

Corrections and Juvenile Delinquency Assessment Report Spring 2019

Author: Joseph F. van Gaalen, Ph.D., Asst. VP of Institutional Research, Assessment & Effectiveness

1 INTRODUCTION

Florida SouthWestern State College's Business Department gathers a multitude of data from various courses as assessment tools in support of the Florida Department of Education Curriculum Framework. These courses included in assessment are CJC 1000 *Introduction to Corrections* and CJJ 2002 *Juvenile Delinquency*. The assessment outcomes are intended to provide a baseline and measurement of achievement moving forward. The assessment plan also provides comparisons between dual Enrollment and non-dual enrollment students, online versus traditional students, and by site, where possible. Where data is sufficient, additional analyses are provided including distribution studies and longitudinal studies.

For additional detail or further analysis not provided in this report, please contact Dr. Joseph F. van Gaalen, Asst. Vice President of Institutional Research, Assessment & Effectiveness, Academic Affairs (jfvangaalen@fsw.edu; x16965).

2 CJC 1000

2.1 LEARNING OUTCOMES, OBJECTIVES, AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The FSW Business faculty defined one area of interest for evaluation in support of the state framework for the spring 2019 term. The outcomes related to CJC 1000 are:

- CJC 1000 PO 07.0 Describe and discuss the field of corrections.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.01 Discuss the history and evolution of corrections.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.02 Discuss the philosophies of incarceration.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.03 Discuss major problems facing contemporary corrections.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.05 Contrast the early Auburn and Philadelphia style of prison construction with modern day practices.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.06 Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of career and technical education within an institutional setting.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.07 Identify contemporary sentencing guidelines.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.08 Define the concept of community based corrections.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.09 Define and contrast the concepts of probation and parole.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.10 Identify the advantages of work release and pre-release programs.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.11 Discuss the problems associated with probation caseloads.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.12 Explain the concept of contracting for correctional services.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.13 Identify important historical progressions in the origins of probation and parole.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.14 Define the general categories of treatment services.

- CJC 1000 LO 07.15 Explain the various roles of psychologists, psychiatrists, and sociologists in corrections.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.16 Explain the different models for the rehabilitation of offenders; such as educational, vocational, and therapeutic.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.17 Explain the inmate classification process.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.18 Explain how the classification process can frequently intensify conflict between treatment and security goals.
- CJC 1000 LO 07.20 Identify types of community resources that are available for offender treatment services.

The measurement and objectives related to CJC 1000 are:

- ❖ Measurement Objective 1 – The total scores measured (combined total of assignments associated with Learning Outcome or Program Outcome) average ‘4’ or higher and that 80% of artifacts score ‘4’ or better.

During the spring 2019 semester, an enrollment of 56 contributed to scores tallied from 3 of 3 sections of CJC 1000. Descriptive statistics for achievement of outcomes are shown in Table 1. The graphical representation of mean scores is shown in Figure 1 and percentage of artifacts scoring ‘4’ or higher is shown in Figure 2. The goal that 80% of artifacts will score ‘4’ or better for each LO was met. The goal that artifacts with average ‘4’ or higher was met.

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i># of Assignments Linked to Outcome</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>% Scoring 4 or Higher</i>
CJ PO 07.0 Describe and discuss the field of corrections.	26	746	4.8	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.01 Discuss the history and evolution of corrections.	2	101	4.9	97%
CJC 1000 LO 07.02 Discuss the philosophies of incarceration.	14	697	4.8	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.03 Discuss major problems facing contemporary corrections.	9	444	4.8	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.05 Contrast the early Auburn and Philadelphia style of prison construction with modern day practices.	4	219	4.7	97%
CJC 1000 LO 07.06 Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of career and technical education within an institutional setting.	2	102	4.8	100%
CJC 1000 LO 07.07 Identify contemporary sentencing guidelines.	13	522	4.7	97%
CJC 1000 LO 07.08 Define the concept of community based corrections.	9	382	4.7	96%
CJC 1000 LO 07.09 Define and contrast the concepts of probation and parole.	2	93	4.7	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.10 Identify the advantages of work release and pre-release programs.	4	198	4.8	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.11 Discuss the problems associated with probation caseloads.	2	93	4.7	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.13 Identify important historical progressions in the origins of probation and parole.	4	174	4.8	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.14 Define the general categories of treatment services.	3	196	4.8	97%
CJC 1000 LO 07.15 Explain the various roles of psychologists, psychiatrists, and sociologists in corrections.	2	170	4.8	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.16 Explain the different models for the rehabilitation of offenders; such as educational, vocational, and therapeutic.	3	143	4.8	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.17 Explain the inmate classification process.	7	308	4.9	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.18 Explain how the classification process can frequently intensify conflict between treatment and security goals.	2	119	4.9	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.20 Identify types of community resources that are available for offender treatment services.	8	318	4.7	97%

