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I. General Information

Department/Program Name: SSHAPE/Administration of Justice  
Last Review: 2012-13  
Current Year: 2014-15  
Preparers’ Name: Cindy Bevan, Faculty  
Area Dean: Mark Gonzales

Evergreen Valley College’s Mission:
With equity, opportunity and social justice as our guiding principles, Evergreen Valley College’s mission is to empower and prepare students from diverse backgrounds to succeed academically, and to be civically responsible global citizens.

Evergreen Valley College Strategic Initiatives:
1. Student-Centered: We provide access to quality and efficient programs and services to ensure student success. Areas of focus are:
   • Increase Visibility
   • Develop Strategic Partnerships
   • Building Campus Community
2. Community Engagement: We create a trusting environment where everyone is valued and empowered. Areas of focus are:
   • Student Access: Completion of Educational Goals
   • Employee Development
   • Transparent Infrastructure
3. Organizational Transformation: We will transform the college image and enhance partnerships with community, business and educational institutions. Areas of focus are:
   • Access
   • Curriculum and Programs
   • Services

II. Summary of the Program

The Administration of Justice Program (referred to as Program) is a Career Technical Educational “CTE” program that serves the diverse needs of students seeking careers in law enforcement, corrections, the courts, legal and social services, and the private sector. It also supports students pursuing higher specialty education and general education pathways as well as those who desire personal educational growth. The Program meets the criteria of local, state, and federal CTE goals and objectives by offering excellent preparation to those interested in pursuing a highly skilled and good paying career in the administration of justice field. The Program benefits a distinct student population who desire to enter a competitive workforce, continue with career technical training, or who want to transfer to a four year institution to continue academic endeavors.
The Program itself was established in 1975 when the college first opened its doors, and today serves approximately 700-900 students each year. With over thirteen feeder high schools from East San Jose Union School District and San Jose Unified School District, the Program has a large contingent of young adult learners. However, data suggests that the Program serves students of many ages from 16 to 70 years who desire a highly skilled and demanding career in the administration of justice field or who wish to better their understanding in this field of study.

Three educational options are available to students of the Program: the A.A. degree, A.S. degree, and A.S-T degree. All three options include the same five core courses: AJ 10, AJ 11, AJ 13, AJ 14, and AJ 15. The Program itself consists of fifteen (15) courses, five (5) of which make up the core courses in the major. The remaining ten (10) courses can be taken to satisfy elective requirements in the major. Students with a more academic orientation may choose to complete either the A.A. or A.S-T degree option, and then continue on to a four-year school or university. Other students may choose to enter directly into the labor market with the minimum requisite education to do so. Students who complete the Program are eligible to pursue many careers in the administration of justice field including, but not limited to, police officer, deputy sheriff, community service officer, correctional officer, dispatcher, juvenile and adult probation officer, social service worker, or private security officer. Individuals with advanced education or extensive experience in law enforcement, criminology, or forensics can pursue opportunities as detectives, forensics experts, or private investigators.

III. Commitments to Action

a. Write a brief description of each proposed CTA from previous Program Review

b. Discuss whether each proposed CTA has been completed, is still in progress or has not been started. Give evidence of completion. Include in your discussion any new CTAs that have been added, removed or revised.

In accordance with the mission statement of the college, the Program helps students from diverse backgrounds realize their potential. The program’s CTAs are designed to support student success in the classroom and bridge, in a practical sense, those students who desire to enter directly into the labor market. By acquiring professional-level skills and knowledge, students can fulfill their academic potential and embark on rewarding careers in a growing administration of justice field. The Program is also intended to provide lower level course work in the major for students who desire to transfer and continue toward advanced degrees. With robust academic and vocational curricula, the Program prepares graduates to engage in a global society as civic-minded citizens, whether they ultimately choose a career in the justice field, in another career field, or continue on to a four year school or university.

Each of the Program’s CTAs is aligned with one of the college-wide initiatives and serves to promote fulfillment of both the college’s broader mission as well as its more targeted strategic initiatives. The Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are in alignment with the college Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), and thus the Program actively supports many of the same objectives and core values such as competency, social responsibility, communication, and personal development. Likewise, California Community Colleges are mandated by mission and expectation to offer school-to-work programs through Career Technical Education and the Program supports this state and local initiative. Finally, the Program receives valuable input from current and former practitioners, educators, and other experts who serve to shape course offerings and its Commitments to Action.
Each of the Program’s CTAs align with the broader strategic objectives as defined by the college such as Student Centered, Community Engagement, and Organization Transformation.

### CTA Report and Analysis

<p>| <strong>Student Centered:</strong> We provide access to quality and efficient programs and services to ensure student success. Areas of focus are: Increase Visibility; Develop Strategic Partnerships; Building Campus Community |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Program Review:</strong> 2012/13</th>
<th><strong>Program Review:</strong> 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Program faculty will consider for offer certain specialty (probation, writing skills, etc) and online hybrid courses in the next academic year to meet the needs of diverse learners.  
2. SLO assessment at the course and program level will continue on a regular cycle.  
3. PLO assessment at the course and program level will continue on a regular cycle.  
4. Certificate of specialties in correction and probation will be explored.  
5. The relationship between enrollment and degree completion will be explored with an emphasis on improving the number of degrees awarded to students. | 1. A new specialty course (AJ 123: Women and the Criminal Justice System) was developed and is available for offer. A second specialty course in Probation is currently under development with an anticipated 2015-16 offer date. One course (AJ 10: Introduction to Administration of Justice) was developed and submitted as an online offering. The course is pending approval.  
2. SLO assessment is continuing on a regular cycle. Currently, 29/37 SLOs have been assessed for AJ 10, 11, 14, 15, and 110. 0/81 SLOs have been assessed for courses (AJ 13, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117).  
3. PLO assessment is continuing on a regular cycle. All PLOs are mapped and aligned with college ILOs and to date, 4/5 PLOs have been assessed.  
4. A new probation course is being developed as an elective course in the major with an anticipated offer date in 2015/16. This course will help determine the feasibility and value of a certificate option in corrections or probation once enrollment data is known.  
5. The relationship between enrollment and degree completion remains a challenge and is continuously discussed and explored. |

