

**SEMINOLE STATE COLLEGE
ASSOCIATE IN SCIENCE IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE (225)**

2017-18 Degree Program Evaluation

The information required to complete this annual evaluation process mirrors the information required by OSRHE Policy on Academic Program Review. Specifically, it covers the following Vitality of the Program items: (1) Program Objectives and Goals, (2) Quality Indicators, (3) Minimum Productivity Indicators, and (4) Other Quantitative Measures (for additional information see OSRHE Policy 3.7.5.B.1-4).

1. Program Objectives and Goals

Associate in Science in Criminal Justice Degree Program Outcomes

Outcomes for Transfer Degree Programs

Outcome 1: Demonstrate successful articulation of Seminole State College transfer degree programs to state and professional institutions of higher learning granting professional and baccalaureate degrees in Oklahoma.

Outcome 2: Demonstrate successful academic achievement by Seminole State College transfer degree students at primary receiving state baccalaureate institutions of higher learning in Oklahoma. Successful academic achievement is defined as the maintenance of satisfactory academic progress toward degree completion as determined by the receiving institution.

Outcomes Specific to Associate in Science in Criminal Justice

Outcome 3: Students will demonstrate knowledge, skills, and values consistent with the science and application of criminal justice.

Outcome 4: Students will display the knowledge, skills and values consistent with curriculum developed for criminal justice.

2. Quality Indicators

**Combined Course Embedded Assessment Results For 2017-18
for Major Field Courses in Degree Program**

General Education Outcomes	Pre-Test % Correct	Post-Test % Correct	Difference
General Education Outcome 1			
General Education Outcome 2			
General Education Outcome 3	46%	61%	15%
General Education Outcome 4			
Specific Outcomes for AS Criminal Justice	Pre-Test % Correct	Post-Test % Correct	Difference
Degree Program Outcome 3	46%	61%	14%
Degree Program Outcome 4	46%	61%	14%

Other Data Indicating Quality Relevant to Degree Program Major Field

Degree Program Enrollment by Ethnicity

Academic Year	Ethnicity	Summer 2017		Fall 2017		Spring 2018	
		Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
2017-18	Total Students	16	100%	51	100%	34	100%
	Black	2	12%	6	12%	4	12%
	Indian	3	19%	13	25%	5	15%
	Asian	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Hispanic	0	0%	2	4%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	White	11	69%	30	59%	25	73%
	Undeclared	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Degree Program Enrollment by Gender

Academic Year	Gender	Summer 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
2017-18	Male	6	25	16
	Female	10	26	18

Student Feedback on Instruction:

Instructors had a mean score of 4.52 out of 5 for all rated questions, which is a slight improvement from the last survey 4.46 results. For online instructors, the mean score was 4.53 out of 5, also an improvement from the last survey results of 4.39 out of 5.

For all courses taught this is positive feedback. Students also rated instructors positively for instructor encouragement of students (4.46), concern for student success was down slightly from the last survey (4.42), and instructors creating an environment respect, inclusion, and tolerance in the classroom (4.62).

For online courses also rated instructors 4.73 out of 5 (up from 4.60) for treating students fairly and respectfully. An area that we wanted to improve in last year was creating greater class interaction. This

year the survey results were 4.46 out of 5 up from 4.13 and instructors routinely providing students grades via My Grades on Brightspace is up from 4.13 to 4.55 out of 5.

Graduate Exit Survey:

When asked to assess their overall experience at SSC, 70.6% of the students rated the educational experience as excellent or above average. Students listed professors as one of the greatest strength at SSC while also referring to small class sizes and caring personnel. “Quality of teaching in your major field of study” scored 74.4% of students choosing excellent or above average. “Quality of teaching in general education courses” rated 66.7% as excellent or above average. Each of these areas are slightly below last year’s survey.

Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) Test:

Seminole State students scored near national means in all five subject areas. For example, SSC students averaged a score of 60.7 on the writing skills test, which is higher than the college’s previous average and 0.1 points lower than the national mean. In reading, SSC students performed above the national mean with a score of 58.9 compared to the national mean of 59.4. In critical thinking, SSC students scored slightly below the national mean of 60.2 with a score of 59.2. SSC students scored slightly below the national mean in all five subject areas for students with 45+ credit hours at other two-year institutions nationwide. This was the last year for the CAAP Test.