Table 1. Student achievement level by Outcome for CJC 1000.




Figure 1. Bar graph of mean score by outcome for CJC 1000.




Figure 2. Bar graph of percentage of artifacts scoring '4' or higher by outcome for CJC 1000.

2.2 EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS AND SIGNIFICANCE TESTING

Multiple comparisons of artifact scores across varying formats, campuses, and student types were made, where possible, in order to add depth to the causes of the distribution of the artifacts. Each course was divided into the appropriate subgroups to perform the analysis. In cases where a subgroup is not represented in the course comparisons were not conducted and are noted for comprehensiveness.

2.2.1 Dual Enrollment to Non-Dual Enrollment (Concurrent) Comparison

No dual enrollment (concurrent) sections of the course were run during spring 2019 so no comparison study between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment could be completed.

2.2.2 Online to Traditional Comparison

During the spring 2019 semester, one course section was offered online while two others were offered traditionally. Depending on outcome, a range of 26-746 artifacts were scored from online sections compared with a range of 0-287 for traditional sections. A comparison of basic statistics is provided in Table 3. Online artifacts mean scores are higher than traditional for all outcomes except LO 07.14, 07.15, and 07.16 (Figure 7). Percentage of artifacts scoring '4' or higher were higher for online artifacts for 10 of 17 outcomes (Figure 8). Differences in the means were tested for significance using a Welch's t-test according to standard methods (Davis, 1973; McDonald, 2009; Wilkinson, 1999). Of those differences, 8 of 17 are found to be statistically significantly different. Therefore, we must reject the null hypothesis that the difference in the means of the online and traditional scores for this outcome is equal to 0, and we can conclude this with a 95% confidence that the differences in scores are not solely due to chance.

Outcomes	Traditional			Online		
	n	Mean	% 4 or Higher	n	Mean	% 4 or Higher
CJ PO 07.0 Describe and discuss the field of corrections.	~	~	~	746	4.8	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.01 Discuss the history and evolution of corrections.	42	4.8	95%	59	4.9	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.02 Discuss the philosophies of incarceration.	287	4.7	97%	410	4.9	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.03 Discuss major problems facing contemporary corrections.	198	4.8	97%	246	4.9	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.05 Contrast the early Auburn and Philadelphia style of prison construction with modern day practices.	107	4.6	94%	112	4.8	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.06 Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of career and technical education within an institutional setting.	48	4.8	100%	54	4.8	100%
CJC 1000 LO 07.07 Identify contemporary sentencing guidelines.	184	4.5	93%	338	4.9	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.08 Define the concept of community based corrections.	129	4.5	92%	253	4.8	97%
CJC 1000 LO 07.09 Define and contrast the concepts of probation and parole.	67	4.7	97%	26	4.8	100%
CJC 1000 LO 07.10 Identify the advantages of work release and pre-release programs.	89	4.8	99%	109	4.9	100%
CJC 1000 LO 07.11 Discuss the problems associated with probation caseloads.	67	4.7	97%	26	4.8	100%
CJC 1000 LO 07.13 Identify important historical progressions in the origins of probation and parole.	93	4.7	97%	81	4.9	100%
CJC 1000 LO 07.14 Define the general categories of treatment services.	63	4.9	100%	133	4.7	96%
CJC 1000 LO 07.15 Explain the various roles of psychologists, psychiatrists, and sociologists in corrections.	63	4.9	100%	107	4.8	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.16 Explain the different models for the rehabilitation of offenders; such as educational, vocational, and therapeutic.	63	4.9	100%	80	4.8	96%
CJC 1000 LO 07.17 Explain the inmate classification process.	119	4.8	99%	189	4.9	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.18 Explain how the classification process can frequently intensify conflict between treatment and security goals.	63	4.8	100%	56	4.9	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.20 Identify types of community resources that are available for offender treatment services.	120	4.6	94%	198	4.8	98%

Table 2. Comparison of basic statistics of student achievement level by Outcome for online and traditional. Statistically significant differences in the means between online and traditional sections is in **bold/italics**.




