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A. ACTIONS TAKEN TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

The 2011-2012 Assessment Report, Response to Assessment Findings, stated: “Program faculty will be encouraged to consider the addition of oral communication skills into their courses.” Several program faculty members have added student presentations to their syllabi. For example, I require oral presentations in all of my courses except Elite Crime in Cinema, and these are worth 20-25% of each student’s grade. The importance of oral communication skills was stressed at the 2013 program advisors’ meeting, and that same year Dr. Steele began a dialogue with Melissa Spirek, Chair of Communication, about developing a dedicated course. One promising addition to the curriculum during the last five-year cycle was the addition of SPN 2110 and 2120, Spanish for Law Enforcement, in collaboration with Dorothy Alvarez of Modern Languages.

B. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSED AND EXAMINED

Which Program Level Student Learning Outcomes did you assess and examine during 2012-2013?

1. Graduates will be prepared to assume their roles as effective and informed citizens.
2. Graduates will be prepared for employment in criminal justice and related fields.
3. Graduates will be prepared to pursue study in graduate and professional schools.

C. METHODS FOR COLLECTING DATA

Data included student writing samples from 2009-2013, exit Interviews of seniors graduating in 2012-2013, and a 2013 alumni survey.

D. ASSESSMENT MEASURES

- Direct measures were writing samples from graduating seniors.
- Indirect assessments were exit interviews and alumni surveys.

E. SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

Writing Samples

These were solicited during Exit Interviews by asking graduating seniors, “Please send us two or three of your best student papers.” They were encouraged to email them to Mary Zurawka, CJS Administrative Assistant, as a more convenient and economical alternative to printing and mailing or hand-carrying them to the CJS Office. The rubric for assessing student writing was previously developed by Director Steele and is reproduced as Appendix A.

A 20% random sample of student writing was obtained by identifying 285 folders containing submitted examples and then retrieving these from each fifth folder, producing a sample of 57. When more than one student paper existed for a particular student, I chose one example with the goal of producing a variety of student writing, resulting in the following examples and categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Writing</th>
<th>Number Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internship Narration Assessment</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Paper</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Research</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Case Analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most commonly available example was Internship Narration Assessment, which was organized according to a rubric provided by Dr. Adamitis. Research Papers and Original Research papers were often done in partial fulfillment of SOC 306/3400 Statistics and/or SOC 406/3410 Research Methodology. Obviously these papers gave students more tasks to coordinate and thus more challenges than other assignments. Assessment showed that 46 of 57 selected papers or 81% had no significant problems according to Dr. Steele’s rubric. Under Mechanics: Grammar, Spelling and Punctuation, a five-point scale ranges from 1 = F to 5 = A. The mean was 4.40, as 27 papers were assessed as A quality, 26 as B and only four as C. Under “Mechanics: Writing is clear and fluid,” a few students had problems with run-on sentences and awkward style. Although not specifically assessed as a deficiency, some papers would be more attractive to the reader if active voice was used instead of passive.

Under the Substance section, a few papers had problems under Subsection 2, three with expressing “conventional wisdom” about criminal justice issues, and one each with mistakes of fact and understanding. Under Subsection 3, four students had problems with methods, statistics or making a good conclusion, and under Subsection 4, six papers had problems with APA style of citing and referencing and three had cited non-academic sources. Subsection 5 assesses persuasiveness, which was diminished in two cases by awkward writing styles and in two others by lack of integration. Subsection 6 assesses knowledge of criminal justice procedures: this wasn’t applicable to quite a few papers, especially those not discussing internship experiences, and only two papers had weakness in this area. Three writing examples had problems under Subsection 7, which assesses knowledge of the criminal justice system and/or social science research. As noted above, examples of Research Papers and Original Research were more likely to have problems under Substance.

In sum, a random sample of CJS student writing showed that 53 out of 57 or 93.0% were able to write an A or B paper at the college level. Only four of the sampled papers were assessed with a C grade, and the mean grade was 84%. This is evidence that CJS graduates are able to function as effective and informed citizens. This outcome should be interpreted with caution because of a possible self-selection effect: submission of writing samples was voluntary and therefore could have differentiated conscientious, well-organized students with pride in their work from students lacking in one or more of these attributes. It is not known how much the assessed examples benefited from editorial help from professors: especially with research papers, professors may ask for a preliminary draft on which to give editorial assistance. This is certainly encouraged by the university, especially in Integrated Writing classes.