Other Quality Indicators:

Entering Student Engagement Survey:

The second annual survey was given to students during week six of the fall 2017 semester as well as all Freshman Seminars and PASS classes. 91.5% of all respondents stated that SSC was their first college experience. 80.8% were between the ages of 18 and 24. Regarding the highest level of education achieved by the students’ parents the highest percentage was high school graduation at 31.6%. 99.6% of respondents think that their instructors want them to succeed. 97.4% said that at least one member of the college staff had learned their name this is up from the first survey. 94.5% said they met with an academic advisor at a time convenient for them, which is also up. This survey is a limited snapshot of entering student opinion it does illustrate a very positive portrait of the welcoming and friendly environment of SSC for students who are primarily young adults experiencing college for the first time.

Faculty Survey on Student Engagement:

The second Faculty Survey on Student Engagement reflects low faculty participation in the survey. As chair I will work to encourage all Social Sciences Division instructors participate in future surveys. Of those participating they offered the following responses to some of the questions. For example, 94.1% of faculty provide students with contact information for contact outside of the classroom. 73.5% of faculty try to learn student names by the end of the first two weeks of class. 70.6% provide students continuous access to their grades via Brightspace. Each of these do seem to suggest that a positive learning environment is the goals of these instructors, whether or not this leads to student success will be determined.

3. Minimum Productivity Indicators

Productivity Indicators

Academic Year	Semester	Declared Majors	Graduates
---------------	----------	-----------------	-----------

2017-18	Summer 2017	16	3
	Fall 2017	51	2
	Spring 2018	34	2

Does the degree program meet the minimum OSRHE standards for productivity this year?

Majors Enrolled (25 per year): Yes

Degree Conferred (5 per year): Yes

Comments/Analysis: The goal is to increase the number of graduates to at least 10 per year. Last year the number of declared majors was 97 with 5 students graduating. This year, the number of declared majors is slightly up to 101 with 7 students graduating. This is movement in the right direction.

Low Productivity Justification:

4. Other Quantitative Measures

Number of Sections Taught and Enrollment for Each Course in Major Field of Degree Program

Prefix	Number	Major Field Course Title	Number of Sections	Total Students	Ave. Class Size	Total Credit Hours Generated
CJ	1103	Introduction to Criminology	2	21	10	63
CJ	1123	Introduction to Criminal Justice Systems	2	32	16	96
CJ	1143	Introduction to Law Enforcement	1	19	19	57
CJ	2203	Rules of Evidence	2	46	23	138
CJ	2243	Fundamentals of Criminal Investigations (not offered this period)	1	13	13	39

Credit Hours Generated in Major Field Courses of Degree Program By Level (from table above)

Academic Year	1000 Level Credit Hours Generated	2000 Level Credit Hours Generated
2017-18	216	177

Note: Credit Hours Generated columns represent the student credit hours generated by all the major field courses of the degree program for the given academic year. The hours do not represent the number of student credit hours generated only by those students declaring this major.

Direct Instructional Costs

Academic Year	Instructional Costs*	Costs Shown By Division or Program?
2017-18	\$577,983*	\$577,983*

*When cost data are not available by degree program, use total division budget for instructional costs for each degree program.

Credit Hours Generated by Courses in Major Field That Are Part of General Education Requirements in Other Degree Programs

Major Field Course Information			
Prefix	Number	Title	Credit Hours Generated
na	na	na	na

Faculty Teaching Major Field Courses in Degree Program

Name		Teaching Area		Highest Degree		Institution	
Sam Rivera		Sam Rivera		Sam Rivera		Sam Rivera	

Current Full-Time Faculty From Other Divisions Teaching Major Courses in Degree Program (Instructors with ** beside their name teach only zero-level classes)			
Current Adjunct Faculty Teaching Major Courses in Degree Program (Instructors with ** beside their name teach only zero-level classes)			
NA	NA	NA	NA

5. Recommendations and Other Relevant Items: Describe recommendations, new developments or initiatives pertaining to degree program.

Last year we made recruitment of criminal justice majors a priority in the division. A program flyer developed last year has been used in recruitment efforts. In addition, the program instructor/mentor has actively been recruiting students into the program. There has also been an effort to help guide students who are already majors through the program to completion. We are hoping this personal attention given to student majors will help improve both retention and graduation rates.

We have given this program two years to make improvements. We are just now completing the first year. We saw some improvements such as the courses offered each semester are not being cancelled and we have regularly offered 5 courses a semester since starting this initiative to improve the program. This will be the first year that the program instructor/mentor has not had to do work in advisement to make contract.