## Assessment Overview

**Discipline/Program Name**: Criminal Justice  
**Assessment Year**: 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Strength of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will be able to increase their general knowledge of the correctional system as a whole.</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Pre/Post-test</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Post-test scores will be significantly better (at p&lt;=.05 level) than pre-test scores.</td>
<td>The post-test scores were significantly better than the pre-test scores.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students will be able to demonstrate proficiency with presentation software or word processing software.</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Rubric Graded Project</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>At least 75% of the students in each of the three assessed areas will achieve an individual score equivalent to no less than 70% of the maximum possible score in each assessed component</td>
<td>Student scores exceeded the benchmark.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students will be able to apply standard conventions of grammar, usage and mechanics in either an oral presentation or written paper.</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Rubric Graded Project</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Same as Outcome #2.</td>
<td>Student scores exceeded the benchmark.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students will be able to demonstrate in-depth knowledge on a particular aspect of the correctional system based on research conducted for either their oral presentation or written paper.</td>
<td>Program &amp; GE</td>
<td>Rubric Graded Project</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Same as Outcome #2.</td>
<td>Student scores exceeded the benchmark.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Describe the Learning Outcome That You Have Measured

| GE, Discipline or Other | Pre-Post Test, Judged Competition, Embedded Questions, Rubric Graded Essay | Number of Students Assessed | # of Years This Outcome Has Been Assessed | Measurement Standard | Report the Results of Your Data Analysis | Strong: Exceeds Benchmark  
Neutral: Meets Benchmark  
Weak: Misses Benchmark |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------|


Recommendation: Complete this Assessment Overview Table after you have completed your Assessment Summary in the following template.
Program / Discipline Assessment Report

Program/Discipline: Criminal Justice / Behavioral Sciences Department
Responsibility: Christine Swenson, Program Coordinator

Program/Discipline's Mission Statement:

It is the mission of the Arapahoe Community College Criminal Justice Program to facilitate student learning and to meet the future needs of the criminal justice system by providing curriculum relevant to current principles and practices of the various criminal justice occupations.

It is the purpose of this program to evaluate students’ knowledge, skills and abilities as it relates not only to criminal justice subject matter but to evaluate students’ proficiency with general education skills, specifically writing, speaking, and use of technology.

Program/Discipline's Assessment History:

By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, how has it previously affected your program's curricula and/or teaching strategies?

Historically, criminal justice assessment has been inconsistent because the program is staffed primarily by adjunct instructors who work full-time in the field. However, when a complete data set is accomplished, the department chair (now program coordinator) has sat down with specific instructors to improve teaching method, to incorporate the available resources on campus (i.e., the writing center) into their courses to assist students in higher achievement. Finally, in 2008-09 year, the department chair (now program coordinator) has instituted minimum reading and writing skills in all coursework.

By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, what changes to student learning have been noted?

Students have a better understanding and appreciation for the integration of content specific material with the general educational skills. Students have produced better written or oral projects and have reached higher levels of Bloom’s.

What unintended consequences, if any, have occurred because of the assessment process?

Students with higher level skills also understand the quantity of effort it takes to succeed in a college setting.

Who receives information about your department's assessment and why? (Please note if you plan on altering either of these items for the coming year.)

The department chair has shared this information with individual instructors in order to improve the quality of education delivered, with the advisory committee to ensure the classroom skills focused meet or exceed their needs in the industry, and with the ACC director/dean and CCCS program director for additional feedback regarding program modification.
**Part 1: Previous Academic Year Assessment Summary**

**Previous Academic Year:**

*Please duplicate or remove the tables on the following pages for each outcome you have assessed. If there are five outcomes in the last year, use/create five tables. (For your convenience, four tables have been generated, three Discipline/Program related and one General Education related.)*

*(To select an entire table, hover over part of the table; an icon should appear with four arrows in the table’s upper-left corner ... click on it. You can also drag over all the cells of the table to select it.) Once selected, choose Edit>Copy, click in the space immediately following the table, and choose Edit>Paste.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #: 1</th>
<th>Outcome Title: Program/Course Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Type</strong> (choose by bolding):</td>
<td><strong>Outcome Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline/Program; General Ed; Other</strong></td>
<td>1) Students will be able to increase their general knowledge of the correctional system as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If <strong>General Education</strong> outcome (choose by bolding):</td>
<td>Benchmark for success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication; Critical Thinking; Quantitative Reasoning; Use of Technology; Diversity and Global Awareness; Leadership and Teamwork</strong></td>
<td>1) Student post-test scores will be significantly better (at ( p &lt; .05 ) level) than their pre-test scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) This benchmark was recommended by Institutional Research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of assessment process:**

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?  
2) How do these methods show students are learning?  
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?  
4) How many students made up the sample size?  

