Program Assessment Report

I. **Degree Name:** Master of Science in Criminal Justice

II. **Academic year:** 2010-11

III. **Completer of Form:** Barry Langford

IV. **Sources of Evaluative information:**

Students enrolled in MSCJ 580 (in seat or online) prepare a culminating paper and research project. The program also uses the Degree program Analysis (DPAF) Form. DPAF forms during the relevant time period indicate that most MSCJ students possess strong research and writing skills. The entire MSCJ program is writing intensive, so it is essential that those persisting to the culminating experience display strong writing skills. Additionally, students on the home campus enrolled in MSCJ 580 complete a Program Assessment Instrument. The most recent results are attached, and these will likely be the last set of results under the old MSCJ curriculum.

V. **Agency for Program Evaluation/Change**

Full time Departmental faculty in cooperation with the EVP/DAA.

VI. **Assessment Feedback loop**

Departmental faculty meetings

Culminating experience course

Graduate Council

Curricular advisory board

Program Reviews

Faculty Integration conferences

Program Coordinator review of faculty evaluations and communications from key informants, including our career services center.
VII. Progress on most recent recommendations

The most recent Assessment report discusses the proposed curricular modifications in MSCJ. These changes have been approved through governance and are now part of the curriculum. There have been decreasing enrollments in the MSCJ program on the home campus, and MSCJ 580 has not been taught on the home campus since the last Assessment report.

VIII. Feedback loop results

The MSCJ program has been operational since the fall of 1998. Since that time, no major curriculum changes have been made until those approved for the current academic year. Several parts of our feedback loop have suggested changes to us over the years, including our advisory board, our extended site faculty, program review teams, and current students and alumni. The curriculum changes proposed were a result of collective suggestions and deliberation between all the above groups. One of the changes approved through governance concerns a new culminating experience course-MSCJ 595. Future Assessment reports will incorporate information collected from that course.
COLUMBIA COLLEGE
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, FORENSIC SCIENCE & HUMAN SERVICES

Master of Science in Criminal Justice/ Program Assessment Instrument

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:

<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: 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:

<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
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-gedared courses were fantastic for anyone – regardless of whether they are a supervisor of 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.