meetings and meetings with our curricular advisory board and extended sites faculty.
Program Assessment Components and Process

Degree Name: Criminal Justice

Academic Year: 2009-10

Completer of Form: Barry R. Langford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Evaluative Information</th>
<th>Agency for Program Evaluation/Change</th>
<th>Assessment Feedback Loop</th>
<th>Progress on Faculty Recommendations in 2006 Annual Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct: Major Field test Assessment of Major</td>
<td>Full-time Departmental faculty in consultation/cooperation with the EVP/DAA.</td>
<td>Departmental faculty meetings College committees dealing with relevant issues Curricular advisory Board meetings Program Reviews Faculty Integration conferences Chair review of faculty evaluations, communications from key informants, and survey results</td>
<td>During 2009-10 the primary focus of our Department was the continued review of MFT scores and DPAF forms, and a close scrutiny of our day program enrollments and courses in contemplation of a possible addition of a new faculty member. Our review was completed. Our performance on the assessment measures continues to be strong, but our enrollments aren't quite strong enough in the day program to justify a new position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[st. test] [portfolios] [case study] [dept. exam] [etc.]</td>
<td>Full-time faculty Academic Assessment Committee EVP/DAA VP/AHE [etc.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect: 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[surveys]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback Loop Results

During 2009-10 the primary focus of our Department was the continued review of MFT scores and Assessment of Major forms, and a close scrutiny of our day program enrollments and courses in contemplation of a possible addition of a new faculty member. We have not made major changes in our undergraduate curriculum and pedagogy since the last report because our information indicates we are successfully teaching out our curriculum. We had another faculty integration conference in October 2010. The conference was successful and confirmed information obtained through the MFT and on the home campus.

E.g.,

- specific changes in curriculum
- specific changes in pedagogy
- personnel changes
- creation of advisory groups
- creation of new student orientation
- specific change in program admission standards
- creation/revision of student handbook
- etc.
A. Assessment of major/DPAF 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 were 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 were weak in one or more communication skills. Multiple evaluators have commented about deficient writing skills with some student, and willingness and ability to use technology.

B. Major Field Test

The national mean scaled score was a 153.6. 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>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Law</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Police</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Court System</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methodology &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score at site:</td>
<td>171-testing of 7 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Home campus evening</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Law</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Police</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Court System</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score at site:</td>
<td>167-testing of 8 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) NY 1</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Law</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Police</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Court System</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score at site:</td>
<td>50-testing of 3 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Research Methodology &amp; Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri 02</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida 1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Site Missouri 02</th>
<th>Site Florida 1</th>
<th>Site Online</th>
<th>Site CP 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Law</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Police</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Court System</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores at respective sites.
Mean score at site: 163 - testing of 9 students

(9) UT 1

- Theory: 56
- The Law: 73
- Police: 62
- Corrections: 67
- The Court system: 72
- Critical thinking: 64

Mean score at site: 166 - testing of 12 students

Interpretation of results: The vast majority of sites and students test at or above the national average on the MFT. This has emerged as a consistent pattern over the past several cycles. We continue to be impressed with the performance of our students in all venues, particularly day and online students. We believe the MFT results demonstrate that our curriculum and instruction are solid.
Program Assessment Components and Process

Degree Name: Human Services

Academic Year: 2009-10

Completer of Form: Barry R. Langford/Lia Willis/Mike Perkins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Evaluative Information</th>
<th>Agency for Program Evaluation/Change</th>
<th>Assessment Feedback Loop</th>
<th>Progress on Faculty Recommendations in 2006 Annual Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct: A specific discipline major field test is not available for Human Services. Human Services faculty have designed an assessment instrument which was first used during fall 2009, in the senior seminar course. Test items are based on core program curriculum. See the attached discussion for details on the score.</td>
<td>Full time Departmental faculty in cooperation with the EVP/DAA.</td>
<td>Departmental faculty meetings Program Reviews Faculty Integration conferences Chair review of faculty evaluations and communications from key informants, including our career services center.</td>
<td>In last year's report, we mentioned that this current year was the first year for use of the assessment exam in Senior Seminar. The assessment exam was given in the most recent version of senior seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect: [surveys] [exit interviews] [alumni surveys] [etc.]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular faculty meetings Academic Assessment Committee meetings FICs [etc.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback Loop Results