1) The method used for this outcome was a pre-test and post-test.  
2) This method would show students are learning if there was any increase in their post-test scores over their pre-test scores. For the objective tests of student performance, SPSS for Windows was used to compare pre- and posttest means for each intended learning outcome. The present study employed a repeated-measures design, and a statistically significant improvement (\( p < .05 \)) in student performance across the pre and post-tests for each learning outcome was predicted. This result would confirm that the students’ comprehension of concepts related to policing, courts and corrections improved after receiving instruction in those concepts  
3) Students are being measured every semester the course is offered.  
4) For CRJ 145 Fall semester, the sample size is 16. For CRJ 145 Spring semester the sample size is 16.  

**Results**

What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)  

SPSS for Windows was used to compare CRJ 145 pre- and posttest means of student performance in a repeated-measures design. Data from both the fall and spring courses pre-test and post-test were collected and entered into SPSS, with scores included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. Scores for both the
pre-test and the post-test were collected for 16 students. For the CRJ 145 fall data, the mean score of the post-test ($M = 14.06$) was significantly greater than the mean score of the pre-test ($M = 11.94$). For the CRJ 145 spring data, the mean score of the post-test ($M = 14.91$) was significantly greater than the mean score of the pre-test ($M = 12.79$).

The chart below shows the pre-test and post-test for each course and compares how each pre-test and post-test compares to each course. The mean score is on X axis.

![Chart showing pre-test and post-test scores for each course in 2008 fall and spring.

What did the department learn?

1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) In the objective assessment of the intended learning outcomes, students achieved the benchmark of significantly improved performance in general knowledge of the correctional system at the end of each semester. The results of the '08 – '09 objective assessment support the hypothesis that students’ understanding of correctional concepts would improve with instruction. The statistically significant improvement in academic performance that was observed across the academic semesters’ data can be attributed to academic experiences stimulated by the criminal justice curriculum. The pattern of results observed in this year’s objective assessment suggests that the criminal justice department excels in the instruction of correctional process concepts.

2) When compared to the data for CRJ 125 (policing) and CRJ 135 (courts) last year, the results are comparable in that the students did surpass the benchmark and their knowledge of the respective topics increased.
### Student performance summary

1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) The department rates the student performance on this outcome as strong.  
2) This assessment measure will be utilized in the future as it is a good measure of how much students are learning relating to course subject matter. |

---

### Outcome #: 2

**Outcome Title**: General Education

**Outcome Type** (choose by bolding):
- Discipline/Program: General Ed; Other
- If General Education outcome (choose by bolding): Communication; Critical Thinking; Quantitative Reasoning; Use of Technology; Diversity and Global Awareness; Leadership and Teamwork

**Outcome Description**: Students will be able to demonstrate proficiency with presentation software or word processing software.

**Benchmark for success**

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

| 1) At least 75% of the students in each of the three assessed areas will achieve an individual score equivalent to no less than 70% of the maximum possible score in each assessed component.  
2) This benchmark was recommended by Institutional Research. |

**Description of assessment process**:

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

| 1) A written project or an oral presentation  
2) Students are learning when they are able to communicate their ideas through written and spoken means. They are evaluated on their ability to analyze their issue of choice, the effectiveness of their presentation/paper (organization), and their presentation (grammar, citations, etc.)  
3) Students are being measured every semester the course is offered.  
4) For CRJ 145 Fall semester, the sample size is 16 (oral presentation). For CRJ 145 Spring semester the sample size is 16 (written paper). |

**Results**

What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

**CRJ 145 Fall**: The mean score for the oral presentation was 9.3. The maximum number of points available for each project was 50 points, with 10 points being dedicated to working with technology.

**CRJ 145 Spring**: The mean score for the oral presentation was 26.9. The maximum number of points available for each project was 100 points, with 30 points being dedicated to working with technology.
Please see attached for charts for visual representation. For this outcome, please specifically see the “Visual” column for the oral presentation and the “Organization” column for the written paper in the following table.
What did the department learn?
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) For CRJ 145 Fall’s oral presentation, the sample met the benchmark as the mean score is higher than the benchmark. For CRJ 145 Spring’s written paper, the sample also met the benchmark as the mean score is higher than the benchmark.
2) This approach to assessment is the first year. Comparison to AY08-09 would not be fair as multiple classes were used and different outcomes were stated and analyzed. This year’s assessment will provide a baseline upon which criminal justice can build and improve upon in future years.
3) N/A

Student performance summary
1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

1) The department rates the student performance on this outcome as strong.
2) This assessment measure will be utilized in the future as it is a good measure of how much students are learning relating to course subject matter.

