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The Master of Science Degree in Criminal Justice moved from the College of Liberal Arts to the College of Science effective academic year 2013 – 2014. As part of this move, the program has become part of the Department of Integrated Science and Technology (IST). To streamline reporting for IST, the full program review for the Master of Science Degree Program in Criminal Justice will be completed at the same time as the reviews for the other degree programs (BS in Environmental Science, BS in Integrated Science and Technology, and BS in Natural Resources and Recreation Management) within the Department of IST. However, because it has been five years since the MS in Criminal Justice completed its last program review, we present this abbreviated review, to be followed by a full review in academic year 2015 - 2016.
Appendix III
Students’ Entrance Abilities for Past Five Years of Graduates: Master of Science in Criminal Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Undergraduate GPA</th>
<th>Mean GRE Verbal</th>
<th>Mean GRE Quantitative</th>
<th>Mean GRE Analytical Writing</th>
<th>Miller Analogies Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>399 (n = 10)</td>
<td>449 (n = 10)</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 – 10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>378.18 (n = 11)</td>
<td>398.18 (n = 11)</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 – 11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>390 (n = 6)</td>
<td>403.33 (n = 6)</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 – 12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>392 (n = 5)</td>
<td>456 (n = 5)</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 - 13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>430 (n = 8)</td>
<td>426.25 (n = 8)</td>
<td>3.63 (n = 8)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix IV

Exit Abilities for Past Five Years of Graduates: Master of Science in Criminal Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean GPA</th>
<th>Licensure Exam Results</th>
<th>Certification Test Results</th>
<th>Other Standardized Exam Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 – 10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 – 11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 – 12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 - 13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix VII

## Program Enrollment: Master of Science in Criminal Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Year 1 2008-2009</th>
<th>Year 2 2009-2010</th>
<th>Year 3 2010-2011</th>
<th>Year 4 2011-2012</th>
<th>Year 5 2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Majors Enrolled: MS in Criminal Justice: No Area of Emphasis</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Majors Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Majors Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of Students enrolled in the Program</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of the Program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Trend Line for Total Enrollment and Program Graduates: Master of Science in Criminal Justice
Appendix IX
Assessment Letters: Criminal Justice - MS

Office of Assessment & Program Review

June 25, 2012

Dr. Dhruba Bora, Chair
Criminal Justice
College of Liberal Arts

Dear Dru:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the MA in Name’s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide general comments and suggestions for improvement. I have included the scoring rubric we used to evaluate your assessment report in a separate document.

As with your undergraduate program, your skills’ outcomes are written emphasizing higher levels of cognition, while your knowledge and attitude skills are not. You have done a nice job developing assessment measures and rubrics. Your report shows evidence of careful data analysis and you are using data to inform improvement. Your report also shows clearly that you are aware of steps you need to take to help you to even more carefully analyze the data. Regarding benchmarks, I agree that you should not inflate grades! I believe that it is reasonable to take students from where they are and determine the supports they need to achieve reasonable benchmarks over time.

During the coming academic year, it will be important that you follow the plan you developed as part of the first two activities of the Open Pathways Demonstration Project. The project’s steering committee will provide more feedback regarding next steps in that project at summer’s end. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. David Pieting, Dean, COLA
June 8, 2011

Dr. Dru Bora, Chair
Criminal Justice
COLA

Dear Dru:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluations of the MS in Criminal Justice’s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports was sent to you in April, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that the rubric is still relatively new and is continuing to be revised. At this time, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this rubric.

I appreciate all of the work you have done on this assessment plan. Your outcomes are outstanding! Do not apologize for not having analytic rubrics developed yet. Development of these takes time and I think you are making excellent progress. Even without these rubrics, your report shows that you are thoughtfully analyzing your students’ learning and continuing to work on refinements to your assessment program. Each year I expect that you will gain more meaningful results and will be able to put these results to good use to improve the program. Reviewers also noted that your outcomes were well written in measurable terms, that you used multiple measures for each student learning outcome, and that you presented data for the benchmarks and results.

During the academic year 2011 – 2012, I plan to meet with all programs to assist with further development of assessment plans and look forward to meeting with you. I will be in touch at the end of the summer about scheduling. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds
Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. David Pittenger, Dean, COLA
April 5, 2010

Dr. Dru Bora, Chair
Criminal Justice
COLA

Dear Dru,

I have completed my evaluation of the MS in Criminal Justice’s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide my general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports is attached, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that we used the attached rubric is still relatively new and, as you will see, it raises the bar for what is considered excellent assessment. However, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this rubric.

You are to be commended for the work you’ve done on this assessment program. It’s obvious that you’ve put a good deal of thought and quite a lot of effort into developing a meaningful assessment program. I have a few suggestions as you continue to refine the plan. First, I recommend that you write your learning outcomes from the perspective of the student rather than from the perspective of the program. So, rather than “to enhance oral communication skills,” you might say, “Students will communicate effectively through speaking.” It’s best to say what students will do, rather than saying, “To develop advanced knowledge of criminological theories,” how about “Students will evaluate various criminological theories” or “Students will compare and contrast various criminological theories, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each.” As with the undergraduate report, I recommend that benchmarks be less holistic – rather than scoring average, what about 90% of students should answer each question correctly. Then, you can easily do an item analysis to see where weaknesses are. It also would be better to assess research projects and presentations against analytic rubrics. I’d like to meet with you soon after Assessment Day to talk about next steps in this process. Among other things, these should include a timeline for assessment of each outcome.

Please see the attached rubric. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. David Pittenger, Dean, COLA