

WSU Five-Year Program Review

Self-Study

Department: Criminal Justice

Semester Submitted: Fall 2016

Self-Study Team Chair: David Lynch

Self –Study Team Members:

David Lynch, Scott Senjo, Bruce Bayley, Brent Horn, Molly Sween, Bradford Reynolds, Monica Williams, Mark Denniston, Dennis Lee

Contact Information:

Phone: 801-626-6714

Email: dlynch@weber.edu

Date: November 14, 2016

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The Criminal Justice Department is one of the largest programs at Weber State University, serving over 600 students in three Baccalaureate programs at campuses in Ogden, Layton and Sandy, UT as well as online. The majority of students go onto successful careers on various areas of the criminal justice system including law enforcement, law school, corrections, and victim assistance. Students in the two forensic science concentrations find work with crime scene investigation units, and fingerprint and DNA laboratories. Criminal Justice also serves students throughout the College of Behavioral Sciences with our minor program. The 12 faculty members, who come from diverse educational and cultural backgrounds, take great pride in being the most well recognized, academic Criminal Justice program in Utah.

STANDARD A. MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of Criminal Justice provides students with the professional and academic preparation necessary for entry level positions throughout the criminal justice system and related professions. The program addresses the functions and organization of the criminal justice system, integrating critical thinking, decision-making skills and the understanding of different cultures, ethics and social problems into the curriculum. The program provides the student with the preparation necessary for successful graduate study, and further endeavors to provide criminal justice professionals with career-enhancing educational experiences.

STANDARD B. CURRICULUM

The Criminal Justice Department has 6 undergraduate programs available to students:

- Criminal Justice AS degree
- Criminal Justice Minor
- Criminal Justice Component of the Bachelor of Integrated Sciences degree
- Criminal Justice BS degree with concentrations in:
 - General Criminal Justice

- Crime Scene Investigation
- Forensic Science (Biology or Chemistry)

The curriculum for these programs is listed below.

Criminal Justice (AS)

Criminal Justice Required Courses (12 hours)

- CJ 1010—Introduction to Criminal Justice
- CJ 1300—Corrections: History, Theory and Practice
- CJ 1330—Criminal Law and Courts
- CJ 2300—Policing: History, Theory and Practice

Criminal Justice Elective Courses (9 hours)

Select from amongst other CJ offerings

Criminal Justice Minor

Criminal Justice Required Courses (6 hours)

- CJ 1010—Introduction to Criminal Justice
- CJ 3270—Theories of Crime and Delinquency

Criminal Justice Breadth Courses (6 hours)

Select 2 of the following:

- CJ 1300—Corrections: History, Theory and Practice
- CJ 1330—Criminal Law and Courts
- CJ 2300—Policing: History, Theory and Practice
- CJ 4200—Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice

Criminal Justice Elective Courses (6 hours)

Select from amongst other CJ offerings

9 hours of upper division CJ required for Minor program

Criminal Justice BIS (BS)

Student completed courses required for the Criminal Justice Minor, or develops a specialty program in conjunction with the Department Chair.

Criminal Justice—General Concentration (BS), 46 hours

Criminal Justice Foundation (9 hours)

- CJ 1010—Introduction to Criminal Justice
- CJ 1330—Criminal Law and Court
- CJ 4200—Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice

Criminal Justice Depth Courses (22 hours)

- CJ 1300—Corrections: History, Theory and Practice
- CJ 2300—Policing: History, Theory and Practice
- CJ 3270—Theories of Crime and Delinquency
- CJ 3300—Victimology
- CJ 3600—Criminal Justice Statistics
- CJ 4165—Constitutional Rights
- CJ 4980—Research Methods in Criminal Justice
- CJ 4995—Criminal Justice Senior Capstone

Criminal Justice Electives (15 hours)

Select from amongst other CJ offerings

A minor in any discipline is also required

Criminal Justice—General Concentration Curriculum Map

Program Outcomes	Core Courses										
	CJ 1010—Intro CJ	CJ 1300—Corrections	CJ 1330—Crim Law	CJ 2300—Policing	CJ 3270—Theories	CJ 3300—Victim	CJ 3600--Stats	CJ 4165—Con Rights	CJ 4200--Ethics	CJ 4980—Rsch Meth	CJ 4995--Capstone
Distinguish between the major theories of crime causation					I,D	D					A
Recognize the key historical, theoretical, and practical components of contemporary policing	I		D	D				D			A
Recognize the key historical, theoretical, and practical components of contemporary corrections	I	D						D			A
Distinguish between the major theories of ethics									I,D		A
Identify the fundamental concepts of criminal law as they are applied in the courts	I		D								A
Recall the fundamental concepts of social science statistics							I, D			D	A
Recall the fundamental principles of social science research methodology							I			D	A
Distinguish between the key constitutional rights that impact the contemporary criminal justice system	I	D	D	D				D			A
Distinguish between the various types, consequences, and theories of victimization	I				D	D					A