**Exit Interviews**
These were conducted when doing graduation checks, and the interview form is attached as Appendix B. Under the Program Feedback section, students were asked for their perspectives on the quality of the program by assigning scale scores of 1 to 5. The range of each student’s ratings varied from 3.56 to 4.94, and the grand mean of numerical ratings for all 16 aspects of the program was 4.44. The mean scale scores for each aspect are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJS Program Aspect</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Perspectives on Quality of Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Classes/Course Content</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Instruction</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Advising</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Flexibility</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-rounded Curriculum</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Internship for Program</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Communication</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Performance in Communicating/Teaching Key Pedagogical Skills/Subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methodology</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall rating of 4.44 out of 5 is high and similar to overall ratings of instructors on Student Evaluation of Instruction forms. The ratings above are categorized under two broad areas, Student Perspectives on Quality of Program, and Program Performance in Communicating/Teaching Key Pedagogical Skills/Subjects. The first six ratings in the latter are relatively low and suggest that these areas merit concern. The two broad categories may be interpreted, respectively, as “What the students like about the program,” and “What they feel they take away from it.” The relatively low ratings in the latter suggest that respondents feel less confident about their academic abilities than they do about program quality. This is especially true for Research Methodology, Critical Thinking, Research Skills, Applied Skills, Writing, and especially Oral Presentation, with the lowest mean rating of all. This is of concern because these are the same skills consistently identified by alumni and employers as important for success in the workplace.

Alumni Survey

The 2012-2013 Alumni Survey was administered by email and produced 38 respondents. The survey instrument is produced below as Appendix C. Twenty women and 18 men responded and the majority identified as Caucasian. Six respondents were African-American, one was Hispanic and two identified as biracial. Half the respondents reported being married or in a domestic partnership, 16 identified as single and three as committed or engaged. The mean age of participating alumni was 29.26, they had an average of 1.38 children and had taken 4.86 years, on average, to finish their degree. Twenty-three or 60.5% of alumni said that CJS was their first choice of a major. Seventeen or 44.7% reported completing a minor but only one had a double major. Only thirteen or 34.2% reported having children. Of these, nine or 69.7% said they would encourage their children to attend Wright State, most often because it was a good school, close to home and affordable. Interestingly, three of four parents who stated they would not recommend Wright State for their children gave reasons such as another school already chosen or children being too young for the question to be relevant.

Thirty-four or 89.5% of responding alumni reported being employed and had been in their current job for a mean of 4.72 years, working an average of 46.53 hours per week. Twenty-four or 70.6% of employed alumni reported working in criminal justice or related fields such as security, law and casework.

**Is your job a good fit?**

The open-ended question “Do you feel your job is a good fit for you?” elicited 29 responses, of which 21 were positive, five were negative and three were interpreted as neutral or ambivalent. Some examples of these responses:

**Positive**

“I enjoy helping people as a dispatcher.” “I get to travel and have lots of responsibility.” “I have a passion for investigations and get to use my interview and other skills on a daily basis.” “I feel I fit in well with staff and community.”

**Negative**

“Overworked and underpaid.” “Not a third-shift person, no room for advancement.” “Low-paying, private sector work.”

**Neutral or ambivalent**

“I’m good at my job but not entirely happy.” “It’s what I wanted in college but I’m looking to change.” “I generally enjoy it but sometimes the work and responsibility are overwhelming.”

**Why CJS at WSU?**

The open-ended question “Why did you choose Wright State University’s CJS Program?” was answered by all 38 alumni. The most common reason was interest in criminal justice (17 mentions), followed by convenient location (11 mentions), migrating from another major (7), cost (7), WSU reputation (5), and CJS reputation (4). Some examples of these responses:

“The program and the professors were amazing. They really showed me that they cared about their students’ educations. I started in K-12 PE but I changed majors in my junior year. Dr. Steele is an awesome teacher.”
I was already a police officer working for WSU. I was able to take classes for free.