<p>| <strong>Community Engagement:</strong> We create a trusting environment where everyone is valued and empowered. Areas of focus are: Student Access: Completion of Educational Goals; Employee Development; Transparent Infrastructure |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Program Review:</strong> 2012/13</th>
<th><strong>Program Review:</strong> 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The Program will continue to expand its outreach efforts to local area high schools.  
2. The Program will continue to work with local area organizations to create mentoring opportunities between program alumni and students.  
3. The Program will explore the feasibility and implementation of a dedicated Administration of Justice Webpage to communicate with internal and external stakeholders. | 1. AJ students are the best ambassadors of the Program. Each semester students are encouraged to participate in “Student-2-Student” a local high school outreach project. To date, four students have completed the project (See Appendix section for further information)  
2. Faculty are in continuous contact with local and state organizations to bring valuable and relevant information to AJ students. Referrals and resources are regularly provided to students who are interested in internships, employment, and volunteer opportunities.  
3. The district recently underwent a redesign of the Website. Now that the new website is in place, examining the feasibility of a dedicated Program Webpage will be explored. |
### Organizational Transformation: Community Engagement

We create a trusting environment where everyone is valued empowered. Areas of focus are: Student Access; Completion of Educational Goals; Employee Development; Transparent Infrastructure

| 1. All stale courses in need of revision (2009 and older) will be revised, and course revisions submitted within the next academic year. | 1. Considerable time and effort has been dedicated to course development and periodic revision. Four (4) courses were updated, two (2) new courses were developed and approved, and one (1) online course was proposed.  
2. Curriculum changes and revisions have been recorded and communicated to stakeholders. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum changes will be finalized and implemented according to timeline with new changes communicated to college stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Areas of Improvement (from previous Program Review)

- **a.** Write a brief description of the identified areas of improvement.
- **b.** Discuss whether each identified area of improvement has been completed, is still in progress or has not been started. Give evidence of completion.

Three general areas of improvement were identified in the 2012-13 Program Review related to SLO/PLO assessment, seatcount/headcount efficiency, and course revisions.

#### SLO assessment for remaining courses

The last few years has yielded considerable effort and focus on SLO management including development of SLOs, identifying assessment timelines, administering assessments, and analyzing and creating action plans to address low performing SLOs. Despite tangible progress in SLO assessment, there is still considerable work to be done. Currently there are 118 total SLOs identified for the thirteen AJ courses (excluding new courses AJ 123 and 19). It is anticipated the total number of SLOs will drop by 35-45 to a more manageable total of 73-83 SLOs as course revisions continue. The primary reason for this reduction (about 30%) is increased awareness and better analysis of SLO relevance and absolute need. As a result of this gained experience, SLOs today tend to be written more expansively, with some merged with other SLOs, and some deleted altogether. The central idea with respect to course SLOs is to ensure that SLOs are relevant to the desired learning outcome, that they are coherent to course objectives, and that they directly support and connect to the over-arching PLOs.

With this said, of the 118 SLOs identified; 29 SLOs have been fully assessed as of this report (25% SLO assessment success rate). After analyzing this data, and considering the importance of learning outcomes at all levels of education, this is an obvious area of improvement. To add some perspective to this statement, there are eight (8) courses that are primarily offered on a regular basis (AJ 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 110, 111 and 115). Of these regularly offered courses, there are 65 SLOs for which 29 SLOs have been fully assessed (45% SLO assessment success rate). While SLO assessment for regularly offered sections is clearly better, improvement is still needed. Finally, the Program has one full time and several highly qualified adjunct professors. A review of the courses taught by full time faculty shows 37 SLOs identified with 29 SLOs fully assessed (78% SLO assessment success rate). While SLO assessments of regularly offered sections taught by full time faculty appear to have higher SLO assessment rates (+53%), there is still room for improvement.
Further influencing and potentially distorting the data are a few courses that remain on the offerings list, but are either never or rarely offered (AJ 112, 113, 114, 116, and 117). Since the last Program Review, two of the five courses were offered only minimally. Please note: AJ 19 and 123 were not considered in the data analysis because they were just recently added to the offerings list. Finally, of the SLOs actively being assessed for regularly offered sections (AJ 10, 11, 14, 15 and 110), SLO assessment is on track and clearly progressing according to the SLO Matrix. A breakdown of SLO assessment by course based on the college SLO matrix is provided below for review.
Seatcount and Headcount Efficiency

The average seatcount/headcount gap noted in the last program review (2012-13) was thought to be quite high (25%). Consequently, seatcount/headcount was identified as an area for improvement with the focus to close this gap if possible. It was determined that closing the seatcount/headcount gap would benefit the program by creating better efficiencies in operational costs and would serve students by ensuring more students ultimately completed courses. Several variables contributing to the inefficient seatcount/headcount gap were noted including students leaving the class during the semester, students registering for the class, but never actually attending, over-saturation of certain sections, and/or improper alignment of desired sections either by topic, time, or day, however no conclusions were reached. Additionally, the seatcount/headcount gap may actually be at tolerable levels when compared to other CTE programs thus supporting the need to gather more data before drawing conclusions. Current information related to seatcount/headcount efficiency and enrollments were ultimately compared with the last program review and while seatcount/headcount has improved, enrollment has declined.

In terms of enrollment, the Program has historically enjoyed a rather robust student population with multiple sections offered and very few cancelations of sections due to low enrollment. Enrollments remained steady from 2008-12 in terms of total students, with an average 573 seatcount to 422 headcount. However, early enrollment figures for 2013-15 indicate a 20% decline in total students with an average 458 seatcount to 355 headcount. Therefore, although total enrollment has noticeably declined, the seatcount/headcount ratio has improved from 25% to 22%. So, despite the Program serving fewer students at entry, it is retaining 3% more students at completion. While this is encouraging and does address the desired improvement in seatcount/headcount gap, the decline in enrollment is conversely very troubling. This 20% decline in enrollment from 2008/12 to 2013/15 could, in part, be due to a small sample size (9 versus 3 semesters). However, if this enrollment trend continues, there will be a significant enrollment decline realized by the Program by the next review.

In summary, the seatcount/headcount gap has improved by 3% from the last program review. However, the loss in student numbers over the last three semesters is concerning. If enrollment continues to decline, the primary focus will shift to respond to this decline on a programmatic and/or college level. The main goal must first be to maintain a robust student population where clear interest in the program is continually reflected by the students served. Enrollment will be monitored going forward and adjustments will be made as determined at the division level.
The graph below illustrates the average comparative seatcount/headcount from the last Program Review to this Program Review. While total enrollment numbers have declined, the Program achieved better student retention (+3%) and greater operating efficiency (+20%) by closing the gap between seatcount/headcount. While this data is encouraging, the sample size is quite small. It is cautioned that making generalizations about sustained improvement should be avoided as more data is needed to better understand the influences of enrollment with respect to seatcount/headcount.

