

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

## Justice, Bachelor's Degree

College of Liberal Arts

AY Fall 2013 to Fall 2014

Submitted by: Mike Daku  
Chair, Justice Department  
Contact Information: 474-5717  
mjdaku@alaska.edu  
Date: October 15, 2014

### 1. Assessment information collected

Intended Objectives/Outcomes	Assessment Criteria and Procedures	Implementation (what, when, who)	Outcomes 201301 to 201402
1. Good technical writing skills.	Writing samples will be collected from one or more Justice writing intensive courses and evaluated using a standard rubric.	Annually, the Justice SLOA assessment committee will evaluate writing samples from a minimum of 10 different writing intensive course students based on the chosen rubric. On the required schedule, the Justice SLOA committee will analyze aggregated scores of all students in writing intensive classes.	Grades for students in writing intensive Justice courses are scored according to a rubric (attached) and then aggregated scores of 130 students in "W" designated courses were analyzed. 55% of students scored A's, 15% B's, 12% C's, and 18% D/F/NB/or W.
2. Good critical thinking skills.	Writing examples will be collected from one or more Justice writing intensive courses and evaluated for analytic content.	Annually, the Justice assessment committee will evaluate writing samples from a minimum of 10 different students. On the required schedule, the Justice SLOA committee will analyze aggregated scores of all students in writing intensive classes for their analytic content.	The rubric (used for outcome #1) gives the faculty an opportunity to gauge both student technical writing skills and good critical thinking skills since good critical thinking skills are required to produce good technical writing and impact the students' final grade in the class.
3. Knowledge in the core areas of criminal justice: the role and function of criminal justice in society; addictive processes; basic criminology; the juvenile justice system; research methods; dispute resolution processes; cultural conflict issues arising from the administration of justice in rural Alaska.	An exam consisting of five questions for each of the required Justice core courses will be administered to Justice students at the beginning of each fall semester.	The assessment exam will be administered during the first week of each fall semester for online and F2F classes. (Exam will not be given to JUST F110 or to JUST 300X students.) Annually, scores will be compiled for individual students and their results compared from one year to the next. Using a dependent sample t-test, results will be analyzed by the Justice assessment committee.	For the three years in which data was collected, the dependent t-test calculation demonstrates a statistically significant gain in the number of points earned on the test by students in successive years.
4. Good oral communication skills.	Student presentations from oral intensive classes will be evaluated for communicative skills.	Annually, a Justice upper division oral intensive course will be identified from which to collect recorded presentations. A minimum sample of at least 10 students will be reviewed and evaluated by the Justice	Grades for students in oral intensive Justice courses are scored according to a rubric (attached) and then aggregated scores of 55 students were analyzed.



		assessment committee. On the required schedule, the Justice SLOA committee will analyze aggregated scores of students in oral intensive classes.	71% of students scored A's, 13% B's, 9% C's, and 7% D/F/NB/or W.
--	--	--	--

## 2. Conclusions drawn from the information summarized above

NB: Conclusions drawn from the information we have gathered may include a decision to alter the SLOA rubric itself to increase sample size and/or better reflect the realities of the data collection. We have made these changes in **bold** and used ~~strikethrough~~ to show deletions.

To ensure a sufficient "N" number for purposes of analysis, we realized that we could increase participation in the test if we automated the scoring by using the test as part of the Blackboard shell for all Justice classes (except Just F110 and 300X) in all semesters. The Justice faculty will implement this change beginning in spring semester 2015.

During the years in which data has been collected, our dependent t-test calculation demonstrates a statistically significant gain in the number of points earned on the test by students in successive years.

- Between fall 2012 and fall 2013 the difference between the means was statistically significant at the  $P < 0.01$  level and higher. The results show a positive gain on average of  $25.8 - 20.05 = 5.75$  points.
- Between fall 2013 and fall 2014 the difference between the means was also statistically significant at the  $P < 0.01$  level and higher. The results show a positive gain on average of  $24.4 - 19.9 = 4.5$  points.