Figure 3. Comparison of mean scores by modality with Traditional (purple) and Online (aqua).




Figure 4. Comparison of percentage of artifacts scoring '4' or higher by modality with Traditional (purple) and Online (aqua).

Effect size was calculated using a method devised by Rosenthal and Rosnow (1991) for meta-analytical purposes in potential comparisons with other institutions (Lipsey and Wilson, 1993). The statistically significant results exhibit a range of what Cohen (1988) would consider small-to-medium effect sizes. In other words, non-overlap score distribution from online artifacts to traditional artifacts is a range of approximately 4% to 24%.

2.2.3 Comparison by Campus/Site

While course sections did include outcomes at all sites, only some of them included the program outcomes. Once this is rectified, a cross-campus comparison can be completed.

2.3 LONGITUDINAL STUDY

Description of achievement over time in CJC 1000 is provided in Figures 3 and 4. LOs exhibits a significant increase over time in most cases, largely the result of a difference in the first set of terms, although no patterns are evident at present. Differences may be a result of normal variation although it is possible data collection may have been at issue in the earlier collection cycles. Note that comparison from fall terms to spring terms is less useful as assessment reports across multiple course level and program level assessments at Florida SouthWestern State College typically exhibit substantial differences from fall to spring term and are better interpreted from fall-to-fall and spring-to-spring (see <http://www.fsw.edu/facultystaff/assessment/history> for further details).




Figure 5. Bar graph of mean score by outcome for CJC 1000 over time




Figure 6. Bar graph of percentage of artifacts scoring '4' or higher by outcome for CJC 1000 over time.

3 CJC 2002

3.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The FSW Business faculty defined one area of interest for evaluation in support of the state framework for the spring 2019 term. The outcomes related to CJC 2002 are:

- CJC 2002 LO 04.0 Describe and discuss juvenile delinquency.
- CJC 2002 LO 04.01 Define juvenile delinquency.
- CJC 2002 LO 04.02 Explain the proceedings of the juvenile court system.
- CJC 2002 LO 04.03 Compare the advantages and disadvantages of juvenile incarceration.
- CJC 2002 LO 04.04 Identify some of the major causes of juvenile delinquency.
- CJC 2002 LO 04.05 Identify the problem areas that have any influence upon juvenile delinquency between peers, parents, and school.
- CJC 2002 LO 04.06 Discuss the relevance and dynamics of gangs as they relate to the detection and prevention of juvenile delinquency.
- CJC 2002 LO 04.07 Discuss the importance of the public school system relative to the detection and prevention of juvenile delinquency.

- CJJ 2002 LO 04.08 Describe juvenile rehabilitative programs.

The measurement and objectives related to CJJ 2002 are:

- ❖ Outcome 1 – The total scores measured (combined total of assignments associated with Learning Outcome or Program Outcome) average ‘4’ or higher and that 80% of artifacts score ‘4’ or better.

During the spring 2019 semester, an enrollment of 43 contributed to scores tallied from 2 of 2 sections of CJJ 2002. Descriptive statistics for achievement of outcomes are shown in Table 2. The graphical representation of mean scores is shown in Figure 5 and percentage of artifacts scoring ‘4’ or higher is shown in Figure 6. The goal that the total scores measured (combined total of assignments associated with Learning Outcome or Program Outcome) average ‘4’ or higher and that 80% of artifacts score ‘4’ or better was met. Outcome means range from 4.9 to 5.0. Outcome percentages scoring ‘4’ or better range from 98% to 100%.