This program has been fully operational for five years. The curriculum is just now being implemented in full, hence there have been no significant changes in curriculum, or any other program changes. However, a departmentally created assessment examination has been created and is being used in HUMS 495. The Human Services program administered their first cumulative evaluative tool for seniors during the 09/53 (Spring 2010) term. This exam consisted of 50 questions written by faculty from the HUMS program. Questions
were gleaned from the following required HUMS coursework in the HUMS major: Social Policy, Working with Individuals, Community Organization, Working with Groups, Research Design.
A pilot test was administered to the students in HUMS 495 (Senior Seminar). 5 students were enrolled in the class, but only three students took the exam. The average score was 78%. Results were somewhat what was predicted, as students scored close to their GPA score; two students with GPAs over 3.0 averaged 85% on the exam, and a student with a lower GPA scored 64% on the exam. The sample size of this pilot is really too small from which to draw too many conclusions. No changes will be made before administering a second exam this fall.

A Faculty Integration conference was held in October 2010. This conference was useful in exploring pedagogical issues.

The HUMS program is preparing for and looking forward to its first program review in the Spring of 2012. The program plans no significant changes before that time.

E.g.,
[specific changes in curriculum]
[specific changes in pedagogy]
[personnel changes]
[creation of advisory groups]
[creation of new student orientation]
[specific change in program admission standards]
[creation/revision of student handbook]
[etc.]
# Program Assessment Components and Process

**Degree Name:** Forensic Science  
**Academic Year:** 2009-10  
**Completer of Form:** Barry R. Langford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Evaluative Information</th>
<th>Agency for Program Evaluation/Change</th>
<th>Assessment Feedback Loop</th>
<th>Progress on Faculty Recommendations in 2006 Annual Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Direct: Major Field test          | Full-time Departmental faculty in consultation/cooperation with the EVP/DAA. | Departmental faculty meetings  
College committees dealing with relevant issues  
Curricular advisory Board meetings  
Program Reviews  
Faculty Integration conferences  
Chair review of faculty evaluations, communications from key informants, and survey results | Last year's report mentioned that we were monitoring curricular issues, enrollments, and the progress of the new senior seminar course. It is too early for any decisions to change the curriculum or pedagogy based on the information collected. |
| Assessment of Major [st. test]    | [portfolios] [case study] [dept. exam] [etc.] | |
| Indirect: 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. | Full-time faculty Academic Assessment Committee  
EVP/DAA  
VP/AHE [etc.] | Regular faculty meetings  
Academic Assessment Committee meetings  
FICs [etc.] | |

[surveys]
Feedback Loop Results

During 2009-10 the primary focus of the program was the continued implementation of the new Senior Seminar in Forensic Science and a close scrutiny of our day program enrollments and courses in contemplation of a possible addition of a new faculty member. Information collected from key informants suggest that the program meets a need in preparing students for graduate study in Forensic science. Additionally, the job market for current Bachelor’s degree graduates is very challenging. The program changed its curriculum to add more math and science in 2004. We have only graduated three cohorts of students who persisted to graduation after four years of the new curriculum. Additionally, the new Senior Seminar class in Forensic Science where the MFT is administered. This is the second set of MFT results which we have received. The MFT’s taken by FS students test students in a few topic areas not covered by existing science curriculum required for FS. Future Assessment reports will provide more detailed and useful information, including details from alumni activities, senior seminar and results from the MFT’s.

E.g.,
- specific changes in curriculum
- specific changes in pedagogy
- personnel changes
- creation of advisory groups
- creation of new student orientation
- specific change in program admission standards
- creation/revision of student handbook
- etc.
Assessment of major forms/DPAF: We only have one form to consider, as this is only the second year for CJAD 475. No major issues have surfaced in review of these forms to date. We will wait until more data is available before making any other recommendations.

B. Major Field Test

During the CJAD 475 class, students take the MFT in Biology or Chemistry, depending on which track they declared. We had 5 Biology track majors take the MFT in 2008-09. We had two Chemistry track students take it. We have more detailed score data on the Biology examinees. The institutional mean for all our students on both the Biology and Chemistry sections is slightly below the national average.

Interpretation of results: Although our Institutional mean was below the national mean. The Biology and Chemistry MFT’s test some areas that aren’t in the respective core for the Biology and Chemistry tracks. For obvious reasons, our students don’t score well in areas where they don’t have course exposure. We do score at or above the mean on most areas where our students have course exposure. We will continue to monitor this in the years ahead.