I= Introduced, D=Developed, A=Assessed

Criminal Justice—Crime Scene Investigation Concentration (BS), 66-69 hours

Criminal Justice Foundation (9 hours)

- CJ 1010—Introduction to Criminal Justice
- CJ 1330—Criminal Law and Court
- CJ 4200—Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice

Core Crime Scene Investigation (37 hours)

- CJ 1340—Criminal Investigation
- CJ 1350—Introduction to Forensic Science
- CJ 2340—Crime Scene Investigation
- CJ 2350—Laws of Evidence
- CJ 3120—Professional Practice for the Forensic Expert
- CJ 3340—Crime Scene Photography
- CJ 4110—Physical Methods in Forensic Science
- CJ 4115—Friction Ridge Analysis
- CJ 4116—Friction Ridge Development
- CJ 4125—Advanced methods in Forensic Science
- CJ 4165—Constitutional Rights

CSI Support (30-33 hours)

- Math 1040—Introduction to Statistics
- Comm 1020—Principles of Public Speaking
- Either:
 - Zool 1020—Human Biology, and
 - Zool 2100—Human Anatomy
 - OR
 - Anth 1020—Biological Anthropology, and
 - Zool 2100—Human Anatomy
 - OR
 - HTHS 1110/1111—Integrated Human Anatomy and Physiology I/II
- Either:
 - Art 2250—Foundations of Photography: Black and White/Analog, OR
 - Art 2450—Foundations of Photography: Color/Digital
- Either:
 - Chem 1110/1120—Elementary Chemistry/Organic Biochemistry, OR
 - Chem 1210/1220—Principles of Chemsiter I/II
- Either:
 - Phys 1010—Elementary Physics, OR
 - Phys 2010—College Physics I, OR
 - Phys 2210—Physics for Scientists and Engineers I
- Science 2600—Laboratory Safety

Criminal Justice—Crime Scene Investigation Concentration Curriculum Map

Program Outcomes	Core Courses														
	CJ 1010—Intro CJ	CJ 1330—Crim Law	CJ 4200—Ethics	CJ 1340—Crim Invest	CJ 1350—Intro FS	CJ 2340—CSI	CJ 2350—Laws Evid	CJ 3120—Prof Pract	CJ 3340—CS Photo	CJ 4110—Phys Meth	CJ 4115—Fric Analys	CJ 4116—Fric Dev	CJ 4125—Adv Meth	CJ 4165—Con Rights	
State the roles and functions of the forensic scientist				I	I	D		U	U					A	
Identify the elements of the crime scene/criminal investigation process				I	I	D			D	D	D	D	DA		
Explain the legal ramifications of the practice of forensic science	I	D	U	D	I	D	D	D	U	U	U	U	UA	D	
Demonstrate proper case documentation of physical evidence						I		D	D	D	D	D	DA		
Demonstrate the ability to perform a friction ridge analyses					I					D	D	D	A		
Summarize the theoretical bases for the handling and analysis of various types of physical evidence	I			I	I	D		D	U	U	U	U	UA		
Illustrate the role of experimental design in the analysis of physical evidence								I		D	D	D	UA		

I= Introduced, D=Developed, U=Utilized, A=Assessed

Criminal Justice—Forensic Science Concentration (BS), 87-88 hours

Criminal Justice Foundation (9 hours)

- CJ 1010—Introduction to Criminal Justice
- CJ 1330—Criminal Law and Court
- CJ 4200—Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice

Core Forensic Science (23 hours)

- CJ 1350—Introduction to Forensic Science
- CJ 2340—Crime Scene Investigation
- CJ 2350—Laws of Evidence
- CJ 3120—Professional Practice for the Forensic Expert
- CJ 4110—Physical Methods in Forensic Science
- CJ 4125—Advanced methods in Forensic Science
- One upper division elective course approved by the Program Director (minimum 3 hours)

General Science (38 hours)

- Math 1210—Calculus I
- Zool 1110—Principles of Zoology I
- Chem 1210/1220—Principles of Chemistry I/II
- Chem 2310/2320—Organic Chemistry I/II
- Either:
 - Phys 2010/2020—College Physics I/II
 - Phys 2210/2220—Physics for Scientists and Engineers I/II

Elective Science (27-28 hours)