Outcome #: 3

Outcome Type (choose by bolding):
Discipline/Program: General Ed; Other
If General Education outcome (choose by

Outcome Title: General Education

Outcome Description:
Students will be able to apply standard conventions of grammar, usage and mechanics in either an oral presentation or written paper.
**Benchmark for success**

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

- 1) At least 75% of the students in each of the three assessed areas will achieve an individual score equivalent to no less than 70% of the maximum possible score in each assessed component.
- 2) This benchmark was recommended by Institutional Research.

**Description of assessment process:**

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

- 1) This was intended to be assessed as part of the written or oral presentation outlined in Outcome 2.
- 2) Students are learning when they are able to communicate their ideas through written or spoken means. They are evaluated on their ability to analyze their issue of choice, the effectiveness of their presentation (organization), and their presentation (grammar, citations, etc.)
- 3) Students are being measured every semester the class is offered.
- 4) For CRJ 145 Fall semester, the sample size is 16 (oral presentation). For CRJ 145 Spring semester the sample size is 16 (written paper).

**Results**

What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

- CRJ 145 Fall: The mean score for the grammar/mechanics segment of the oral presentation was 18.7. The maximum number of points available for each project was 50 points, with 20 points being dedicated to grammar/mechanics.
- CRJ 145 Spring: The mean score for the grammar/mechanics written paper was 25.3. The maximum number of points available for each project was 100 points, with 30 points being dedicated to grammar/mechanics.

For a visual representation, please see the charts under Outcome 2. For this outcome, please specifically see the “Presentation” column for the oral presentation and the “Grammar” column for the written paper.

**What did the department learn?**

1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

- 1) For CRJ 145 Fall’s oral presentation, the sample met the benchmark as the mean score is higher than the benchmark. For CRJ 145 Spring’s written paper, the sample also met the benchmark as the mean score is higher than the benchmark.
- 2) This approach to assessment is the first year. Comparison to AY08-09 would not be fair as multiple classes were used and different outcomes were stated and analyzed. This year’s assessment will provide a baseline upon which criminal justice can build and improve upon in future years.
- 3) NA

**Student performance summary**

1) The department rates the student performance on this outcome as strong.
1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #: 4</th>
<th>Outcome Title: Course content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Type</strong> (choose by bolding):</td>
<td><strong>Outcome Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/Program: General Ed; Other</td>
<td>Students will be able to demonstrate in-depth knowledge on a particular aspect of the correctional system based on research conducted for either their oral presentation or written paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If General Education outcome (choose by bolding): Communication; Critical Thinking; Quantitative Reasoning; Use of Technology; Diversity and Global Awareness; Leadership and Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark for success</strong></td>
<td>1) At least 75% of the students in each of the three assessed areas will achieve an individual score equivalent to no less than 70% of the maximum possible score in each assessed component. 2) This benchmark was recommended by Institutional Research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark. 2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of assessment process:</strong></td>
<td>1) This was intended to be assessed as part of the written or oral presentation outlined in Outcome 2. 2) Students are learning when they are able to communicate their ideas through written or spoken means. They are evaluated on their ability to analyze their issue of choice, the effectiveness of their presentation (organization), and their presentation (grammar, citations, etc.) 3) Students are being measured every semester the class is offered. 4) For CRJ 145 Fall semester, the sample size is 16 (oral presentation). For CRJ 145 Spring semester the sample size is 16 (written paper).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)? 2) How do these methods show students are learning? 3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why? 4) How many students made up the sample size?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>CRJ 145 Fall:</strong> The mean score for the oral presentation content segment was 19.1. The maximum number of points available for each project was 50 points, with 20 points being dedicated to content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)</td>
<td><strong>CRJ 145 Spring:</strong> The mean score for the written paper content segment was 35.1. The maximum number of points available for each project was 100 points, with 40 points being dedicated to content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) How did group performance compare to the</td>
<td>Please see the charts for visual representation under Outcome 2. For this outcome, each project (oral presentation or written paper) uses the Content label.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What did the department learn?</strong> 1) How did group performance compare to the</td>
<td>1) For CRJ 145 Fall’s oral presentation, the sample met the benchmark as the mean score is higher than the benchmark. For CRJ 145 Spring’s written paper, the sample also met the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark as the mean score is higher than the benchmark.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) This approach to assessment is the first year. Comparison to AY08-09 would not be fair as multiple classes were used and different outcomes were stated and analyzed. This year’s assessment will provide a baseline upon which criminal justice can build and improve upon in future years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student performance summary
1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The department rates the student performance on this outcome as strong.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) This assessment measure will be utilized in the future as it is a good measure of how much students are learning relating to course subject matter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 2: Current Academic Year (2009-10) Assessment Plan