It was easy to transfer credits to Wright State. I also heard good things about the program.

Program ranking and why

Alumni were then asked to rank the CJS program on a ten-point scale and explain their reasoning. Thirty-six respondents gave rankings which formed a normal distribution with a mode of 8.0 and median of 8.5. Some examples of these rankings followed by the ranker’s explanation:

10. “Excellent professors who are passionate about their work.”
8. “I enjoyed most all of the major classes and the professors were excellent and cared a lot about their students.”
8. “Some professors made my journey difficult and if one did not agree, a grade could be affected.”
7. “It provided a decent theoretical basis for my law enforcement career, but the hands-on and police classes were rare or lacking in substance.”
6. “I loved my classes but the program does not prepare students for getting a job in this field.”
2. “I felt I got nowhere with my degree, even with an internship. Didn’t really prepare me for a job.”

Respondents were also asked to rank possible reasons for choosing the CJS major as “very important,” “somewhat important,” and “not important.” For 31 respondents or 81.6 %, “I liked the coursework/subject matter in the field” and “I thought CJS would prepare me for the career I wanted” were considered very important. “The faculty (expertise, personal attention, accessibility)” was very important to 21 or 55.3% of alumni, whereas “I had/have a family member in this field” was very important to only five or 13.1% of respondents.

Alumni were next asked, “On a scale of 1 to 10, how likely are you to recommend our program to a friend or family member in the future?” These rankings produced a bimodal distribution, with nine rankings each of 10 and 8, and a median ranking of eight. Asking this concrete question related to acquaintances produced more response variability than the more abstract question above about ranking the program itself. Some examples of these rankings followed by the ranker’s explanation:

10. “Same reasons I chose to attend WSU and cost/benefit.”
8. “The cost of tuition. I was also happy about assistance in getting an internship which led to my current job.”
8. “I enjoyed the professors and classes, especially the flexibility to take classes to accommodate my work.”
5. “No help with career prep.”
1. “It doesn’t set you up for success. I’d recommend another degree.”

Internships

Thirty-two or 84.3% of alumni participated in internships. This is a requirement in the CJS Core but may be waived if the student is working or has work experience in the justice system. If students are ineligible for academic or other reasons, they are allowed to substitute a service learning course or take an extra Advanced CJS Elective. Most internships were in court systems (16) and law enforcement (8), but one student interned in a U.S. congressman’s office. Former internees were asked “How valuable was this experience for you?” Twenty-seven or 71.1% felt that it was “very valuable” or “somewhat valuable.” A probing question then asked the basis for the value assessment and ideas for improvement. Twenty statements were positive, nine were negative and three were ambivalent. Suggestions for improvement tended to cluster around making internships longer or multiple (8 suggestions), available sooner in one’s academic career (3 suggestions), and more likely to approximate and result in a job (5 suggestions). Eight alumni thought there should be more choices. Some examples of responses to the probing question about attitudes toward and suggestions for improving internships:

Positive
“My internship was hands-on and as a result of my experience, they decided to hire me before I graduated. I would require the student to complete two or more internships.”

Ambivalent
“I learned a lot in probation and realized I would enjoy that career. Unfortunately, I didn’t realize how low P.O.s are paid and no longer want to pursue probation. I would have liked to know about more and different kinds of internship opportunities.”
Negative
“WSU desperately needs an internship program in which you actually have a shot to land the job you’re shadowing.”

Research Skills
On five-point Likert statements from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree,” alumni were asked about research skills they learned in completing their CJS degree. The percentage of respondents in the “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” categories for each research skill are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH SKILL</th>
<th>STRONGLY or SOMEWHAT AGREE I LEARNED IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a hypothesis with independent and dependent variables.</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use PCs to find information and create a bibliography.</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use basic statistical techniques to evaluate data.</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use statistical software such as SPSS.</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate different research methods.</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret data.</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relatively low percentages for self-reported learning of statistical techniques and software merit special attention, especially as Statistics and Research Methodology are required for the CJS major.