**Program Review Comparison of Average Seatcount/Headcount**

The graph below illustrates the slight closure of the gap between seatcount and headcount.

**Seven Year Analysis of Seatcount versus Headcount**
Course Revision and Update

From 2010-12, the Program underwent revisions of nine (9) of its thirteen (13) courses that had not been updated since 2003. In addition, updated versions of the Program’s degrees, the A.A., A.S., and the A.S.-Transfer degree, were submitted to the all-college curriculum committee (ACCC) in 2010-11. Despite concerted effort to bring all thirteen (13) courses current; four (4) courses still remained outdated at the last program review. In 2013-14 the four (4) remaining courses (AJ 14, 115, 116, and 117) were revised and approved by ACCC. In addition, two (2) new courses were developed, AJ 123 Women and the Criminal Justice System and AJ 19 Law Enforcement in Multicultural Communities. AJ 19 was specifically added to satisfy state requirements for the A.S.-T degree. The courses are current and meet accrediting standards.

Although the goal of updating all courses has been achieved, it is time to begin the process again. Given that one full-time faculty member is primarily responsible for all program administrative duties including course revisions, program reviews, and PLO/SLO management, it has become ever more challenging to meet Program demands. Moreover, these programmatic administrative duties do not include the time needed to prepare for and teach classes; participate on committees, or to grow the Program in other meaningful ways. Therefore, while the Program has made great progress with respect to course revision, the work in this area is cyclical and requires the effort of all faculty members to ensure excellence in the Program.

V. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

a. What are the PLOs and how do they align to the Institutional Learning Outcomes?

b. What are the criteria needed to meet the PLOs?

c. What percentage of students would you expect to achieve each PLO by the end of the program?

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are essential core competencies that students should master upon completion of the Program. PLOs are communicated to students as part of degree criteria and are available in the college catalog for review. While PLOs aim to build broader skill acquisition, they also support over-arching goals of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of the college.

**Program PLOs are aligned with college ILOs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College ILOs</th>
<th>AJ Program PLOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO #1: Communication</td>
<td>PLO #1: Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #2: Inquiry and Reasoning</td>
<td>PLO #2: Critical Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #3: Information and Competency</td>
<td>PLO #3: Information Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #4: Social Responsibility</td>
<td>PLO #4: Social and Cultural Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #5: Personal Development</td>
<td>PLO #5: Ethical Intelligence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Program strives to support students holistically by focusing on program core competencies, or PLOs, including effective communication, critical inquiry, information literacy, social and cultural awareness, and ethical intelligence. It is through these PLOs that we believe students are best prepared to advance their information literacy and skill in their desired career field. PLOs also serve as a method for measuring and gauging program excellence and effectiveness. Subsequently, PLO data is collected from each core course in the major and is then used to measure and verify content proficiency.
The general proficiency target is 70/70, which means 70% of students will ultimately reach a minimum 70% proficiency level or will demonstrate an average 70% mastery on the respective PLO. To date, four out of five PLOs have been assessed and analyzed for action. Although each PLO measured at or above the target 70%, two PLOs that fell within the 70th range were earmarked for action. Homework assignments were added to PLO 4 Social and Cultural Awareness (78% proficiency) and PLO 5 Ethical Intelligence (75% proficiency) to strengthen and reinforce key concepts.

VI. What evidence are you analyzing to assess the PLOs?
   a. List and describe tools used for assessment of the criteria needed to meet the PLO, include the assessment process.
   b. Describe measurement methods, if applicable (i.e. scoring rules, grading rubrics, checklist...etc.)

PLOs are assessed through exams, academic papers, written assignments, oral presentations, homework, and in-class assignments. Grading and scoring rubrics are used to evaluate student work as determined by the professor. An example of the scoring rubrics used can be reviewed in the appendix section of this report.
Below is a list of PLOs in terms of alignment to college ILOs, criteria used to assess performance, and sample measurement descriptions:

1. Communication
   Demonstrate effective written and oral communication necessary in the study of criminal justice.

   PLO #1 aligns with ILO #1 (Communication)
   
   Written assignments are incorporated in all facets of the Program. For example, AJ 010, 011, 014, 015, and 110 require an academic research paper. Academic papers are typically between 5 - 7 pages in length and closely align to course content. Instructors dictate grading guidelines, but generally speaking, grading rubrics are used. (see appendix section for review) AJ 010, 011, 014, 015, and 110 require an oral presentation where students work cooperatively in groups. A grading rubric is used to assess student performance (see appendix section for review).

   As described, PLO #1 is introduced and developed throughout the Program, however is formally assessed for mastery in AJ-015. Students complete a written assignment where they write a police report after determining the appropriate crime. This PLO was assessed with an average score of 80% which is above the 70% target.

2. Critical Inquiry
   Interpret, analyze, and synthesize information, concepts, and theories of the criminal justice system from multiple perspectives

   PLO #2 aligns with ILO #2 (Inquiry and Reasoning)

   Critical and analytical thinking components are embedded in all facets of the Program. For example, AJ 010, 011, 013, 014, and 015, introduce students to various federal and state courts where they must then analyze and interpret judicial decisions of the courts. AJ 014 includes the creation of public policy (e.g. police policy, standard operating procedure, etc), how these policies affect the community and how specific policies are implemented by criminal justice agencies.

   PLO#2 is introduced and developed throughout the Program, and is formally assessed for mastery in AJ-013. This SLO has not been assessed.

3. Information Literacy
   Apply and integrate terminology, concepts, and practices of Law Enforcement, the Courts, and Corrections

   PLO #3 aligns with ILO #3 (Information Competency)

   All courses contain quizzes, exams, essays, and class activities that introduce students to basic terminology, definitions, concepts, and theories. For instance, AJ-010 students are introduced to Wolfgang’s Victim Participation Theory through a series of scenarios depicting random crimes. In small groups, students analyze the scenarios and apply the concepts learned.
PLO#3 is introduced and developed throughout the Program, and is formally assessed for mastery in AJ-011. Seven questions that address PLO 3 were evaluated for content mastery. The combined average for this PLO was 86% mastery. No action plan was recommended.

