

**Texas A&M International University
Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER)
for Academic Programs**

Program: Master of Science in Criminal Justice

Assessment Period Covered: March 1, 2008 to January 31, 2009

Program Coordinator (Preparer of Report) Dr. Claudia San Miguel

List Other Program Faculty:

Dr. Dean Champion
Dr. Judith Warner
Dr. Amy Poland
Ms. Lorna Alvarez
Mr. Dae-Hoon Kwak
Dr. John Kilburn

The Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review for Academic Programs is directed at Goal 1: Academics of the Texas A&M International University 2006-2010 Strategic Plan:

Develop, maintain, assess, and improve academic programs, administrative/educational support services and student services, to admit, retain, and graduate students who achieve established learning outcomes designed to prepare them for success in their chosen careers.

Institutional Mission

Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, prepares students for leadership roles in their chosen profession in an increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society ... Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University embodies a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

Academic Program Mission

This program addresses the College (COAS) goal of preparing students for a variety of professions and roles by providing a broad-based liberal arts education. We provide a curriculum that teaches current and relevant Criminal Justice material and that facilitates employment in a high-demand field. The graduate program teaches advanced skills for those pursuing more knowledge in the field.

Provide summary of the last cycle's use of results and changes implemented

Program faculty should evaluate the former cycle. This statement should specify if the outcomes addressed were a continuation of previous ones, new outcomes, or modified versions of previous outcomes. In addition, the statement should include a concise analysis of the assessment data collected during the previous year, a brief explanation of actions taken to address specific outcomes, an evaluation of how these actions contributed to the improvement of the program, and any recommendations

formulated. Assessment data—including actual samples of student work—must be viewed and discussed by program faculty during this process.

Because we only graduate a few MSCJ students each year, data gathered on the program is an ongoing process. However, faculty discussions have led us to focus on core competencies that we consider necessary for demonstrating knowledge and preparation for further graduate study. With regards to curriculum, we have reconsidered our required courses (Law and Criminal Justice, Criminological Theory, Administration of Justice, Ethics, and Advanced Research Methods) for the core of the program. Because most of our courses for this degree are taught online, students are writing considerably more than they have in the past.

Selected list of program-level intended student learning outcomes: *It is recommended that programs rotate through their entire set of outcomes over a multi-year period. Programs may focus on one or two outcomes each year, as deemed appropriate.*

1. Students will demonstrate use of appropriate research methods to appraise contemporary criminal justice policies.
2. Students will identify and explain the nature of major theoretical concepts and philosophies in Criminal Justice.
3. Students will demonstrate professional writing skills in Criminal Justice through successful completion of comprehensive exams.
4. Students will identify the nature of ethical issues in Criminal Justice and demonstrate knowledge of key legal considerations in the Criminal Justice system.

Section I: Planning and Implementation

Outcome(s): *Identify the outcome(s) that will be focused upon this year.*

Students will demonstrate professional writing in the field of criminal justice by developing an understanding of key issues in criminal justice as well as methods to evaluate criminal justice issues through successful completion of comprehensive exams.

Please indicate if the outcome(s) is (are) related to writing (QEP).

Methods of assessment to be used: *The explanation should identify and describe the type of assessment(s) that will be used (e.g., survey, questionnaire, observation instrument, test, rubric to evaluate performance, standardized examination, action research, interviews, etc.), who will provide the information, and how the data will be obtained.*

The Criminal Justice writing rubric will be used to evaluate student performance (see attached rubric).

Indicate when assessment(s) will take place:

November 2008

Criteria/Benchmark(s): *Specify, if deemed appropriate to assess outcome(s). Criteria/ benchmark(s) may be optional, especially if qualitative measures are used for data collection]*

All students should score a 2.0 on writing rubric to successfully pass comprehensive exams. (Rubric is attached at end of report)

Section II: Analysis of Results

What were the results attained? *Describe the primary results or findings from your analysis of the information collected. This section should include an explanation of any strength(s) or weakness(es) of the program suggested by the results.*

Four students took comprehensive exams and all scored above a 2.0. All students mastered skills such as: focusing on a main idea, organizing and developing information into several paragraphs, using proper in-text research citations, and writing with few grammatical errors.