Theory, Law and System Structure
On the same Likert scales, alumni were asked about their learning of theory, law and structure. The percentage of respondents in the “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” categories for these learning outcomes are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY, LAW, STRUCTURE</th>
<th>STRONGLY or SOMEWHAT AGREE I LEARNED IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify ethical issues in CJ research</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic concepts</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic theoretical perspectives or paradigms</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How individual behavior and demographics affect crime</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How social institutions and structure affect crime</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic knowledge of police courts and corrections</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative and procedural techniques and skills</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewing crime from a critical perspective</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical assessment and evaluation of ideas</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and improvement of writing skills</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and improvement of oral communication skills</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining credible and scientific information</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking skills</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lowest percentages in the table above suggest that alumni lack confidence that they have learned critical thinking, writing and speaking. This also merits further attention.

Participation in Activities
Alumni were asked about their participation in certain activities, and their responses are categorized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job fairs at Wright State</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus interviews</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning class</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteerism while at WSU</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job fairs are heavily promoted at Wright State and participating does not require a lot of effort, so that probably explains the relatively high percentage of alumni who checked that activity on the survey. As mentioned in the discussion of internships above, a service learning class offers course credit and may be an alternative for those ineligible for internships, so participation could be involuntary.
General Satisfaction with CJS Program

Respondents then indicated their general satisfaction with several aspects of the program on a four-point scale from “very satisfied” to “very dissatisfied:”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM ASPECT</th>
<th>VERY SATISFIED OR SATISFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall program</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of curriculum</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of curriculum</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of courses taken</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instruction</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of communication</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relatively low satisfaction percentages for advising, structure and communication suggest that improvements could be made in these areas.

Alumni were asked how challenging their courses were on a four-point scale from “very challenging” to “very unchallenging,” and 84.2% indicated that their courses were “very” or “somewhat” challenging.

Preparation for Graduate School

CJS graduates were then asked about how well the program had prepared them for graduate school. Fourteen of 38 respondents indicated they had received some sort of postgraduate education, but two cited police academy, three mentioned certificate programs such as paralegal training, and two got a second baccalaureate in another field. Conventional graduate degrees granted were six master’s degrees and two law degrees. Seventeen respondents answered two questions on a four-point scale from “very satisfied” to “very dissatisfied,” but obviously these questions were hypothetical for some:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREPARATION ASPECT</th>
<th>VERY SATISFIED OR SATISFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program coursework</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and recommendations</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction with preparation for graduate study is somewhat less than satisfaction with the program examined in the previous table, so this discrepancy bears further study.

Value of Courses

All 38 alumni responded to the question, “Of the courses you took within the major, which one or two did you feel were most valuable and why?” Nine mentioned law, five cited internships, and the other classes only got one or two mentions each. A large variety of responses to the “why” element didn’t reveal any pattern that could answer this part of the question. When asked what one or two classes were least valuable, five respondents each cited “none,” statistics, research methods and internships.

Subject Areas Deserving More Focus

Respondents were asked an open-ended question: “What, if any, subject areas would you have liked to have seen focused upon more in the criminal justice curriculum? Why?” Eight alumni mentioned law and eight stated procedures and forensics, but there was some push-back against these choices by six graduates who felt that there was already too much focus on these two areas. One example: “I felt most classes were directed at some sort of police job. I felt there should be more to criminal justice than just law enforcement.” Three respondents suggested more focus on sociology and another three supported the status quo and had no suggestions to improve focus.

Specific Memories

Alumni were prompted to reminisce by this statement: “Please describe any specific memories or experiences you had with our program that you feel do(es) a good job of capturing what the major meant/means to you.” Fourteen respondents took this opportunity to praise professors for teaching and advising, especially Dr. Steele and Dr. Lahm. Four alumni favorably recalled their internship experiences, and six fondly remembered a variety of features, including prison tours, police ride-alongs, the Forensic Science Society, opportunities for public speaking and debate, and learning about policies and procedures.
Final Question

“Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about your undergraduate program or career? If so please use this space to do so.” Only 17 of 38 alumni chose to respond to this cue. Four unequivocally praised the program but another four decried a lack of help in getting jobs. Other alumni had a wide variety of suggestions, including a public speaking course, better communication, adding police academy to the curriculum, and more instructors with practical experience.

F. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Results will be shared with CJS faculty at the next program meeting and with other directors and Dean Sobolik at the next program director’s meeting.