- Either:
 - Chemical Sciences
 - Math 1220—Calculus II
 - Chem 3000—Quantitative Analysis
 - Chem 3020—Computer Applications in Chemistry
 - Chem 3050—Instrumental Analysis
 - Chem 3400—Molecular Symmetry and Applied Math for Physical Chemistry
 - Chem 3410/3420—Physical Chemistry I/II
 - Chem 4540—Spectrometric and Separation Methods
 - OR
 - Biological Sciences
 - Chem 3070—Biochemistry
 - Micr 2054—Principles of Microbiology
 - Zool 1120—Principles of Zoology II
 - Zool 3200—Cell Biology
 - Zool 3300—Genetics
 - Either:
 - Zool 3730—Population Genetics, OR
 - Math 1040—Introduction to Statistics
 - Zool 4300—Molecular Genetics

Criminal Justice—Forensic Science Curriculum Map

Program Outcomes	Core Courses									
	CJ 1010—Intro CJ	CJ 1330—Crim Law	CJ 4200—Ethics	CJ 1350—Intro FS	CJ 2340—CSI	CJ 2350—Laws Evid	CJ 3120—Prof Pract	CJ 4110—Phys Meth	CJ 4125—Adv Meth	FS Elective
State the roles and functions of the forensic scientist				I	D		U		A	
Identify the elements of the crime scene/criminal investigation process				I	D			D	DA	
Explain the legal ramifications of the practice of forensic science	I	D	U	I	D	D	D	U	UA	
Demonstrate proper case documentation of physical evidence					I		D	D	DA	
Apply fundamental physical/life science concepts to various types of physics evidence				I	D		D	U	UA	D
Summarize the theoretical bases for the handling and analysis of various types of physical evidence				I	D		D	U	UA	
Illustrate the role of experimental design in the analysis of physical evidence							I	D	UA	

I= Introduced, D=Developed, U=Utilized, A=Assessed

STANDARD C. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

A. Brief Introductory Statement:

Please review the Introductory Statement and contact information for your department displayed on the assessment site:

<http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if this information is current, please place an 'X' below. No further information is needed. We will indicate "Last Reviewed: [current date]" on the page.

The Criminal Justice program provides students with a liberal education, while offering academic preparation through an expanded emphasis on criminal justice education. The program also offers a basis for graduate study and seeks to contribute significantly to the improvement of the quality of justice administration.

Criminal justice agencies in the recent past have established advanced academic standards. Education is becoming a more meaningful factor in selection of law enforcement, corrections, and security personnel for initial employment, promotion, and administrative roles.

B. Mission Statement

Please review the Mission Statement for your department displayed on the assessment site: <http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as "Last Reviewed [current date]". No further information is needed.

If the information is not current, please provide an update:

The Department of Criminal Justice provides students with the professional and academic preparation necessary for entry level positions throughout the criminal justice system and related professions. The program addresses the functions and organization of the criminal justice system, integrating critical thinking, decision-making skills and the understanding of different cultures, ethics and social problems into the curriculum. The program provides the student with the preparation necessary for successful graduate study, and further endeavors to provide criminal justice professionals with career-enhancing educational experiences.

C. Student Learning Outcomes

Please review the Student Learning Outcomes for your department displayed on the

assessment site: <http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if they are current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

If they are not current, please provide an update:

Information is current; no changes required.

Information is not current; updates below.

Measurable Learning Outcomes

At the end of their study at WSU, students in this program will:

1. Recognize the key historical, theoretical, and practical components of contemporary corrections.
2. Identify the fundamental concepts of criminal law as they are applied in the courts.
3. Recognize the key historical, theoretical, and practical components of contemporary policing.
4. Distinguish between the major theories of crime causation.
5. Distinguish between the various types, consequences, and theories of victimization.
6. Recall the fundamental concepts of social science statistics.
7. Distinguish between the key constitutional rights that impact the contemporary criminal justice system.
8. Distinguish between the major theories of ethics.
9. Recall the fundamental principles of social science research methodology.

D. Curriculum

Please review the Curriculum Grid for your department displayed on the assessment site: <http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed: [current data]”. No further information is needed.

If the curriculum grid is not current, please provide an update:

Information is current; no changes required.

Information is not current; updates below

Curriculum Map

Core Courses in Department/Program	Department/Program Learning Outcomes										
	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5	Learning Outcome 6	Learning Outcome 7	Learning Outcome 8	Learning Outcome 9		
CJ 1010	1	1	1	1	1		1	1			
CJ 1300	2										
CJ 1330		2									
CJ 2300			2								
CJ 3270				2							
CJ 3300					2						
CJ 3600						1, 2					
CJ 4165							2				
CJ 4200								2			
CJ 4980									1, 2		
CJ 4995	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3		

Note^a: 1= introduced, 2 = mastered, 3 = assessed

E. Assessment Plan

Please review the Assessment Plan for your department displayed on the assessment site: <http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if the plan current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

The site should contain an up-to-date assessment plan with planning going out a minimum of three years beyond the current year. Please review the plan displayed for your department at the above site. The plan should include a list of courses from which data will be gathered and the schedule, as well as an overview of the assessment strategy the department is using (for example, portfolios, or a combination of Chi assessment data and student survey information, or industry certification exams, etc.).