4. Social and Cultural Awareness

*Recognize the value of a multicultural society and the importance of social justice within our community both locally and globally*

**PLO #4 aligns with ILO #4 (Social Responsibility)**

Student centric activities, class assignments, and extra credit assignments are used to promote social and cultural responsibility. For example, AJ-010 students have participated for credit in Service Learning where several options are available such as volunteering at local shelters, community service organizations, and the police academy. In addition, Student-2-Student, an assignment for extra credit, encourages students to present information to high school students about AJ careers and Evergreen Valley College in general. The assignment is designed to connect AJ students with local high school students in the Evergreen service area who might be interested in AJ. (Appendix 3)

PLO#4 is introduced and developed throughout the Program, and is formally assessed for mastery in AJ-014. Seven questions that address PLO 4 were evaluated for content mastery. The combined average for this PLO was 78% mastery. Although the average was above the 70% target, a homework assignment was modified to strengthen PLO content mastery.

5. Ethical Intelligence

*Analyze and consider decisions and ideas based on civility, civic responsibility, and aesthetics*

**PLO #5 aligns with ILO #5 (Personal Development)**

Students complete in-class activities, scenarios, and assignments that are intended to promote ethical intelligence and ethical decision-making. For example, in AJ-010 students participate as rater and test taker in a mock-oral interview. Students are asked a series of questions that are developed by other students related to ethical dilemmas, integrity scenarios, and police-public perception.

PLO#5 is introduced and developed throughout the Program, and is formally assessed for mastery in AJ-014. Eight questions that address PLO 5 were evaluated for content mastery. The combined average for this PLO was 75% mastery. Although the average was above the 70% target, a homework assignment was modified to strengthen PLO content mastery.

The PLO matrix serves as a guide to monitor PLO assessment and ensure alignment with college ILOs. The PLO matrix is updated and reported to the SLO Coordinator as required. (See PLO Matrix in the appendix section for review)
VII. How well are students learning?
   a. Based on the assessment results, did the students achieve the standards of success?
   b. Based on discussions with faculty, what have you discovered about learning and the significance of these findings for your program (what did your findings show you)?

   The Program gauges effectiveness through multiple measures including assessment of program learning outcomes (PLOs) and student learning outcomes (SLOs), grade outcomes, completion/awarding of degrees, student evaluations, job placement, student satisfaction, and faculty evaluations. It is clear based on these factors that students are learning and reaching success in all areas of the Program. In terms of PLO and SLO benchmarks, students are doing quite well across all categories. For example, 29 SLOs were assessed with students scoring at or above the target achievement goal of 70% in 24 of the SLOs, which is an 83% success rate. Although five SLOs fell short of the 70% target achievement goal, students still performed near or close to the target.

   **SLOs assessment from courses: AJ 10, 11, 14, 15, and 110**

   ![Aggregate SLO Success Rate](chart.png)

   - **70-100%**: 83%
   - **69-0%**: 17%
Students performed equally well on the PLOs, which is another indicator of student success. Four PLOs were assessed and all four measured at or above the 70% benchmark. In fact, 80% of students scored above the 70% target. Based on analysis of PLO and SLO assessments, it is clear that students are performing quite well in all areas of the Program.

In summary, it is important to note that while great strides have been made in the area of PLO/SLO development, setting timelines for assessment, conducting assessments, and analyzing results for action, there have been several challenges as well. For example, the Program has thirteen courses for offering, but only five of its courses have been assessed. Although SLO templates have been started for each of the Program’s courses and two courses contain identified timelines for assessment, no assessments beyond the setting of timelines have occurred. The importance and need to assess SLOs and PLOs has been communicated at the college, division, and program level. Because SLO/PLO assessment is an important mechanism to gauge program effectiveness and student learning, it is our hope that all courses will be regularly assessed in the near future. As such, we will continue to communicate the value of assessment and encourage the need to complete it.
Student grades are another indicator of success and are used to gauge Program effectiveness. Data suggests that AJ students have done very well in the program over the last seven years, with 83% of students earning a C grade or better in the course. This represents a 7% improvement of students earning a C or better grade since the last program review, which was 79% of students earning a C or better grade. Because student grades vary based on several factors, this information should not be construed as a sole marker of success. Moreover, the grades received by AJ students are clearly within the range of those received by students of the general college population and therefore no grading anomalies are expected. Since grades are one sign of success, it is very encouraging though that 86% of AJ students are successfully passing with a C or better grade, and that this represents a slight improvement (+7%) since the last program review.

**Comparison of Grades**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2008-2012</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Program also measures effectiveness and success by student completion and the awarding of the AJ degree. The last Program Review showed that 219 A.A. degrees, 21 A.S. degrees and 4 A.S.-T degrees were awarded. This data suggested a small percentage of students who participate in the Program actually go on to earn a degree in Administration of Justice. Unfortunately, this data does not indicate if the remaining students earned a degree in another major, transferred to a four year institution prior to receiving a degree, directly enter the job market prior to receiving a degree, or attend just one AJ class as an elective. Comprehensive and specific data could help provide a better understanding of Program effectiveness in terms of the awarding of degrees. However, absent this information, it is clear the Program can do a better job in the total percentage of degrees awarded for completion. If the Program can garner better, more reliable data related to students earning AJ degrees, it can appropriately respond and improve in this area. The awarding of degrees will continue to be a CTA of the Program.

Finally, the Program measures effectiveness by successful job placement of its graduates in administration of justice positions, student transfers to four year schools, and/or transfer to technical training centers. Unfortunately, limited information is available because students are rarely followed after they leave the Program. During my tenure and based on personal knowledge, at least ten students, have attended the police academy and at least five students have been hired by local law enforcement agencies. At least four students were selected and are serving as explorers/community service officers for three different law enforcement agencies (Santa Clara Sheriff, Santa Clara PD, and Sunnyvale DPS). Although this is information based on personal knowledge, it does show that students are achieving success in the Program. Unfortunately, without empirical data driving this question, an unknown number of students are being missed and unaccounted.
A mechanism to track students after they leave the college would be very beneficial to better understand program effectiveness in terms of job placement. Like the awarding of the AJ degree, broad assumptions should not be made about job placement success. The administration of justice hiring process, and in particular law enforcement, is extremely long and difficult. It often takes over a year to navigate the rigorous hiring process, which does not include the police academy or the field training program. However, we do know anecdotally based on collective feedback that students are benefiting from the Program, either by achieving AJ jobs, transferring to four year schools/universities, or volunteering within their communities.