Writing Samples

A direct assessment measure was analyzing writing samples of graduating seniors. A random sample of 57 student papers showed that 53 or 93% had written an A or B college level paper. The mean for Dr. Steele’s Mechanics: Grammar, Spelling and Punctuation measure was 4.40 out of 5.0, which compares favorably with 4.11 out of 5.0 on the same measure for a sample of 22 student papers analyzed in the 2007-2008 assessment report. These papers covered a wide variety of topics and formats. Forty-six of 57 or 81% of these papers had no significant problems according to the rubric described in Appendix A.

These results suggest an improvement in the quality of CJS student writing over a five-year period. Recent graduates may be taking their assignments more seriously, benefiting from better editing by professors, or taking more pride in their writing because of increased participation in social media. The latter, however, can also encourage plagiarism, as Susan Blum and others have pointed out cultural approval for copy-pasting in constructing one’s online persona. Some of these differences may also be due to inter-rater reliability, because Dr. Steele assessed 2004-2008 writing samples and I assessed 2009-2013 writing samples. Other causal factors could also be in play, including economic collapse in 2008 leading to a more competitive market for graduates in 2009-2013, but these results are favorable for the CJS program.

Exit Interviews

An indirect assessment was senior exit interviews. Ratings of 17 different aspects of the program averaged 4.40 on a five-point scale. Two self-reported measures of student competence are comparable over the five-year assessment period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXIT INTERVIEW MEASURE</th>
<th>2007-2008 SCORE</th>
<th>2012-2013 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall understanding of CJ system</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of procedures</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the same caveats about inferring program improvement from the writing sample numbers also apply here, but these measures suggest that CJS graduates are prepared for employment in criminal justice and related fields. As discussed earlier, however, the relatively lower student confidence levels in Research Methodology, Critical Thinking, Research Skills, Applied Skills, Writing, and especially Oral Presentation are of concern and merit further attention.

Alumni Survey

A second indirect assessment was the 2013-2013 alumni survey. In a sample of 38 graduates, 89.5% were employed and 70.6% were working in criminal justice or related fields, which is evidence for the second major program objective of preparing graduates for employment. When asked to rate the CJS Program overall, 86.8% of alumni were either very satisfied or satisfied. Seventeen graduates went on to postgraduate study, and 76.4% said that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with their undergraduate coursework as preparation for graduate school, which is evidence for the third major program objective of preparing graduates for postgraduate study. The alumni survey instrument was greatly expanded for 2012-2013 and thus not directly comparable with the earlier one, but these differences stand out.
A caveat for any alumni survey is that employed alumni may be more likely to participate and indicate satisfaction with their degree than unemployed respondents. Twenty-nine of 38 alumni believed that their present job was a good fit. These alumni cited the CJS major as their most common reason for coming here, followed by convenient location, migrating from another major, low cost, Wright State’s general appeal and the CJS program’s reputation, which was ranked between 8.0 and 8.50 on a 10-point scale.

As with graduating seniors in Exit Interviews, alumni were also asked to self-report their learning and although the two instruments are not directly comparable, some areas of concern in the former are echoed in the latter. Only 55.3% of alumni strongly or somewhat agreed that they knew how to analyze statistical data, and only 42.2% had the same confidence in their abilities with statistical software. Only 63.1% of alumni strongly or somewhat agreed that they had learned critical assessment and evaluation of ideas, and development and improvement of oral communication skills.

Overall program satisfaction was 86.8% for alumni. The highest component satisfaction percentages were for quality of instruction (100.0%) and flexibility of curriculum (97.4%), and the lowest were for academic advising (78.9%) and effectiveness of communication (65.8%). In terms of preparation for graduate study, 76.4% of alumni felt that their coursework was adequate and 73.3% were satisfied with advice and recommendations.

When asked about the most valuable courses taken, the most often cited were law and internships. When asked for suggestions, more law classes was the most common response. Some alumni suggested more applied courses like procedures and forensics, but others disagreed and said there was already too much focus on these. When asked about specific memories of their time in CJS, the most common response was fond memories of helpful professors, particularly Dr. Steele.