Please be sure to include your planned assessment of any general education courses taught within your department. This information will be used to update the General Education Improvement and Assessment Committee’s planning documentation.

Assessment plan:

Assessment of the Criminal Justice Department's undergraduate program outcomes will be accomplished through a comprehensive assessment exam administered through Chi Tester to all criminal justice majors prior to graduation. This assessment will take place as part of the CJ 4995 Senior Capstone course and include materials from each of the core courses in the CJ program. Accordingly, assessments will take place every semester that CJ 4995 is offered, which will be as needed.

Assessment data for the social science general education learning outcomes will be collected at the end of every semester from every section of CJ 1010. These data are collected using a uniform multiple choice exam reflecting each outcome as they apply to CJ 1010. Review of these data will take place every Fall semester.

F. Report of assessment results for the most previous academic year:

There are a variety of ways in which departments can choose to show evidence of learning. This is one example. The critical pieces to include are 1) what learning outcome is being assessed, 2) what method of measurement was used, 3) what the threshold for 'acceptable performance' is for that measurement, 4) what the actual results of the assessment were, 5) how those findings are interpreted, and 6) what is the course of action to be taken based upon the interpretation.

Measurable Learning Outcome	Description of Outcome	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes – Average Score	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Learning Outcome 1 (CJ 1300)	Demonstrate comprehension of the major issues in corrections	59.5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The average score across all learning outcomes was 59.7%, which is below the 70% threshold The high score was 73.7% and the low score was 36.6%, indicating a wide range For all 9 learning outcomes, student averages were below the 70% threshold These findings indicate that either the 70% metric needs to be revisited or course delivery needs to be adjusted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty will discuss whether 70% truly reflects success or whether this threshold is arbitrary If the threshold remains at 70% then efforts need to be made to ensure students are learning the materials associated with the learning objectives in every core CJ course
Learning Outcome 2 (CJ 1330)	Demonstrate comprehension of the fundamental concepts of the criminal law	63.6%		
Learning Outcome 3 (CJ 2300)	Demonstrate comprehension of the major issues in police work	66.3%		
Learning Outcome 4 (CJ 3270)	Demonstrate comprehension of the major theories of crime causation	52.2%		
Learning Outcome 5 (CJ 3300)	Demonstrate comprehension of the central issues in victimology, including types, consequences, and theories of victimization	65.4%		
Learning Outcome 6 (CJ 3600)	Demonstrate comprehension of the principles of social research methodology	54.5%		
Learning Outcome 7 (CJ 4165)	Demonstrate comprehension of the issues of due process, equal protection and fundamental fairness in policing, courts and corrections	62.7%		
Learning Outcome 8 (CJ 4200)	Demonstrate comprehension of the major theories of ethics	55%		
Learning Outcome 9 (CJ 4980)	Demonstrate comprehension of the principles of social research methodology	63.6%		

Note: All outcomes are measured using the CJ 4995 assessment exam. The threshold for learning is 70% for all outcomes.

The course codes from the outcome column are associated with a section of questions from the exam that correspond to a learning outcome.

b. Evidence of Learning: High Impact or Service Learning

This is an optional section. If you provide students with high impact or service learning opportunities you may briefly describe those opportunities and explain how you assess their impact on student learning. This [excerpt](#) from George D. Kuh provides a brief overview of high-impact practices.

c. Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses

(Area-specific EOL grids can be found at http://weber.edu/oie/Complete_Rubrics.html; they can replace this page.)

1. Outcomes assessed:

- a. Interactions between individuals and society
- b. Application of concepts, theories, and methods
- c. Diverse perspectives

2. Method of measurement:

- a. In every section of CJ 1010 a 30 item multiple choice assessment exam was given. This exam includes 10 criminal justice questions reflecting each of the three general education learning outcomes of the College of Social and Behavioral Science. The assessment will be administered every semester.

3. Threshold for ‘acceptable performance’:

- a. Fall 2015 was the first administration of this assessment exam. Tentatively, the Department’s threshold is set at 70%.

4. Results of the assessment:

- a. The average score on the assessment, which included 227 student scores, was 74%.
- b. The average score on Outcome A (above) was 74%.
- c. The average score on Outcome B (above) was 69%.
- d. The average score on Outcome C (above) was 75%.

5. How are findings interpreted

- a. Findings indicate that across all sections of CJ 1010 learning objectives are generally being met. As the threshold is set at 70%, the average across learning objectives was above this mark, as were the averages for two of the three outcomes.