The AJ faculty also provides an additional source of evaluation by reviewing curriculum and other student success markers. By evaluating the Program and sharing any needed improvements, faculty provide assurance that graduates possess the requisite knowledge and skill needed to succeed in administration of justice careers, public agencies, and other related organizations. When our graduates are hired and their employers are pleased with the skills and knowledge they possess, this is the ultimate validation of Program effectiveness.

VIII. Strengths of the Program
   a. What strengths did you discover in your program?

CTE Benefit and Student Access

The AJ Program is one of the most productive CTE programs at EVC. Most CTE programs tend to have lower-than-average productivity because it is much more demanding to train students in a skills field than it is to pack a lecture hall for a general education transfer subject. As a California community college, Evergreen Valley College strives for an overall WSCH/FTEF ratio in the range of 500-525. The Program is one of the few CTE programs with a WSCH/FTEF average of 682-849. Generally speaking, the college has very few career programs and all of them are important, however the productivity of the AJ Program clearly supports its fiscal benefit to the college.

The Program is also proud to serve a diverse student population, and in terms of student numbers is one of the most robust on campus. With an average of 450-580 students enrolled per semester, the Program attracts students of all backgrounds to the campus and satisfies local and state school-to-work initiatives. The Program represents every demographic in terms of race, gender, age, and culture and provides access to a field of study that leads to highly skilled and good paying careers. Moreover, AJ students also take general education courses en route to an A.A., A.S., or A.S.-T degree, so in the long term; the Program not only provides a financial incentive for the college, but a mission student-centric benefit as well. AJ students are supporting the general health of the college by taking classes, participating in student events, and bringing spirit to the campus. This accomplishment directly supports the college’s CTA related to Student Centeredness by strengthening access for students and promoting programs and careers.
Expert Faculty, Staff, and Advisory Network

CTE programs, and in particular AJ, require specially trained and experienced staff. Students expect professors to adeptly present information, but to do so in a way that demonstrates practical expertise as well. All professors in the Program have experience in the field, and are current practitioners or retired law enforcement, corrections, probation, or forensics personnel. In addition, faculty members remain current in the discipline by completing continuing professional training (CPT) courses on a regular basis. Four faculty members are professionals working in the criminal justice field as police officers, probation officers or forensic specialists and must complete a minimum number of CPT hours every year in order to maintain active status. Four faculty members are retired law enforcement and have extensive training and education in the field.

The Program maintains a strong network of advisory groups, law enforcement officers, probation officers, correctional officers, and forensic specialists who help guide the Program in terms of curricula and instruction. This comprehensive network of criminal justice professionals is invaluable in ensuring the Program remains current and relevant. Advisors provide regular feedback and advice on trends and needs. Furthermore, maintaining solid professional relationships with criminal justice personnel helps assure retention of current expertise from industry professionals as guest lecturers and workshop presenters. This accomplishment directly supports the college’s mission related to Community Engagement by strengthening visibility and reinforcing strategic partnerships.

Instruction

The Program and its staff endeavor to use the most current teaching strategies whether through technology or problem-based approaches. Faculty utilizes technologically-driven instruction including power point, embedded video and critical-thinking scenarios to meet the needs of diverse learners. For example the use of the Police Academy’s Driving and Use of Force Simulators allows students to apply concepts learned in the classroom to real-life decision making scenarios identical to what new police officers might experience in the field. Faculty regularly works with stakeholders (e.g. police academy staff) to provide access to this equipment which is only available at the academy.

Several classes such as AJ-11 Criminal Law and AJ-15 Introduction to Criminal Investigations also use innovative problem-based instruction to enhance the learning experience of students. These learning environments propel introductory level curriculum to the next level whereby students apply what they have learned in the classroom to a dynamic and practical situation. For example, students in AJ-15 participate in a mock crime scene where they investigate a staged homicide. The Faculty works with police academy staff to bring specialized equipment to the campus to enhance the learning experience for the students. For example, equipment such as mannequins, training weapons, and other realistic evidence is used to create a practical scene. This accomplishment directly supports the college’s CTA related to Student Centeredness by strengthening access for students and promoting additional services, innovative instruction, and networking.
Promotion of the Program and Community Outreach

Student-2-Student, an extra credit assignment, was created to promote AJ careers, and to advance the Program and the college. AJ students present information to high school students related to the AJ program, various careers in criminal justice, and the college in general. The assignment is intended to encourage community engagement, to showcase the AJ Program, and to raise awareness of the college with potential students and local community stakeholders. To date, four students have completed the assignment and anecdotally, reports thus far are quite favorable. Positive feedback was received from high school teachers who agreed to participate and allow presentations in their classes. As a result of these presentations, at least two students were encouraged enough to enroll in the AJ Program. For an example of the assignment, please refer to the appendix section of this report. (Appendix 3, Example Assignment)

The AJ Program was also very successful this semester in identifying an AJ tutor to assist students. The tutor, worked several hours each week to help students with writing papers, studying for exams, and answering general questions. I am pleased to say that approximately twenty (20) students attended the tutoring center to receive one-on-one assistance. This opportunity certainly helped students achieve greater success in courses and enhanced networking between students. These accomplishments directly support the college’s CTA related to Organizational Transformation by strengthening community building and outreach.

IX. Additional Improvements
a. What would you like to improve in your program?

We would like to keep the Program in steady growth mode and ensure all courses are aligned with transfer guidelines and career standards. It is important that each course that comprises the three degrees also translate into something of value for the student, whether they are transferring to a four year institution or entering the labor market. Although concrete data is challenging with respect to degree completion, we would nonetheless like to increase the number of associate degrees awarded to students attending the Program.

Aside from improvements already mentioned including SLO/PLO assessment, seatcount/headcount efficiency, and course revisions, we would also like to focus more on community outreach and program growth. The college staff does an outstanding job hosting campus events, organizing job fairs, and providing employment opportunities for AJ students, however, program staff can do a better job connecting with potential students in an attempt to grow the Program. Many faculty members are actively interested in promoting the Program in various ways, and this could be an area of focus in the near future.
X. Vocational (CTE) programs only (departments with CTE TOP Code)

a. Changes in occupational outlook (from county, state, or federal sources)

b. Any updates are recommendations from Advisory Board (please attach Advisory Board Meeting minutes)?