## 3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above

1) The Justice Department is in the process of dropping the course titled F460O: American Crime Control and replacing it with F453O: Comparative Criminology. The reason for this change is that faculty recognize that the former course was based on a model that required students to debate the pros and cons of American systems of deterrence and punishment, which, while useful, was of limited value because the systems are already codified and not subject to meaningful change. On the other hand, the study of Comparative Criminology allows students to study and debate the American system as compared to other criminal justice systems throughout the world. The different emphasis broadens the students' perspective on the world and provides more, and more varied, material for reflection and discussion which are goals of oral intensive classes.

**4. Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the curricular changes resulting**

Mike Daku, Chair

Rob Duke, Graduate Advisor (developed and teaches the classes that were changed)



## Rubric for Scoring Justice Writing and Critical Thinking Intensive Courses

Rob Duke

October 13, 2013

During the writing intensive courses, instructor delivers information about the topic of the course and also instructs students on a method of research. The individual steps of this research model are intermediate assignments for the final paper and students are able to continuously improve their writing product until the final paper submission.

Students are evaluated on the following:

### 1. Preliminary writing assessment (concept paper): (later develops as the Introduction)

The instructor evaluates the student's writing and the paper topic suggested. Instructor gives advice on the structure of the paper, suggested themes to pursue, and potential sources of information.

### 2. Annotated Bibliography

The instructor evaluates the logic and rigor of the analysis; suggests ways that these articles may lead the student towards certain conclusions; and further suggests ways to present balanced arguments.

### 3. Argument of Discovery: Literature Review

The instructor allows the student to write to understand at this point and helps them refine their logic and structure of the paper.

### 4. Argument of Advocacy:

The instructor helps the student write to be understood at this stage and to attempt to draw some logical conclusions about the problem statement or thesis. Instructor helps student link previous assignments together to present a unified argument and paper.

### 5. Final Paper:

Each of the previous assignments join to become a final research paper.

The rubric for evaluating the final paper is as follows (note category for improvement, while a paper might not be perfect, it can still score well if the student adheres to the model and makes a good faith effort to implement instructor's suggestions):

Category	A/A-	B+/B	B-/C+	C/C-	D+/D	F
Thesis	Easily identifiable, plausible, novel, sophisticated, insightful, and crystal clear. Connects well with paper title.	Promising, but slightly unclear, or lacks originality. Paper title doesn't connect w/thesis.	Unclear or vague, unoriginal, provides little upon which to build paper, title disconnected w/thesis.	Difficult to identify, bland statement or obvious point.	Introduction with weak or missing thesis.	
Structure	Evident, understandable, appropriate for thesis, excellent transitions from point to point. Paragraphs have solid topic sentences.	Clear and appropriate, may wander occasionally, few weak transitions, most paragraphs have good topic sentences.	Generally unclear, often wanders or jumps. Weak transitions, few topic sentences.	Unclear, transitions confusing, no topic sentences.	Rambling stream of consciousness writing	
Use of Evidence	Primary source info used to buttress every point w/at least one example. Demonstrates mastery of topic.	Evidence used to support point(s). Some evidence may not fully support point(s). Demonstrates good understanding of topic.	Evidence used to support some points. Points lack supporting evidence. Demonstrates general understanding of ideas.	Very few or weak examples. Generally fails to support statements. Demonstrates little understanding of ideas.	No support examples.	
Analysis	Evidence clearly relates to mini-theses. Fresh and exciting analysis.	Examples sometimes not clearly related to mini-theses.	Quotes or examples appear w/out analysis.	Weak attempts to relate evidence to arguments.	No evidence.	
Logic and argumentation	Ideas flow logically. Reasoning sound, anticipates counter-arguments.	Arguments clear and usually flow logically. May miss some likely counter-arguments.	Logic often fails and may be unclear. Fails to account for most counter-arguments.	Ideas do not flow at all because there is no argument to support.	No logic or arguments.	

Mechanics	Grammar/sentence structure are excellent. Conforms to APA format.	Strong with occasional lapses. Conforms with APA format.	Grammar/structure problems evident. Mostly conforms w/APA format.	Grammar/Structure is very problematic. Does not conform to APA.	Poor grammar/structure. Does not conform to APA.	
Improvement (from writing assessment to final paper)	Most improved. Adapts to model and suggestions given after the preliminary writing assessment (Concept paper).	Good effort made to use the paper writing model given for the class; and, good effort to follow suggestions made by the instructor.	Model was followed and some attempt was made to incorporate instructors suggestions.	Some evidence that model was used, but instructor suggestions not followed.	Not clear that comments or model was consulted.	
Total:						



## PRESENTATION EVALUATION FORM

Presenter: \_\_\_\_\_

Course: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Please score all categories on a scale of 1 to 5.