What were the conclusions reached? *Should include a brief description of the procedure used for reaching the conclusion(s) based on the evidence collected and describe the process used to disseminate the information to other individuals. For example, if the discussion took place during the annual spring retreat, include a summary from those deliberations using the Meeting Minutes template found at <http://www.tamtu.edu/integrate/docs/Minutes-Template.doc>. Once completed, submit the minutes to assessment@tamtu.edu.*

The procedure used for reaching the conclusions was based on an assessment of their comprehensive writing exams using the attached writing rubric which assesses skills such as focusing on a main idea, organizing and developing information into several paragraphs, using proper in-text research citations, and writing with few grammatical errors.. Based on the evidence collected, students are performing at a desired level. Results will be shared during program meeting.

Describe the action plan formulated. (The plan may be multi-year in nature.) *Based on the conclusion(s), describe the action plan to be implemented to improve or maintain student learning, including a timeline for implementation.*

Writing skills listed above will continue to be reinforced in all graduate courses. Because the MSCJ is a writing-intensive program given that it is entirely online, student writing is continuously been assessed and students are being provided with timely constructive criticism to improve writing skills. Such continuous reinforcement of writing skills is expected to yield desired results again in the future.

Section III: Resources

Resource(s) to implement action plan: *Describe the resources that will be needed to implement the action plan. Also indicate if the resources are currently available, or if additional funds will be needed to obtain these resources.*

Funding

- New Resources Required

- Reallocation of current funds

Physical

- New or reallocated space

Other

- Primarily faculty/staff time
- University/rule procedure change only

Provide a narrative description and justification for requested resources (include linkage to Strategic Plan)

Identify proposed outcomes for the next assessment cycle:

Continuation of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for continuation):

New Outcome(s) – (List outcomes below):

Modification of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for modification):

MSCJ Comprehensive Exam Grading Rubric

	4 (Excellent)	3 (Above Average)	2 (Average)	1 (Below Average)
Overall Writing Quality	Strong writing ability. Few, if any grammatical errors. Answer is of appropriate length, content and detail. Transitions are provided from one paragraph to another. Content of answer is not obscured by grammatical errors.	Above average writing ability with few grammatical errors. Most paragraphs are of appropriate length, content and detail. Transitions are provided but may not be consistent. Content is not obscured by grammatical errors.	Average writing ability. Includes some but not many grammatical errors. Some paragraphs are too long/too short and do not consistently contain appropriate/relevant content. Transitions not consistently provided and grammatical errors minimally impact the ability to comprehend content.	Weak writing ability. Major grammatical errors. Paragraphs are too long/too short and contain too much irrelevant content. No transitions are provided and grammatical errors seriously impact the ability to comprehend content.
Organization & Development	Organization and development of content is logical. Answer is well structured and contains an introductory paragraph, several body paragraphs, and a conclusion. Paragraphs are effectively developed with excellent elaboration of content.	Organization and development of content is logical with minimal errors. Answer is structured and contains an introductory paragraph, several body paragraphs, and a conclusion. Paragraphs are developed with content well discussed/developed.	Organization and development of content is adequate. Answer has few problems with structure. Answer either lacks an introductory paragraph, enough body paragraphs, or a well developed conclusion. Content only adequately discussed/developed.	Organization and development of content is insufficient. Answer lacks an introductory paragraph, body paragraphs, or a conclusion. Content poorly discussed/developed.
Focus/Content	Question (all sections) is thoroughly and completely answered. Content is well developed throughout answer. Answer is specific to question and does not contain irrelevant information that seriously detracts from question.	Question (all sections) is thoroughly and completely answered. Content is developed but contains some irrelevant information. Irrelevant information does not seriously detract from question.	Question (all sections) is answered. Content is not well developed. Answer is not specific to question. Answer contains some irrelevant information but does not significantly detract from question.	Question (all sections) is not completely answered. Content is not developed. Answer is not specific to question and contains too much irrelevant information that seriously detracts from question.
Citations	In text citations are provided according to the standards of the APA 5 th edition.	In text citations are provided using APA 5 th edition with few errors.	Few in text citations are provided. In text citations are not consistent with the standards of APA 5 th edition.	No in text citations are provided.