6. Course of action:

- b. The CJ faculty will continue to administer this assessment exam at the end of each semester and monitor the results. These initial results suggest some additional focus may be warranted on Outcome B.

Additional narrative (optional – use as much space as needed):

G. Summary of artifact collection procedure

CJ 1010 Learning Objectives:

The CJ 1010 assessment exam will be given every semester during the last two weeks of instruction. No artifacts will be collected for assessment – performance will be evaluated based on exam scores. These scores will be stored in ChiTester.

Program Learning Objectives:

Artifacts are not collected for program assessment. However, results of the assessment exam are stored in ChiTester.

Summary Information (as needed)

Appendix A

Most departments or programs receive a number of recommendations from their Five-Year Program Review processes. This page provides a means of updating progress towards the recommendations the department/program is acting upon.

Date of Program Review:	Recommendation	Progress Description
3/2/2012		
Recommendation 1	<i>“We recommend that the department use the results of the first week student</i>	Curriculum changes are currently being considered by the faculty, particularly as they relate to the referenced

	<i>assessment in the currently conceived 1-unit assessment course as feedback to inform them of future curriculum changes and/or course content modifications. We also suggest utilizing Alpha Phi Sigma students as tutors for students in the capstone assessment course.”</i>	Capstone course. While we are seeking means to utilize tutors, Alpha Phi Sigma is currently shelved due to lack of student interest.
Recommendation 2	<i>“We recommend assessing these [distance] programs by interviewing the coordinators, reviewing course and instructor evaluations, conducting classroom visits/evaluations, as well as reviewing grade distributions at the distance sites.”</i>	The Department Chair has reviewed the distance programs and instructor evaluations during this time period. He also has conducted numerous interviews with the coordinators of our off-campus programs at SLCC and Davis campuses during the past five years. Advice was given and adjustments were made.
Recommendation 3	<i>“We further recommend that the department consider reducing the total number of credits in the major from 45 to 42 or 39, eliminating 3-6 units of electives in the major. The reduction of credits in the major at WSU will mirror the trend to reduce credits in the criminal justice major across the country.”</i>	The Department carefully considered this recommendation and elected not to reduce the total number of credits required for the major. Instead, we expanded the core and added a one credit senior capstone course. The did simplify the major (now at 46 credit hours) by requiring just the core plus five elective courses. This eliminated the ‘concentrations’ that were previously available.
Recommendation 4	<i>“We recommend that department leaders work with the Dean to provide some relief to faculty members in the department who would like to pursue active research agendas.”</i>	The Dean has worked with our department by giving one faculty member a course reduction while serving as the editor of a journal, and allowing those who successfully pass 3 rd year review to have a one course reduction for a semester to do research.

Recommendation 5	<i>“We recommend that the department engage in a process that eventually articulates its primary focus—perhaps with a revision of its current mission statements.”</i>	Ongoing discussions have and continue to take place regarding the proper ‘primary focus’ of our department. For example, it was decided not to attempt to further expand the size of our graduate program at the expense of our undergraduate program. There is a consensus that our primary focus should be on teaching, especially with regard to our large undergraduate program. Nevertheless, scholarship and research continue to be essential areas of secondary focus. Our mission statement has not been changed.
------------------	--	--

Additional Narrative Regarding Assessment of Learning Objectives Since Last Five-Year Program Review:

Assessment has been an area of focus since our last program review. Since that time, we have developed new objectives for the undergraduate program, new methods for assessing those objectives, as well as new methods for assessing the general education social science objectives for CJ 1010. These methods have been in place for 2 academic years (only 1 year for general education assessment), and have provided valuable information in each of these areas.

Since the last program review, we recognized that our objectives were not written in a measurable way, and that some of the ‘old’ objectives were not being assessed. Therefore, we revised our objectives using measurable language and ensured that each objective was being assessed.

In developing our new methods for assessing our program, we discussed at length the best mode of administration, the assessment tools, and the pedagogy involved in doing so. Ultimately, we decided upon our current assessment methods, but have since identified some challenges/opportunities that we hope to address in the future. For example, trends indicate that students consistently underperform on specific assessment questions. As such, we have a plan in place to identify these questions, and either rework them or potentially identify these content areas as needing more focus in the classroom.

Regarding the assessment of the social science general education objectives in CJ 1010, we recently revised our assessment method. This was necessitated by a change in the objectives themselves from the SS general education assessment committee. There is likely to be another change in these objectives again in the near future, and we stand ready to rework our methods to ensure that SS general education outcomes are being assessed.

Finally, assessment has expanded beyond its original scope from a one-person task 5 years ago to an assessment committee today. Starting in January of 2017, assessment will receive even more attention

from faculty by being expanded into a 4 person committee headed by two co-chairs (one for undergraduate and one for graduate assessment).