5 = excellent

4 = very good

3 = good

2 = fair

1 = poor

### SUBSTANTIVE QUALITY:

Impartial and thorough presentation of material \_\_\_\_\_

Logical progression of information \_\_\_\_\_

Comprehensive summary showing familiarity with materials \_\_\_\_\_

Provides alternative explanations as needed \_\_\_\_\_

Raised significant issues/questions during discussion \_\_\_\_\_

### QUALITY OF COMMUNICATIONS:

Eye contact with audience \_\_\_\_\_

Avoids reading presentations \_\_\_\_\_

Uses alternative communication methods \_\_\_\_\_

Quality of speech (clarity, volume, inflection) \_\_\_\_\_

Appropriate appearance, behavior and posture \_\_\_\_\_

### COMMENTS:

OVERALL LETTER GRADE FOR PRESENTATION: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator had prepared by reading the assigned material? YES NO

Evaluator's signature: \_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]



Justice Department Fall 2013  
Dependent T-Test for Paired Samples Calculation  
Worked Solution

1. Table of the variable scores and the product of the two scores.

$X_1$	$X_2$	$d (X_2 - X_1)$	$d^2$
18	22	4	16
20	30	10	100
23	24	1	1
10	16	6	36
18	31	13	169
20	25	5	25
24	19	-5	25
26	34	8	64
29	32	3	9
25	22	-3	9
14	23	9	81
19	32	13	169
<b>246</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>704</b>
Mean: 20.05	Mean: 25.8	$\uparrow$ $\Sigma d$	$\uparrow$ $\Sigma d^2$

2. Used the following equation to calculate  $t$ :

$$t = \frac{\Sigma d}{\sqrt{\frac{n(\Sigma d^2) - (\Sigma d)^2}{n-1}}}$$

3. Substituted the values obtained from the table into the equation:

$$t = \frac{64}{\sqrt{\frac{12(704) - (64)^2}{12-1}}}$$

$$t = \frac{64}{\sqrt{\frac{8,448 - 4,096}{11}}}$$

$$t = \frac{64}{\sqrt{395.636}}$$

$$t = \frac{64}{19.891}$$

$$t = 3.218$$

$$t = \frac{63.65}{\sqrt{\frac{14(475) - (64)^2}{14-1}}}$$

$$t = \frac{63.65}{\sqrt{\frac{5070 - 3969.4096}{13}}}$$

$$t = \frac{63}{\sqrt{\frac{405}{20.1}}}$$

$$t = 3.23$$

24.4

4. The difference between the means is statistically significant at the  $P < 0.01$  level and higher. The results show a positive gain on average of ~~25.8~~ 20.05 = 5.75 points. 4.5

19.9

df	Sig. Level (Two-tailed)			
	0.10	0.05	0.01	0.001
10	1.796	2.201	<b>3.106</b>	4.437
	$P < 0.10$	$P < 0.05$	$P < 0.01$	$P > 0.001$

df	0.10	0.05	0.01	<del>0.001</del>
13	1.34	<del>1.77</del> 1.76	2.62	
	$P < 0.10$	$P < 0.05$	$P < 0.01$	



# 1. TABLE OF Pre and Post Scores : 2014

A	B
18	22
20	30
23	22
10	18
10	16
18	31
20	25
24	19
26	34
29	32
25	22
14	23
19	29
22	19

2. used the following Equation

$$t = \frac{\sum d}{\sqrt{\frac{n(\sum d^2) - (\sum d)^2}{n-1}}}$$

3. Results

$$t = \frac{65}{\sqrt{\frac{14(678) - (65)^2}{14-1}}} = \frac{65}{\sqrt{\frac{9492 - 4225}{13}}} = \boxed{3.23}$$

4. The difference between  $\bar{X}_B - \bar{X}_A = 24.4 - 19.9 = 4.5$ .  
 Thus, the average gain in scores equal 4.5 units  
 and is statistically significant at  
 $P < .01$  level of significance.