Outcomes	# of Assignments Linked to Outcome	n	Mean	% Scoring 4 or Higher
CJ PO 04.0 Describe and discuss juvenile delinquency.	29	895	4.9	99%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.01 Define juvenile delinquency.	6	200	4.9	100%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.02 Explain the proceedings of the juvenile court system.	6	176	4.9	98%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.03 Compare the advantages and disadvantages of juvenile incarceration.	3	72	5.0	100%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.04 Identify some of the major causes of juvenile delinquency.	11	354	4.9	99%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.05 Identify the problem areas that have any influence upon juvenile delinquency between peers, parents, and school.	7	206	4.9	100%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.06 Discuss the relevance and dynamics of gangs as they relate to the detection and prevention of juvenile delinquency.	4	127	4.9	100%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.07 Discuss the importance of the public school system relative to the detection and prevention of juvenile delinquency.	4	108	4.9	99%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.08 Describe juvenile rehabilitative programs.	3	81	4.9	100%

Table 3. Student achievement level by outcome for CJJ 2002.




Figure 7. Bar graph of mean score by outcome for CJJ 2002.




Figure 8. Bar graph of percentage of artifacts scoring '4' or higher by outcome for CJJ 2002.

3.2 EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS AND SIGNIFICANCE TESTING

Multiple comparisons of artifact scores across varying formats, campuses, and student types were made, where possible, in order to add depth to the causes of the distribution of the artifacts. Each course was divided into the appropriate subgroups to perform the analysis. In cases where a subgroup is not represented in the course comparisons were not conducted and are noted for comprehensiveness.

3.2.1 Dual Enrollment to Non-Dual Enrollment (Concurrent) Comparison

No dual enrollment (concurrent) sections of the course were run during spring 2019 so no comparison study between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment could be completed.

3.2.2 Online to Traditional Comparison

During the spring 2019 semester, one course section was offered online while another was offered traditionally. Depending on outcome, a range of 70-726 artifacts were scored from online sections compared with a range of 2-169 for traditional sections. A comparison of basic statistics is provided in Table 3. Online artifacts mean scores are higher than traditional for all outcomes (Figure 7). Percentage of artifacts scoring '4' or higher were higher for online artifacts for 5 of 9 outcomes and equal in another 2/9 (Figure 8). Differences in the means were tested for significance using a Welch's t-test according to standard methods (Davis, 1973; McDonald, 2009; Wilkinson, 1999). Six of nine outcomes are found to be statistically significantly different. Therefore, we must reject the null hypothesis that the difference in the means of the online and traditional scores for those outcomes are equal to 0, and we can conclude this with a 95% confidence that the differences in scores are not solely due to chance.

Outcomes	Traditional			Online		
	n	Mean	% 4 or Higher	n	Mean	% 4 or Higher
CJ PO 04.0 Describe and discuss juvenile delinquency.	169	4.6	97%	726	4.9	99%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.01 Define juvenile delinquency.	53	4.7	98%	147	5.0	100%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.02 Explain the proceedings of the juvenile court system.	31	4.5	90%	145	5.0	100%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.03 Compare the advantages and disadvantages of juvenile incarceration.	2	5.0	100%	70	5.0	100%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.04 Identify some of the major causes of juvenile delinquency.	66	4.7	100%	288	4.9	99%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.05 Identify the problem areas that have any influence upon juvenile delinquency between peers, parents, and school.	36	4.6	97%	170	5.0	100%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.06 Discuss the relevance and dynamics of gangs as they relate to the detection and prevention of juvenile delinquency.	27	4.6	100%	100	5.0	100%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.07 Discuss the importance of the public school system relative to the detection and prevention of juvenile delinquency.	13	4.7	92%	95	5.0	100%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.08 Describe juvenile rehabilitative programs.	11	4.6	100%	70	5.0	100%

Table 4. Comparison of basic statistics of student achievement level by Outcome for online and traditional. Statistically significant differences in the means between online and traditional sections is in **bold/italics**.




Figure 9. Comparison of mean scores by modality with Traditional (purple) and Online (aqua).




Figure 10. Comparison of percentage of artifacts scoring '4' or higher by modality with Traditional (purple) and Online (aqua).