Appendix B

Please provide the following information about the full-time and adjunct faculty contracted by your department during the last academic year (summer through spring). Gathering this information each year will help with the headcount reporting that must be done for the final Five Year Program Review document that is shared with the State Board of Regents.

Faculty	
Headcount	12
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)	
Full-time Tenured	4
Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track)	8
Part-time	1
With Master's Degrees	
Full-time Tenured	
Full-time Non-Tenured	
Part-time	12
With Bachelor's Degrees	
Full-time Tenured	
Full-time Non-tenured	
Part-time	1
Other (J.D.)	
Full-time Tenured	
Full-time Non-tenured	
Part-time	8
Total Headcount Faculty	
Full-time Tenured	
Full-time Non-tenured	
Part-time	

Please respond to the following questions.

- 1) Based on your program's assessment findings, what subsequent action will your program take?

Based on your program's assessment findings, what subsequent action will your program take?

- a. Undergraduate Program:

- i. We will continue to assess the program objectives in the manner described, with the CJ 4995 assessment exam acting as the department's metric for assessing student learning.
- ii. Patterns in results from future administrations of the exam will be identified so that deficiencies can be addressed.
- iii. The CJ assessment committee will propose changes to the program's learning objectives so that the objectives are phrased in more measurable ways.

- b. CJ 1010:

- i. The department will continue to assess the new SS gen ed learning objectives using the new assessment tool that went 'live' Fall of 2015.
- ii. As results of the assessment become available in forthcoming semesters, patterns in the data will be examined, and changes proposed if necessary. No changes are currently being considered since the exam has only been administered once.

- 2) We are interested in better understanding how departments/programs assess their graduating seniors. Please provide a short narrative describing the practices/curriculum in place for your department/program. Please include both direct and indirect measures employed.

We assess our program objectives as part of CJ 4995, which is our senior capstone course. This one credit hour class is administered online and includes a 100 question multiple choice exam spanning each core course in our program. Students who pass the assessment with a 70% or higher score are considered to have mastered the core elements of the program. This course is only available to students once they have completed the other 8 core classes, so it is essentially administered to graduating seniors.

STANDARD D. ACADEMIC ADVISING

Advising Strategy and Process

All students are assigned an advisor on the basis of their last names. Flyers addressing this policy are posted in prominent locations in and near the departmental office. Students are encouraged to meet with a faculty advisor at least annually for course and program advisement and are free to meet with them as often as they like.

Advising is primarily conducted in a traditional manner. That is, students meet individually with a faculty member in his/her office to discuss course work, research, employment, graduation concerns, and progress towards degree. Cat-tracks is often employed as a useful tool to help a student see where he/she is at with regards to progress towards a degree. All full-time criminal justice faculty are familiar with the Cat-tracks utility.

Effectiveness of Advising

Student Feedback

Feedback on advising from the student perspective tends to be anecdotal. In the past, we have conducted an Exit Survey with students, but only one question may have loosely addressed advising as it asked students, “What suggestions do you have that would help the criminal justice department to better serve students?” Only a few responses indicated that students were pleased with advising perhaps due in part to the broad scope of the question. As a second layer of anecdotal evidence of effectiveness from students, our departmental secretary speaks with students frequently. She has expressed that the majority of students are pleased with advising although a small handful have vocalized concerns that are mentioned below in the weakness section under faculty feedback.

Faculty Feedback

One of our tenure-track faculty administered an e-mail survey to faculty asking them a series of questions regarding academic advising. The three questions of interest for this report are:

1. What are some of the strengths of our current undergraduate advising system?
2. What are some of the weaknesses of our current undergraduate advising system?
3. Do you get the sense that students are pleased with our current undergraduate advising system?

While it is a small sample size from which to draw upon (N=7), some common themes emerged from the faculty. Those findings are discussed below.

- *Strengths*
 - Beneficial for faculty and students
 - The common theme regarding strengths is the fact that we split the students up among faculty and this serves a beneficial function for both faculty and students. The practical function for faculty is that it distributes the advising load and it is also argued that this allows students exposure to diverse perspectives (in that it allows students to draw upon multiple expertise to answer career related questions).

- Electronic system allows asynchronous advising
 - A second strength that faculty noted with the CatTracks system was that we could easily advise students electronically or over the telephone if we were unable to meet with them face-to-face.

- *Weaknesses*
 - Quality of faculty advising
 - A reoccurring response was that faculty were concerned with the quality of advising that students were receiving. Many of us acknowledge that advising is a very time-consuming endeavor and not all faculty are equally committed to the process.
 - Spill-over effect
 - Faculty note frustrations about having to pick up the load of other faculty that are either unwilling to advise, do an inadequate job of it (so students seek them out), or are not accessible due to limited hours of availability
 - CatTracks training
 - Some faculty noted an absence of training when it comes to the CatTracks program and felt as though they had the basic skills necessary to navigate the program but wished they understood it more.
 - Programming barriers
 - Another group of faculty (small handful) noted issues with software programming in that it can make the interface of CatTracks hard to navigate for both students and faculty as far as meeting program objectives for their major, minor, or associates degree in criminal justice. The faculty also noted that these are barriers that we cannot overcome at the departmental level as they are controlled by other entities on campus.