Students who complete the Program can pursue careers in the administration of justice field including, but not limited to, police officer, deputy sheriff, community service officer, correctional officer, juvenile and adult probation officer, social service worker, or private security officer. Individuals with advanced education or extensive experience in law enforcement, criminology, or forensics can pursue opportunities as detectives, forensics experts, or private investigators. While many of these jobs have been stagnant due to budgetary constraints, more openings are now becoming available for graduates. In fact, most agencies have lifted hiring freezes and are looking for quality applicants.

There has been little to no change from the last program review in terms of labor market projections for criminal justice related jobs. See below chart for the listing of projected labor market data on California jobs. See chart below for details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of Projected California Jobs (2010-2020)</th>
<th>Projected Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>73,100</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detectives/Criminal Investigators</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>42,700</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatchers</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Community Service Managers</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Services Workers</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Investigators</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Officers</td>
<td>134,400</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(4) [http://www.careerinfonet.org/occ_rep.asp?next=occ_rep&Level=1&optstatus=111111111&jobfam=33&id=1&nodeid=2&soccode=333051&menuMode=&stfips=06&x=34&y=18](http://www.careerinfonet.org/occ_rep.asp?next=occ_rep&Level=1&optstatus=111111111&jobfam=33&id=1&nodeid=2&soccode=333051&menuMode=&stfips=06&x=34&y=18)
Labor market data remains consistent across local, state, and federal sources. Jobs growth in administration of justice fields indicates a modest increase in all areas. For example, police and deputy sheriff jobs are projected to increase about 7% in California and 6% nationally. Correctional officer positions are forecasted to increase about 6% in California and 5% nationally. This trend is true of all jobs except private investigators, where job growth is forecasted about 20% for California and 11% nationally. Although labor market projections indicate modest police/deputy sheriff growth (7%), many local departments are in full hire mode. For example, San Jose Police Department is operating two to three police academies per year, training some 100 plus employees annually. In addition, the department is experiencing reported firsts, with more officers leaving the department than can be replaced and minimum staffing levels dipping below historic lows. San Jose Police Department is not the only department in full hire mode. Because departments were virtually dormant the last few years due to budgetary constraints and average officer attrition remained constant during that time, most departments will need to build up their staffing levels to offset these two leveling down factors. As a result, it is expected that the growth in Santa Clara County will be slightly higher than the 7% labor market projection.

In summary, the AJ Program is a highly successful CTE program. Its degrees prepare students for professional-level jobs in a career field that continues to grow and is projected by the U.S. Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics to continue growing at a “much faster than average” pace. The AJ Program is helping the college fulfill its mission and strategic initiatives, is working closely with strong community advisories, and is creating a cycle of improvement through learning outcome assessment and evaluation. Moreover, the Program’s productivity is higher, and its cost lower, than most other CTE programs on this campus. The college should remain committed to supporting and growing this valuable program.

XI. Appendix

a. Attach assessment tools/methods used to assess evidence.

1. Academic Paper Rubric
2. Oral Presentation Rubric
3. Student – Student Project
4. PLOMatrix
5. SLO Matrix
Appendix 1

Academic Paper Rubric (Sample)
## Academic Paper Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
<td>Clear and well developed thesis that thoroughly addresses all</td>
<td>Thesis generally addresses content. Some parts of paper</td>
<td>Thesis is staked, but not clearly supported. Topic is relevant</td>
<td>Incomplete thesis or poorly defined thesis, and does not</td>
<td>No clear thesis and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Textbook</td>
<td>aspects of the assignment. All parts of paper support thesis</td>
<td>supported, but is not developed through the use of the</td>
<td>mostly developed through the use of the textbook and other</td>
<td>completely address the assignment. Topic is somewhat</td>
<td>clearly support the assignment. Topic is unrelated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clearly and accurately make sense. Topic is relevant and</td>
<td>textbook or other sources. Topic is relevant and</td>
<td>sources. Topic is somewhat relevant to the assignment but is</td>
<td>is not supported by the use of the textbook or other</td>
<td>has limited readability and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well developed through the use of the textbook</td>
<td>mostly developed through the use of the textbook and other</td>
<td>not supported by the use of the textbook or other sources</td>
<td>sources. Topic is somewhat relevant to the assignment but is</td>
<td>organization. Body, and/or conclusion. Transitions are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sources.</td>
<td>sources.</td>
<td>sources.</td>
<td>not supported by the use of the textbook or other sources</td>
<td>transitions are lack, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sources.</td>
<td>sources.</td>
<td>paper is difficult to understand. The paper lacks clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sources.</td>
<td>sources.</td>
<td>organization, has no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
<td>Paper is interesting and readable. It has a distinct</td>
<td>Paper is readable and has an introduction, a body, and a</td>
<td>Paper has limited readability and limited introduction, body,</td>
<td>Paper is disorganized, has no introduction, body, or conclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thesis introduction, a body, and a conclusion. Some points could</td>
<td>conclusion. Transitions are sometimes awkward and</td>
<td>and conclusion. Transitions are</td>
<td>Transitions are lacking, and paper is difficult to understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be used to better support. Stronger and cleaner transitions could</td>
<td>disorganized. Central ideas are still</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>The paper lacks clear organization. Central ideas are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have helped paper have better flow.</td>
<td>understandable.</td>
<td>still not clear and</td>
<td>still understandable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disorganized.</td>
<td>disorganized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disorganized.</td>
<td>disorganized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disorganized.</td>
<td>disorganized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRITICAL THINKING</strong></td>
<td>Logical and reasoned ideas that go beyond predictable outcomes</td>
<td>Ideas are logical and reasoned, but demonstrate greater</td>
<td>Ideas are logically and reasoned, but demonstrate greater</td>
<td>Paper lacks evidence of critical thinking. Uses superficial,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or the conclusions of research. Analytic evidence and</td>
<td>degree of originality and thought. Follows where evidence and</td>
<td>degree of originality and thought. Follows where evidence and</td>
<td>analytical thinking. Uses superficial,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uses definable, thoughtful, logical arguments. Makes deep</td>
<td>evidence and reason lead to obtain justifiable logical</td>
<td>evidence and reason lead to obtain justifiable logical</td>
<td>analytical thinking. Uses superficial,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and thoughtful inferences and conclusions. Identifies the most</td>
<td>conclusions. Makes valid inferences, but lacks depth of</td>
<td>conclusions. Makes valid inferences, but lacks depth of</td>
<td>analytical thinking. Uses superficial,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant implications and consequences of the reasoning</td>
<td>thought and analysis. Identifies significant implications and</td>
<td>thought and analysis.</td>
<td>analytical thinking. Uses superficial,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whether positive or negative.</td>
<td>consequences, but does not adequately</td>
<td></td>
<td>analytical thinking. Uses superficial,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td>Strong use of APA style for the introduction, and organization</td>
<td>Strong use of APA style for the introduction, and organization</td>
<td>Strong use of APA style for the introduction, and organization</td>
<td>Strong use of APA style for the introduction, and organization</td>
<td>Strong use of APA style for the introduction, and organization</td>
<td>Strong use of APA style for the introduction, and organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>throughout. Spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and vocabulary</td>
<td>throughout. Spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and</td>
<td>throughout. Spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and</td>
<td>throughout. Spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and</td>
<td>throughout. Spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and</td>
<td>throughout. Spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>usage are correct and appropriate but not necessarily</td>
<td>vocabulary usage contain some flaws that</td>
<td>vocabulary usage contain some flaws that</td>
<td>vocabulary usage contain some flaws that</td>
<td>vocabulary usage contain some flaws that</td>
<td>vocabulary usage contain some flaws that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completely correct. Word choice and</td>
<td>impact and detract from readability. Some spelling</td>
<td>impact and detract from readability. Some spelling</td>
<td>impact and detract from readability. Some spelling</td>
<td>impact and detract from readability. Some spelling</td>
<td>impact and detract from readability. Some spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vocabulary show an exceptional understanding. Word choice is</td>
<td>and punctuation errors exist, but they do not generally</td>
<td>and punctuation errors exist, but they do not generally</td>
<td>and punctuation errors exist, but they do not generally</td>
<td>and punctuation errors exist, but they do not generally</td>
<td>and punctuation errors exist, but they do not generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well matched to the subject audience.</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APA Citing</strong></td>
<td>Correctly uses APA style for the in-text citations. Sentences</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have few grammatical errors that impact and detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>readability.</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrectly uses APA style for the in-text citations. Sentences</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have many grammatical errors that impact and detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>readability.</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrectly uses APA style for the in-text citations. Sentences</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
<td>generally detract from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Oral Presentation Rubric (Sample)
Presentation - Grade Sheets