G. ACTIONS PLANNED TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

Writing Samples
Program faculty should be told that although they are doing a good job with teaching their students to write, there is always room for improvement. Program faculty should receive a checklist of common problems found in the last five-year cycle of student papers, such as expressing “conventional wisdom” about criminal justice issues, awkward writing, inadequate description of research methods and presentation of statistics, and problems with APA style where applicable. Discussions about plagiarism prevention are also needed. Important questions are how many instructors filter all assignments through turnitin.com, how many submit only suspect papers, and how many use no plagiarism detection software.

Exit Interviews and Alumni Surveys
Having two different measures of something increases our confidence that we have insight into the reality of situations. Both the senior Exit Interviews and Alumni Survey show that our students doubt their abilities in the important areas of research methods, statistics, critical thinking and oral communication skills. Conversations with colleagues who regularly teach statistics and methods suggest that there is considerable student resistance to this instruction, and a tendency toward faculty burnout. More of these conversations need to happen, along with focus groups of students, to get ideas for improvement. Since confidence in oral communication was particularly low for both new graduates and alumni, work should begin toward a dedicated “Speech Skills in Criminal Justice” course. Such a course could address not only organizing and giving a talk about a particular topic, but also problems in communicating with vulnerable groups (e.g., crime victims, the homeless and disabled), presenting and defending crime rates in a high-pressure Comp-Stat environment, and advancing legal arguments.

H. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (recommended)
Program faculty meetings, advisor meetings and student focus groups will discuss these results and move toward action planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALUMNI SURVEY YEAR</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>CJ EMPLOYMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: CJS Writing Sample Evaluation Form

Mechanics

1. Grammar, Spelling, Punctuation (1 = F, 5 = A)
2. Writing is clear and fluid
3. Paper organization is satisfactory

Substance

1. Paper is focused
2. Paper demonstrates mastery of topics relevant to assignment
3. Results and conclusions are clear
4. Results and conclusions are substantiated with available facts/data
5. Writing is persuasive
6. Demonstrates knowledge of procedures, investigative techniques and operations in law enforcement, probation, parole or legal agencies (where appropriate)
7. Demonstrates overall knowledge of criminal justice system or adequate knowledge of social science research (where appropriate)

Appendix B: CJS Graduation Check and Exit Interview

Name ____________________________ Date __________
UID ____________________________

Done Courses Remaining

GE Areas 1-6

____ WAC Courses

LA Language

____

PHL

____

CS

____

Methods

____

CRJ Core

____

Foundation

____

Electives

____

2 WAC Courses

____

Total Hours (192)

____

Max major hours 68

____

100 hrs LA

____

UL credits 60 (30 WSU)

____

Total WSU hrs 45 (15 last yr)

____

GPA

____

Grad Check Issued

____

Submitted Writing Samples (2-3)

____

Career Services Avail.

____
Reminder to keep us updated
Minor

**Contact Information**
Student Phone
Address
Alternate

Permanent Contact Name
Phone
Address

**Future Plans**

**Internship Experiences**

**Program Feedback (1 – 5, 5 is high, add comments)**

*Student Perspectives on Quality of Program*
- Quality of Classes/Course Content

  - Quality of Instruction
  - Quality of Advising
  - Program Flexibility
  - Well-rounded Curriculum
  - Value of Internship for Program
  - Program Communication

*Program Performance in Communicating/Teaching Key Pedagogical Skills/Subjects*
- Research Methodology
  - Critical Thinking
  - Research Skills
  - Applied Skills
  - Writing
  - Oral Presentation

Appreciation of Diversity

Overall Understanding of CRJ system (org. structure)

Knowledge of procedures, investigative techniques, and operations in law enforcement, probation, parole or legal agencies

**Comments on Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program**
2013 Criminal Justice Alumni Survey

As part of the on-going assessment process at Wright State University, our program gathers information from program alumni in order to evaluate the quality of the education we provide. As an alumnus of our program, we feel your insights about our program are both unique and invaluable. Therefore, we would very much appreciate your taking the time to provide us with information regarding your experiences as a Criminal Justice major.