Students Pleased?

- Students pleased
 - Many faculty members expressed that they have not heard negative feedback so they take this to be an indication that students are pleased.
- Students not pleased
 - Other faculty members said that they had heard through the grapevine (either through e-mail feedback, face-to-face conversations, or discussions overheard among students before/after class) that students are not pleased with:
 - Certain faculty and their lack of commitment to advising
 - The hours of availability of their faculty advisor
 - Receiving inaccurate information that delayed their graduation

- Being shuffled from faculty to faculty when the alphabet assignment shifted

Past Changes and Future Recommendations

In 2013, the department underwent a large curriculum overhaul that we feel makes advising students a more streamlined process (mainly due to dropping the need for an emphasis). It is easier to track students and see their progress when there are less options or tracks for them to take. However, given the current climate of advising and the self-reflective survey, we acknowledge that there are deficiencies that need to be addressed. As such, we have prioritized academic advising as one of our many program objectives that we will assess and evaluate in the next five years.

The future recommendations that we have as a department are threefold. First, we need to do a better job assessing the effectiveness of our advising by reaching out to students and asking them what they think the strengths and weaknesses are. The suggestion would be that this is done in a more formal manner like using an Exit Survey or some other type of survey where we get their input. A second recommendation that we have as a faculty is better oversight of advisors. If there truly is such discrepancy between the quality of advising that we are offering our students, we need to address the deficiencies and hold faculty accountable. A third and final recommendation that we have is exploring the option of centralizing advising to one faculty member. There are still some reservations throughout the department about making this transition, but it is something to explore nonetheless.

STANDARD E. FACULTY

The Department of Criminal Justice currently has nine tenured or tenure-track faculty and three full-time, non-tenure track (contract) faculty. In the past year (academic year 2015-2016, and fall 2016, the department has also employed twenty adjunct faculty, nearly all of whom teach courses in the evening on the main campus in Ogden, in our B.S. program at Salt Lake Community College, or at our program housed at the Davis County campus.

Faculty Demographic Information

All of the department's tenured or tenure-track faculty have Ph.D.'s, and three also have J.D.'s. Of the nine tenured or tenure-track faculty, seven identify as male and two as female. In addition, seven identify as White or Caucasian, one as Native American, and one as Asian. The faculty has significant teaching experience, ranging from three to twenty-two years of post-graduate teaching. The areas of expertise cover the entire range of the criminal justice system from police, courts, and

corrections, to criminology, forensics, law, ethics, theory, law and society, statistics, and research methods.

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty							
Name	Rank	Tenure status	Gender	Ethnicity	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching*	Areas of Expertise
David Lynch	Full	Tenured	M	White	JD, PhD	22	Courts, Law
Scott Senjo	Full	Tenured	M	Cauc.	JD, PhD	19	Statistics, Law
Bruce Bayley	Full	Tenured	M	N. Amer	PhD	12	Ethics, Corrections
Brent Horn	Associate	Tenured	M	White	PhD	12	Forensics
Bradford Reyns	Assistant	Tenure Track	M	White	PhD	7	Victimology, Criminology
Molly Sween	Assistant	Tenure Track	F	White	PhD	6	Theory, Race/Class/Gender and the CJS
Mark Denniston	Assistant	Tenure Track	M	White	JD, PhD	5	Constitutional Rights and Procedures, Judicial Politics
Monica Williams	Assistant	Tenure Track	F	White	PhD	4	Law & Society, Statistics, Policing
Dennis Lee	Assistant	Tenure Track	M	Asian	PhD	3	Policing

NOTE: M=Male, F=Female, N.Amer=Native American, Cauc.=Caucasian, DNI=Did Not Identify

*Years of teaching includes only post-graduate degree teaching. Years are rounded up.

