

# Corrections and Juvenile Delinquency Assessment Report Summer 2019

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

## 1 INTRODUCTION

---

Florida SouthWestern State College's Crime Scene & Criminal Justice Technology 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](mailto:jfvangaalen@fsw.edu); x16965).

## 2 CJC 1000

---

### 2.1 LEARNING OUTCOMES, OBJECTIVES, AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The FSW Crime Scene & Criminal Justice Technology 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:

- CJ 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 summer 2019 semester, an enrollment of 13 contributed to scores tallied from 1 of 1 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	296	4.7	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.01 Discuss the history and evolution of corrections.	2	22	4.2	91%
CJC 1000 LO 07.02 Discuss the philosophies of incarceration.	14	167	4.6	97%
CJC 1000 LO 07.03 Discuss major problems facing contemporary corrections.	9	98	4.7	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.05 Contrast the early Auburn and Philadelphia style of prison construction with modern day practices.	4	45	4.7	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.06 Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of career and technical education within an institutional setting.	2	24	4.7	100%
CJC 1000 LO 07.07 Identify contemporary sentencing guidelines.	13	128	4.8	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.08 Define the concept of community based corrections.	9	93	4.8	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.09 Define and contrast the concepts of probation and parole.	2	23	4.6	96%
CJC 1000 LO 07.10 Identify the advantages of work release and pre-release programs.	4	46	4.6	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.11 Discuss the problems associated with probation caseloads.	2	23	4.6	96%
CJC 1000 LO 07.13 Identify important historical progressions in the origins of probation and parole.	4	45	4.5	96%
CJC 1000 LO 07.14 Define the general categories of treatment services.	3	47	4.7	98%
CJC 1000 LO 07.15 Explain the various roles of psychologists, psychiatrists, and sociologists in corrections.	2	36	4.8	100%
CJC 1000 LO 07.16 Explain the different models for the rehabilitation of offenders; such as educational, vocational, and therapeutic.	3	35	4.7	97%
CJC 1000 LO 07.17 Explain the inmate classification process.	7	80	4.8	99%
CJC 1000 LO 07.18 Explain how the classification process can frequently intensify conflict between treatment and security goals.	2	23	4.8	100%
CJC 1000 LO 07.20 Identify types of community resources that are available for offender treatment services.	8	68	4.8	99%

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 summer 2019 so no comparison study between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment could be completed.

### 2.2.2 Online to Traditional Comparison

Only one course section was run during summer 2019, so no comparison between online and traditional sections could be completed.

### 2.2.3 Comparison by Campus/Site

Only one course section was run during summer 2019, so no comparison between sites could 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. Scores are consistent since summer 2018. 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 3. Bar graph of mean score by outcome for CJC 1000 over time




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

### 3 CJJ 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 summer 2019 term. The outcomes related to CJJ 2002 are:

- CJ PO 04.0 Describe and discuss juvenile delinquency.
- CJJ 2002 LO 04.01 Define juvenile delinquency.
- CJJ 2002 LO 04.02 Explain the proceedings of the juvenile court system.
- CJJ 2002 LO 04.03 Compare the advantages and disadvantages of juvenile incarceration.
- CJJ 2002 LO 04.04 Identify some of the major causes of juvenile delinquency.
- CJJ 2002 LO 04.05 Identify the problem areas that have any influence upon juvenile delinquency between peers, parents, and school.
- CJJ 2002 LO 04.06 Discuss the relevance and dynamics of gangs as they relate to the detection and prevention of juvenile delinquency.
- CJJ 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 summer 2019 semester, an enrollment of 15 contributed to scores tallied from 1 of 1 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 4.5 to 4.8. Outcome percentages scoring ‘4’ or better range from 88% to 95%.

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i># of Assignments Linked to Outcome</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>% Scoring 4 or Higher</i>
CJ PO 04.0 Describe and discuss juvenile delinquency.	29	370	4.7	93%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.01 Define juvenile delinquency.	6	78	4.8	95%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.02 Explain the proceedings of the juvenile court system.	6	78	4.6	91%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.03 Compare the advantages and disadvantages of juvenile incarceration.	3	38	4.6	89%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.04 Identify some of the major causes of juvenile delinquency.	11	138	4.8	93%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.05 Identify the problem areas that have any influence upon juvenile delinquency between peers, parents, and school.	7	89	4.6	90%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.06 Discuss the relevance and dynamics of gangs as they relate to the detection and prevention of juvenile delinquency.	4	51	4.5	88%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.07 Discuss the importance of the public school system relative to the detection and prevention of juvenile delinquency.	4	50	4.6	88%
CJJ 2002 LO 04.08 Describe juvenile rehabilitative programs.	3	38	4.6	89%

Table 2. Student achievement level by outcome for CJJ 2002.




Figure 5. Bar graph of mean score by outcome for CJJ 2002.




Figure 6. 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 summer 2019 so no comparison study between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment could be completed.

### 3.2.2 Online to Traditional Comparison

Only one section of the course was run in summer 2019 so no comparison study between online and traditional could be completed.

### 3.2.3 Comparison by Campus/Site

Only one section of the course was run in summer 2019 so no cross-site comparison could be completed.

## 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 7. Bar graph of mean score by outcome for CJJ 2002 over time.






Figure 8. 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. No dual enrollment (concurrent) sections of the course were run during summer 2019 so no comparison study between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment could be completed.
3. Only one course section was run during summer 2019, so no comparison between online and traditional sections could be completed.
4. Only one course section was run during summer 2019, so no comparison between sites could be completed.
5. 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. Scores are consistent since summer 2018.

## 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 4.5 to 4.8. Outcome percentages scoring '4' or better range from 88% to 95%.
2. No dual enrollment (concurrent) sections of the course were run during summer 2019 so no comparison study between dual enrollment and non-dual enrollment could be completed.
3. Only one section of the course was run in summer 2019 so no comparison study between online and traditional could be completed.
4. Only one section of the course was run in summer 2019 so no cross-site comparison could be completed.
5. In a longitudinal study, no LO exhibits a significant difference from any other over time. Differences may be a result of normal variation.

## 5 REFERENCES

---

- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Lawrence Earlbaum 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* (2<sup>nd</sup> 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.