Your frank assessment of our program will help us to determine the aspects of the program that worked well as well as those that are not. Moreover, it will help us continue to improve our program for future students. Please take a few moments to respond to help us with this effort. You are free to skip any questions you find objectionable or for which you are unsure of a response. Please be assured that we will keep your answers in the strictest of confidence.

Even if you choose not to complete the survey please send us an email to let us know how you are doing!

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact the Program Director:

Tracey Steele, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Director
Criminal Justice Program (now Crime and Justice Studies)
Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio 45435-0001
Email: tracey.steele@wright.edu
Telephone: (937) 775-2582
Fax: (937) 775-4228

*Please note—the information you provide is meant for internal data collection purposes only and will not be shared or sold to any person or organization outside of Wright State University
PART I: General Background Information
This section of the survey contains specific demographic questions about you and your educational and employment experiences since your graduation from Wright State University. Please write the information in the space provided. As a reminder, your responses are confidential and will be aggregated for analysis—we will not share your personal information with anyone outside the University.

A1. What is your sex? _________

A2. With which of the following groups to you most closely identify? 
___ African –American  ___ Asian  ___ Caucasian  ___ Hispanic  
___ Native American  ___ Other (please describe) _____________

A3. What is your marital/relationship status? (Check the most current status) 
___ Single  ___ Married/Domestic Partnership  ___ In a Committed Relationship  ___ Divorced  
___ Widowed  ___ Other (please describe) _____________

A4. Do you have any children?  ___ yes  ___ no 

If yes: A4 a. How many children do you have? ____________

Ab. What are their ages? _____________

Ac. Have you (or will you) encourage them to attend WSU?  ___yes  ___ no  

4 d. Why or why not? ______________________________________

A5. Do you work in the paid labor force?  a. yes  b. no 

A5a. If no, Please describe your situation (e.g. homemaker, retired, looking for work, disability, in school, etc.) - 

A5b. If yes, How many hours a week on average do you work? ____________

A5c. If yes, Tell us a little about your work (e.g. your current job title and type of employer, for example, “I am a statistician for the Internal Revenue Service and have worked there since graduating from college”).

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

A5d. If yes, How long have you been at your current job? ____________

A5e. If yes, Is your job related to your Criminal Justice education?  ___yes  ___ no

A5f. Do you feel you job is a good fit for you? ___yes  ___ no 

Why/why not?________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
A6. What is your current age (in whole years)? __________

A7. What year did you graduate from WSU with a major in Criminal Justice? __________

A8. Was Criminal Justice your first choice of major? ___yes ___ no

A9. How long did it take you to complete this degree? __________

A10. Did you have a second major?  a. yes b. no

A9a. If yes, what was that major? ________________________________

A11. Did you have a minor(s)?  a. yes b. no

10a. If yes, what minor(s)? ________________________________

PART II: Assessment of Substantive Content and Skill Sets

This section of the survey contains questions specific to the skills and substantive material learned from being a Criminal Justice major.

B1. Why did you choose Wright State University’s Criminal Justice Program?

B2. On a scale of 1 to 10 (where 1 is low and 10 is high) how would you rank Wright State University’s Criminal Justice Program? __________

B2a. Why?

B3. Please rank the importance of each of the following possible reasons for choosing our program where:

1 = very important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = not important.

___ I liked the coursework/subject matter in the field
___ I thought Criminal Justice would prepare me for the career I wanted
___ The faculty (expertise, personal attention, accessibility)
___ I had/have a family member in this field
___ Other (Please specify): ________________________________

B4. Have you recommended our program to others ___ yes ___ no

B5. On a scale of 1 to 10 (again where 1 is low and 10 is high) how likely are you recommend our Criminal Justice/Crime and Justice Studies Program to a friend or family member in the future? __________

B5a. Why or Why not?
B6. Did you participate in an internship at W.S.U.? ___ yes ___ no

If yes:

B6a. Where did you intern? _______________________________________________

B6b. How valuable was this experience for you? (check one)
    ____ very valuable  ____ somewhat valuable  ____ not very valuable  ____ not at all valuable

B6c. Why do you feel this way?

