HOW ARE WE USING THE RESULTS OF ASSESSMENTS TO MAKE CHANGES?

1. What courses/certificates/programs have you assessed this past year?

   This table represents all of the course assessments that have been uploaded to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>SLO #1</th>
<th>SLO #2</th>
<th>SLO #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJ 1</td>
<td>F2010</td>
<td>F2010</td>
<td>F2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ 2</td>
<td>SP 2010</td>
<td>SP 2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ 3</td>
<td>F2010</td>
<td>F2010</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ 4</td>
<td>SP 2010,</td>
<td>SP2010</td>
<td>SP2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ 5</td>
<td>F 2010</td>
<td>F2010</td>
<td>F 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ 6</td>
<td>F2010</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td>F2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ 14</td>
<td>F2010</td>
<td>F 2010</td>
<td>SP2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ 75</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td>SP2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ 150</td>
<td>F2010</td>
<td>F2011</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ 160</td>
<td>F2010</td>
<td>F2010</td>
<td>F2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Learning Outcomes two and four were assessed in the summer of 2012 for the Administration of Justice degree.

2. Summarize the analysis of your assessment results for courses in your area.

   For Program Learning Outcomes, a survey was mailed to 25 students who had recently graduated from our program with a degree in Administration of Justice. Thirteen students responded.

   Students were asked how well they thought the Administration of Justice Program was preparing them to do the following:

   Program Learning Outcome #2: Apply critical thinking skills and an appropriate problem-solving strategy to a criminal justice situation. 30% of respondents said Very well and 54% said somewhat well.
Program Learning Outcome#4: Transfer to an undergraduate program at the University level in the field of criminal justice. 85% said Very well.

**AJ1:**
For class section 0107, 3 of the questions on the test students consistently scored low in, both in the pre-test and post-test, questions 11, 12 and 16. These questions concerned the rights defendants, sentencing and community policing. In the future, more time will be devoted in class to address these issues.

For section 3105, students basically scored the same as the previous section on questions 11, 12 and 16.

Section 0106 was basically the same as the above course sections however, students scored consistently lower on questions related to the court system and how it is structured.

**AJ2:**
6 of the questions on the test students consistently scored low in both on the pre-test and post-test, questions 4,5,13,18,19, 20. Most of these questions were hypothetical in nature requiring students to analyze a scenario and choose the best answer. In the future, more time needs to be spent in class analyzing several different scenarios making sure students understand the material.

**AJ3:**
Analysis of results from pre-test and post-test comparison indicates an increase in evidence law and evidence procedure knowledge domains by 31%. No curriculum modification planned.

**AJ4:**
3 of the questions on the test students consistently scored low in, both in the pre-test and post-test, questions 8, 10 and 16. Two of these questions concerned the rights defendants are given at the time of arrest and during trial. In the future, more time will be devoted in class to address these issues

**AJ5:**
Questions 9 talked about the search incident to arrest case of Chimel v. California. Question 13 talked about Gun Shot Residue and 14 addressed the proper method of blood collection at a crime scene. Question 15 asked what was the proper method of searching a crime scene. In the future, more time will be devoted in class to address these issues.
AJ6:

3 of the questions on the test students consistently scored low in, both in the pre-test and post-test, questions 6, 11, and 19. Questions 6 and 11 talked about the history and different types of police patrol. Question 19 asked about a case law decision regarding searching suspects after they have been arrested, Chimel v. California. In the future, more time will be devoted in class to address these issues.

AJ14: More emphasis is needed on grammar, structure, and spelling. Penmanship needs to be emphasized. Narrative portions of the report require more "storytelling." A greater degree of grammar lessons will be included in the upcoming semesters. Also, more videos of crimes will be shown, involving more report writing. Other incidents were used to write police reports, and weekly written assignments, chapter (textbook) quizzes, and English grammar and usage quizzes were also used to assess student comprehension of writing police reports. If a student improved in their writing abilities, they were graded accordingly.

AJ75: From results of the pre-test in comparison to the post-test, there has been improvement shown in their basis of understanding of the many careers available in the field of corrections. It was clear that many of the students did not understand the basic differences between probation officers and parole officers before taking the class. The class will write one Probation violation report given a scenario by the professor.

AJ150: Emphasis will be placed on current information and statistic data. Stereotypes of street and prison gangs will be discussed and updated.

AJ160: 8 of the questions on the test students consistently scored low in, both in the pre-test and post-test, questions 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 19, and 20. Questions 2, 3 and 4 talked about organizational theory. Questions 9, 10 and 11 addressed civil liability, police promotional examinations and the culture of policing. Questions 19 and 20 talked about use of force and corruption. In the future, more time will be devoted in class to address these issues.

3. How have the results of your assessments been shared and discussed among the members of your program? (Provide dates and minutes of meetings or transcript of online discussion)

There was a departmental SLO Workshop presented by the campus SLO Coordinator and IT Web Designer in Spring 2011 which was attended by all full-time faculty and some of the department’s adjunct faculty.

The 2011-2012 FLEX DAY activities and department meeting on August 25, 2011, included discussions and group work on SLO and PLO assessment.
The SLO Coordinator, Pat Flood, met with several of our adjuncts four individual consultations on assessment during the Spring and Fall 2011 semester. These trainings focused on getting the course level assessments uploaded into the campus SLO management system.

We also have ongoing, informal conversations amongst the department faculty.

4. How have the results of your assessments been shared and discussed with members of your advisory committee (if vocational program)?

We had an Administration of Justice advisory board meeting in March of 2012 where the results of the course level outcomes were shared with the committee.

5. Based on the discussion and analysis of your assessment results, what changes have you made or do you plan to make (provide dates, description of changes, and person responsible).

A discussion will take place in January of 2013 with Administration of Justice adjunct faculty as to what changes and planning should be made as a result of the program learning outcomes.

6. What is your assessment plan for the program and courses for the upcoming program review period? Provide dates, SLO(s) to be measured, means of assessment, and person to be responsible.

During the spring of 2013 we plan on mailing out a survey and holding a focus group to assess the Program Learning Outcomes for the Basic Police Academy Preparation Certificate program. The Vice Chair of AJ will be responsible for coordinating this.