Group:

1. Law Enforcement: Showcase - A Comparative Approach  (SLO 2, 4, 5)
   Students will work in teams to examine a law enforcement agency including organizational structure, mission and scope. **Compare and contrast** two agencies from different LE systems (e.g. local, state, or federal).
   - Department name, brief overview, role/responsibility (jurisdiction), and location
   - Organizational structure (Chief, Sheriff, Director, etc) with contrast differences
   - Demographics of agency compared to population served (agency/community diversity)
   - Compare and contrast required training, if any (e.g. academy – number of weeks, topics, etc)
   - Ideal candidate standards (i.e. education, minimum hiring standards, hiring tests, etc)
   - Contrast of employee Benefits (e.g. salary, benefits, etc)
   - Positive and negative aspects about the agency (be specific- what do people say, what is the agency’s image with the public, etc)
   - Which agency would your group chose to work for and why?

2. Correction Corner: A Look at Incarceration  (SLO 2, 4, 5)
   Students will work in teams to examine the Corrections and Rehabilitation system. **Compare and contrast** a prison with a jail system (e.g. state or federal prison, county jail, juvenile detention center, CYA, or other center). The following must be met:
   - a. Name of the institutions, location, brief overview, role/responsibility (jurisdiction), and location.
   - b. Organization structure (Warden, Sheriff, Director, Chief, etc)
   - c. Employees (i.e. hiring standards, training standards, pay, benefits, ideal candidate standards)
   - d. Inmates (current versus maximum occupancy), demographics (race, age, etc), security type (max, minimum, cost of operation, etc), prison design, etc.
   - e. Compare two inmate programs (why is the program(s) important, positive impact of the program on the inmate, institution, and society, etc)
   - f. Which institution would your group chose to work for and why

Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceed Standards (A+ to A-)</th>
<th>Meets Standards (B+ to C-)</th>
<th>Below Standards (C- to F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provides additional details to enhance understanding (i.e. personal visit, brochures, etc)</td>
<td>• Covers objectives only as listed with no enhancement</td>
<td>• Minimally covers or does not cover required objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shows high level of subject matter expertise and understanding</td>
<td>• Demonstrates understanding of content and assignment</td>
<td>• Uses minimal sources to demonstrate understanding of content and assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very logical, clear, and organized</td>
<td>• Mostly logical, clear, and organized</td>
<td>• Does not present material in a logical, clear or organized manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses systems of inquiry such as asking questions, statistics, analysis, etc.</td>
<td>• Includes the audience minimally in the learning experience</td>
<td>• Does not include audience in the learning experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engages and involves audience in the learning experience (activity, questions, games, etc)</td>
<td>• Uses some learning modalities during presentation (PP, video)</td>
<td>• Uses minimal or no learning modalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses several learning modalities (i.e. PowerPoint, Media, games, etc)</td>
<td>• Reads minimally from slides or handouts</td>
<td>• Reads primarily or solely from slides or handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does Not read from slides or handouts</td>
<td>• Most members present information</td>
<td>• Demonstrates minimal creativity and effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All members participate</td>
<td>• Shows some creativity and effort</td>
<td>• Only a few members participate or present information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates a high level of creativity and effort</td>
<td>• Written work is mostly organized and factual, but may contain some errors</td>
<td>• Written work is unorganized, unclear, and contains many errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Written work is organized, thoughtful, with high degree of academic standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2: Oral Presentation Rubric - Sample
APPENDIX 3

Student-2 - Student - Sample
Student-2-Student
“Connecting Students to Higher Education”

Goal: Promote the Evergreen Valley College Administration of Justice Program to High School Students

Objectives:

1. Communicate and work with high school students so they have a better understanding of the opportunities at Evergreen Valley College and higher education choices at their local community college.

2. Discuss the AJ program at Evergreen, your experiences as an Evergreen Student, and be willing to assist individual high school students by answering relevant questions.