B6d. Are there ways we can improve the internship experience? (Please describe)

B7. Please use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you learned the following types of material as a criminal justice major where:

   1-strongly agree, 2-somewhat agree, 3-neutral, 4-somewhat disagree, 5-strongly disagree

As part of the Criminal Justice Major I learned:

(Research Skills)

____ a. How to create a hypothesis with independent and dependent variables

____ b. How to use computers to find information to develop a bibliography or a list of references

____ c. How to use basic statistical techniques (frequency distributions, analysis of variance, chi-square, and/or regression), to evaluate information

____ d. How to use standard statistical software packages such as SPSS to analyze data

____ e. How to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of different research methods (e.g. surveys, participant observations) for answering specific research questions

____ f. How to interpret data

(Theory, Law, System Structure)

____ g. How to identify ethical issues in criminal justice research

____ h. Basic concepts in Law and Criminal Justice (e.g. arrest, probable cause, etc.)
i. Basic theoretical perspectives or paradigms in Criminal Justice (e.g. conflict theory, labeling theory, social control theory etc.)

j. How individual behavior and circumstances (e.g. race, age, and class) may affect crime in the United States.

k. How various social institutions and structures (e.g. the police, courts, and corrections) affect crime in the United States.

l. Basic knowledge of the structure, function, and operation of police, courts, and Corrections

m. Investigative, legal, and/or procedural techniques and/skills

n. To view crime from a critical perspective

(Advanced Educational Skills)

o. How to critically assess and evaluate ideas

p. How to develop and improve my writing skills

q. How to develop and improve my oral communication skills

r. How to obtain credible and scientific information (e.g. library, internet, etc.)

s. Critical thinking skills

B8. Did you participate in any of the following while at WSU? (Circle all that apply)
   a. Job fairs
   b. On campus interviews by firms
   c. A service learning class(es)
   c. Individual community, political, or other volunteer activity

B9. For each of the following, please indicate the number that best represents your level of satisfaction where:
   1- very satisfied, 2- satisfied 3- dissatisfied, 4-dissatisfied

a. The Criminal Justice Program (overall)

b. Advising in the Criminal Justice Program

c. The flexibility of the criminal justice curriculum

d. The structure of the criminal justice curriculum

e. The quality of the criminal justice courses you took

f. The quality of instruction in your criminal justice courses
g. How effectively the program communicated information to you (e.g. regarding classes, job fairs, registration deadlines, etc.) about the major.

B10. How challenging were courses in the Criminal Justice program? (Circle one)
   a. Very challenging  b. Somewhat challenging
   c. Somewhat unchallenging  d. Very unchallenging

PART III: Assessment of Preparation for Graduate or Professional Education

This section of the survey contains questions specific to your preparedness for graduate school. Many of these questions will be relevant ONLY if you have completed additional education since your Criminal Justice degree.

C1. Have you completed other degrees, licensures, or certifications since your graduation from WSU with a BA in Criminal Justice?  a. yes  b. no

   C1a. If yes, please describe the degrees, licensures, and/or certifications you have completed (include both the degree and the field, e.g. an M.A. and PhD in Public Administration)
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

   C1b. For each of the following, please indicate the number that best represents your level of satisfaction where:
   1-very satisfied, 2- satisfied 3- dissatisfied, 4-very dissatisfied

   _____ 1. How satisfied were you with your Criminal Justice coursework in helping prepare you for graduate level or professional education?

   _____ 2. How satisfied were you with Criminal Justice faculty in providing assistance, advising, and letters of recommendation in helping apply for graduate level or professional education?

PART IV: Program Development

Da. Of the courses you took within the major, what one to two classes/topics do you feel were the most valuable? Why?

D2. Of the courses you took within the major, what one to two classes/topics do you feel were the least valuable? Why?

D3. What, if any, subject areas would you have liked to have seen focused upon more in the criminal justice curriculum? Why?
D4. Please describe any specific memories or experiences you had with our program that you feel do(es) a good job of capturing what the major meant/means to you.

D5. Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about your undergraduate program or career? If so please use this space to do so.

Thank you for completing this survey. Your time and participation are very much appreciated.

P.S. We would love to celebrate your accomplishments more formally in our newsletter! You can write, call, email, fax, or even drop by to let us know what you have been doing since graduation. And if you are humble or shy, consider it a favor to us—let our current undergraduates know that there is life after graduation!