Effect size was calculated using a method devised by Rosenthal and Rosnow (1991) for meta-analytical purposes in potential comparisons with other institutions (Lipsey and Wilson, 1993). The statistically significant results exhibit a range of what Cohen (1988) would consider small-to-large effect sizes. In other words, non-overlap score distribution from online artifacts to traditional artifacts is a range of approximately 22% to 45%.

3.2.3 Comparison by Campus/Site

Two sections of the course were run during spring 2019, one at FSW Online and a second at the Thomas Edison (Lee) campus. As such, the comparison study is described above in 3.2.2.

3.3 LONGITUDINAL STUDY

Description of achievement over time in CJJ 2002 is provided in Figures 9 and 10. No LO exhibits a significant difference from any other over time. Differences may be a result of normal variation. Note that comparison from fall terms to spring terms is less useful as assessment reports across multiple course level and program level assessments at Florida SouthWestern State College typically exhibit substantial differences from fall to spring term and are better interpreted from fall-to-fall and spring-to-spring (see <http://www.fsw.edu/facultystaff/assessment/history> for further details).




Figure 11. Bar graph of mean score by outcome for CJJ 2002 over time.




Figure 12. Bar graph of percentage of artifacts scoring '4' or higher by outcome for CJJ 2002 over time.

4 CONCLUSIONS

FSW's Business Department gathers a multitude of data from various courses as assessment tools in support of the Florida Department of Education Curriculum Framework. These courses included in assessment are CJC 1000 *Introduction to Corrections* and CJJ 2002 *Juvenile Delinquency*. The assessment outcomes are intended to provide a baseline and measurement of achievement moving forward.

4.1 CJC 1000

A drill-down of CJC 1000 results are as follows:

1. In a study of outcome achievement, the goal that the total scores measured (combined total of assignments associated with Learning Outcome or Program Outcome) average '4' or higher and that 100% of artifacts score '4' or better was met.
2. In a comparison between online and traditional artifacts, online artifacts mean scores are higher than traditional for all outcomes except LO 07.14, 07.15, and 07.16. Percentage of artifacts scoring '4' or higher were higher for online artifacts for 10 of 17 outcomes. Of those differences, 8 of 17 are found to be statistically significantly different.
3. While course sections did include outcomes at all sites, only some of them included the program outcomes. Once this is rectified, a cross-campus comparison can be completed.
4. In a longitudinal study, LOs exhibits a significant increase over time in most cases, largely the result of a difference in the first set of terms, although no patterns are evident at present. Differences may be a result of normal variation although it is possible data collection may have been at issue in the earlier collection cycles.

4.2 CJJ 2002

A drill-down of CJJ 2002 results are as follows:

1. In a study of outcome achievement, the goal that the total scores measured (combined total of assignments associated with Learning Outcome or Program Outcome) average '4' or higher and that 80% of artifacts score '4' or better was met. Outcome means range from 4.9 to 5.0. Outcome percentages scoring '4' or better range from 98% to 100%.
2. In a study comparing online and traditional artifacts, online artifacts mean scores are higher than traditional for all outcomes. Percentage of artifacts scoring '4' or higher were higher for online artifacts for 5 of 9 outcomes and equal in another 2/9. Six of nine outcomes are found to be statistically significantly different.
3. Two sections of the course were run during spring 2019, one at FSW Online and a second at the Thomas Edison (Lee) campus. As such, the comparison study is described above in 3.2.2.
4. In a longitudinal study, no LO exhibits a significant difference from any other over time.

5 REFERENCES

- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Davis, J.C. 1973. *Statistics and Data Analysis in Geology*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, New York, 564 pp.

- Lipsey, M.W. and Wilson, D.B. 1993. The efficacy of psychological, educational, and behavioral treatment: Confirmation from meta-analysis. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1181-1209.
- McDonald, J.H. 2009. *Handbook of Biological Statistics* (2nd ed.). Sparky House Publishing, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Rosenthal, R. and Rosnow, R.L. 1991. *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis* (2nd ed.). McGraw Hill, New York, NY.
- Wilkinson, L. 1999. APA Task Force on Statistical Inference. *Statistical Methods in Psychology Journals: Guidelines and Explanations*. *American Psychologist* 54 (8), 594–604.