Introduction to a more flexible approach

Assessment planning is more flexible than in previous years.

- Your program may wish to examine how retention differs among sections of an important course or you may choose to do an analysis of grade inflation across courses within your program/discipline. Such items aren't truly student outcomes, but they certainly affect learning. As such, these outcomes will be classified as "Other" in the summary you create next year. (Measuring such outcomes is purely optional.)
- Two or more instruments of measuring an objective may provide greater clarity and validity, but only one is required. The department or program makes the decision. The Program Assessment committee and deans are available for consultation.
- In the past, some programs have been identified purely by prefix or in some cases by the type of section offered. Sometimes, a very limited pool of students have been available for such a program to assess, or the program lacks full-time faculty to plan, assess, and report outcomes. If your program has such difficulties, please contact either the Program Assessment committee's chair or your School's Program Assessment committee representative. We will work with you to find a solution.
- CTE programs with external accreditation may use the accreditation report to in addition or in lieu of these forms, please contact the Program Assessment committee representative if this format is desired. In absence of this contact, these forms are expected.
- Outcomes are to be measured annually. Exceptions are made with VPI approval for outcomes that clearly need a less (or more) frequent review.

Outcome minimums

- At least two outcomes are to be program-related.
- At least two outcomes are to be General Education in nature. One General Education outcome must be continued from the prior year to develop a historical trend. General Education outcomes need to be assessed and reported annually, regardless of the frequency of reporting for other outcomes.
- Both outcomes above are classified as "student learning" outcomes, requiring benchmarks and analysis. It is strongly recommended that you use the table provided in Part 1 of this report for this function. Definitions and examples of these outcomes are provided in Appendix A at the end of this document. Your Program Assessment committee is available to assist.
- An assessment report is requested annually. Such a report may only consist of a report on General Education outcomes and a plan summarizing where your program is in an assessment with multi-year frequency.
Current Academic Year: 2009-10

Intended Learning Outcomes (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
1. Students will be able to increase their general knowledge of the judicial system as a whole. (Program)
2. Students will be able to demonstrate proficiency with presentation or word processing software. (General Ed: Technology)
3. Students will be able to apply standard conventions of grammar, usage, and mechanics in an oral presentation or written paper. (General Ed: Communication)
4. Students will be able to demonstrate in-depth knowledge on a particular aspect of the judicial system based on the research conducted for their oral presentation or written paper. (Program; Gen Ed: Critical Thinking)

NOTE: The assessment will rotate in its focus. While the focus for AY2008-09 was on corrections (CRJ 145), next year (2009-10) it will be on courts (CRJ 135). For 2010-11, the focus will be policing (CRJ 125). This will enable CRJ to conduct a true program assessment without doing each course every year.

Assessment Method(s) (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
1. Pre-/Post-test administered at the beginning and end of the semester in CRJ 135, Judicial Function. (Outcome 1)

   2. Students will be evaluated by a grading rubric which covers content (Outcome 4), communication skills (Outcome 3) and integration of presentation or word processing software (Outcome 2).

Benchmarks (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
1. Student post-test scores will be significantly better (at p<.05 level) than their pre-test scores. (Outcome 1)

   2. At least 75% of the students in each of the three assessed areas will achieve an individual score equivalent to no less than 70% of the maximum possible score in each assessed component. (Outcomes 2, 3, and 4)

Have you submitted a separate budget worksheet? (Choose by bolding; for information about this worksheet, please refer to the specific budgeting e-mail sent by the committee chairperson.)
   Yes  
   No

Please submit this report (including both last year's summary and this year's plan) in a Word document to the Program Assessment committee chairperson (Cheyne Bamford: cheyne.bamford@arapahoe.edu). If you have any questions about the process, please contact the chairperson.