3. Be an ambassador for the AJ program by discussing career opportunities, course information, and mentoring high school students who are interested in the field of administration of justice.

Assignment Guidelines:

A maximum of 75 extra credit points may be earned toward the student’s class grade.

1. Choose a school.
2. Create a short presentation using PowerPoint or other illustrative tool that minimally covers
   a. Overview of EVC
   b. Overview of the AJ Program
   c. Types of Jobs that are available to AJ students (i.e. police, probation, court personnel, private, etc)
   d. What you like best about the program and why they should consider EVC
   e. How to get started; Registration, counseling services, etc
3. Work with the instructor to discuss/finalize contacting the school
   a. PowerPoint must be approved and on file with the instructor before the school presentation
4. Must have final instructor approval regarding presentation content
5. Submit the Completion of Student-2-Student Form for credit at least four weeks before the end of the semester
6. Complete a one-page reflective narrative paper at least four weeks before the end of the semester

Appendix 3: Student-2-Student Sample
Student – 2- Student Assignment

Two Page Reflective Narrative Paper Guidelines:

Each student must submit a two page reflective paper about their experience. The paper should include positive reflections about how the project helped high school students become more aware of higher education opportunities, Evergreen Valley College, and the AJ program in particular.

The second part of the paper should focus on specific challenges you encountered.

The third part of the paper should focus on how to improve the project. You can include what could have been done differently to enhance the presentation or to improve the experience of the students.
Student(s) Participating:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
High School: ______________________________________________________________________________
Contact Person/Teacher: ______________ email: _____________________________
Number of Students Attending:_____________________

Answer the Following Questions:

1. What suggestions or feedback did the students provide to enhance this project?

2. What is the value of EVC students participating in this project?

3. What suggestions or feedback did the teacher provide to enhance this project?

4. Was the assignment worthwhile for you and the HS students. Explain?

5. What did you learn from this assignment and what changes would you recommend?
APPENDIX 4

PLO Matrix - Example
### Program Level SLO and Assessment Matrix

**Program: Administration of Justice**

#### Program SLOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO #</th>
<th>Assessment Plan for each Program SLO</th>
<th>Program Courses</th>
<th>Analysis/Action Plan and Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td>Demonstrate effective written and oral communication necessary in the criminal justice system field.</td>
<td>A1 10, A1 11, A1 13, A1 14, A1 15</td>
<td>Students will write a law enforcement report in April 2014. A 70/70 formula will be used as a program goal for this SLO. This means 70 percent of participating students will achieve a pass point of at least 70%. Data was collected from 48 students. 11% scored 90% or above, 29% scored between 80% and 89%, 32% scored between 70% and 79%, and 28% scored between 70% and 79%. 70% of students in this class earned above 70%. No change to instruction pending future data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td>Interpret and analyze information, concepts, and theories of the criminal justice system from multiple perspectives</td>
<td>A1 10, A1 11, A1 13, A1 14, A1 15</td>
<td>PEO will be assessed Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td>Apply and integrate terminology, concepts, and practices of law enforcement, the courts, and corrections</td>
<td>A1 10, A1 11, A1 13, A1 14, A1 15</td>
<td>Seven questions from the final exam were assessed related to this PEO. 49 respondents earned an average combined score of 89%. The percentages ranged from 69% to 96%. Four questions received scores of 90% or better. One question (R1) was below the 70% target at 69%. A homework assignment will be given to reinforce the concept of &quot;state discretion&quot; which was assessed with this question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>Recognize the value of a multicultural society and the importance of cooperation within the community both personally and within the criminal justice</td>
<td>A1 10, A1 11, A1 13, A1 14, A1 15</td>
<td>Seven questions from the final exam were assessed. 55 respondents scored a combined average 78%. The range was 38% to 99%. One question (R2) fell below the target of 70% with a 36% respondent average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Program Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Rec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assessment Plan for each Program SLO

- **March 23, 2012**

#### Analysis/Action Plan and Timeline

- Students will write a law enforcement report in April 2014.
- A 70/70 formula will be used as a program goal for this SLO.
- Data was collected from 48 students: 11% scored 90% or above, 29% scored between 80% and 89%, 32% scored between 70% and 79%, and 28% scored between 70% and 79%.
- 70% of students in this class earned above 70%. No change to instruction pending future data.

- PEO will be assessed Fall 2012.
- Seven questions from the final exam were assessed related to this PEO.
- 49 respondents earned an average combined score of 89%.
- The percentages ranged from 69% to 96%.
- Four questions received scores of 90% or better.
- One question (R1) was below the 70% target at 69%.
- A homework assignment will be given to reinforce the concept of "state discretion" which was assessed with this question.

- Seven questions from the final exam were assessed. 55 respondents scored a combined average 78%.
- The range was 38% to 99%.
- One question (R2) fell below the target of 70% with a 36% respondent average.
APPENDIX 5

SLO Matrix - Example
### Course Level SLO and Assessment Matrix

**Course:** A1014: Contemporary Police Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Evaluation Timeline</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Analysis/Action Plan and Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1:</strong> Identify four different law enforcement agencies and explain how their roles vary (e.g., local, federal, and international agencies.)</td>
<td>Question embedded in quiz and/or final</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>27 students completed 20 (55%) questions on the final exam. The average score was 78%.</td>
<td>Students scored above the target proficiency of 70%. No changes will be made pending a broader sample size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2:</strong> Explain how to write a police report for a specific incident.</td>
<td>In-Class Assignment</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>22 students completed 20 (55%) individual assignment. The average score was 85%.</td>
<td>Students scored above the target proficiency of 70%. No changes will be made pending a broader sample size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3:</strong> Summarize the history of policing in terms of incorporating a racially neutral and culturally diverse workforce.</td>
<td>Question embedded in quiz and/or final</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>33 students completed 20 (55%) questions on the final exam. The average score was 78%.</td>
<td>This SLO will be reevaluated on a framework and during recertification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4:</strong> Define the term community policing and identify specific aspects of this law enforcement strategy that may be responsible for the reduction of crime.</td>
<td>Academic Paper</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>22 students completed the paper. 65% scored 70% or better and 45% scored 80% or better</td>
<td>Need for additional feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

- SLO 1: 50% of students scored above 70%
- SLO 2: 80% of students scored above 70%
- SLO 3: 75% of students scored above 70%
- SLO 4: 65% of students scored above 70%