The department's non-tenure track faculty include three full-time contract faculty, all of whom have either a Master's degree or a J.D., and twenty part-time adjunct instructors, all but one of whom have at least a Master's degree or a J.D. Of the non-tenure track faculty and instructors, 19 identify as male, and 4 identify as female. Nineteen identify as White or Caucasian, two identify as Asian, one identifies as Black, and one as Hispanic. The non-tenure track faculty and instructors have a wide range of expertise, from international criminal justice, to forensics, law, corrections, policing, juvenile justice, and crime scene investigation.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty							
Name	Rank	Status	Gender	Ethnicity	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching*	Areas of Expertise
Jean Kapenda	Director, SLCC	Contract, FT	M	Black	MCJ	4	Transnational /International CJ, CJ Management
Brian Namba	Director, Davis campus	Contract, FT	M	Asian	JD	6	Law
Russell Dean	Assistant Professor	Contract, FT	M	White	MS	13	Forensics
Gage Arnold	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	JD	6	Law
Catherine Conklin	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	F	White	JD	12	Law
Brad Cottrell	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	MS	16	Corrections
Michael Chabries, Sr.	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	MPA	13	Corrections
Michael Chabries, Jr.	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	DNI	DNI	Ethics
Seth Dereta	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	MS	1	General CJ, Policing
Chanar Goodrich	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	F	Asian	MSW	3	Juvenile Justice
Mike Haddon	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	Cauc.	MPA	9	General CJ, Corrections
LuAnn Hooker	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	F	White	MS	6	Corrections
Roger Hunt	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	MS	14	Policing
Gary Jensen	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	MS	1	Policing
Phil Kirk	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	Hispanic	MPA	10	Policing
Richard Larsen	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	Cauc.	JD	10	Law
Glen Passey	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	MPA	6	Security
Mitchell Pilkington	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	MS	5	CSI
Jack Rickards	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	MS	6	Policing
Paul Rimmasch	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	BA	1	CSI
Robert Wadman	Instructor	Adjunct, PT; Prof. Emeritus	M	White	DA	19	Policing
Teresa Welch	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	F	White	JD	3	International CJ, Constitutional Rights, Victimology
Rick Westmoreland	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	Cauc.	JD	9	Law
Chris Zimmerman	Instructor	Adjunct, PT	M	White	MS	12	Policing

NOTE: M=Male, F=Female, Cauc.=Caucasian, DNI=Did Not Identify

*Years of teaching includes only teaching at Weber State University. Years are rounded up.

Programmatic/Departmental Teaching Standards

The department relies on the standards set by the university and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. At the end of each course, students evaluate the faculty based on 16 items that assess our department's agreed-upon teaching standards. Course evaluations are administered via ChiTester. The department's teaching standards include each of the following, which are assessed by the items listed after each standard:

- Providing students with substantive content that adds to their understanding of the criminal justice system:
 - “In general, the course stimulated my thinking.”
 - “This course added to my knowledge of the subject.”
 - “This course presented new knowledge or skills.”
- Delivering content in ways that enhance students' learning experience:
 - “The presentations followed a logical pattern of organization.”
 - “The presentations helped me to understand the material.”
 - “The instructor emphasized key points.”
 - “The instructor's explanations seemed clear to me.”
 - “When the instructor used teaching aids, they helped to clarify the ideas presented.”
 - “I had opportunities to participate in class.”
 - “The instructor used class time effectively.”
- Assigning in-class activities, outside of class assignments, and exams that enhance students' learning experience:
 - “The classroom activities were supportive of the objectives.”
 - “The tests covered the content presented in the course (text, lectures, outside readings, etc.).”
 - “Outside-the-class assignments contributed to my understanding of the subject matter.”
- Providing and adhering to clear expectations:
 - “My work was graded according to announced guidelines.”
 - “The objectives of this course were clearly presented.”
- Developing and maintaining rapport with students:
 - “The instructor treated me with respect and regard.”

In addition to these standards, the faculty are also expected to be accessible to students by holding regular office hours and responding promptly to telephone calls and emails.

Faculty Qualifications

For the qualifications of tenured and tenure-track faculty, please see the curriculum vitae in Appendix XX. Our contract and adjunct faculty have extensive field experience in criminal justice and related fields.

Faculty & Staff (current academic year)

	Tenure/ TT	Contract	Adjunct
Number of faculty with Doctoral degrees	9		1
Number of faculty with Master's degrees		2	13
Number of faculty with Bachelor's degrees			1
Other Faculty*		1	5
Total	9	3	20

* All of these faculty have J.D.'s as their highest degree completed.

Evidence of Effective Instruction

Students evaluate all regular faculty at least once a year and they evaluate adjunct faculty every time they teach a course. From Fall 2011 through Spring 2013, students completed their course evaluations on paper. Since Fall 2013, students complete their evaluations online via Chitester. Students evaluate the faculty based on sixteen criteria developed by the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Each of the item on the course evaluations uses a five-point scale, where 1="hardly ever" and 5="almost always."

Overall course evaluations provide evidence of effective instruction. As indicated in the tables below, students rated all of the course evaluation items for face-to-face courses at 4.26 or above, with most items rated at least a 4.40.

Face-to Face Courses				
	Fall 2011-Spring 2013		Fall 2013-Spring 2016	
<i>Question</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. The objectives of this course were clearly presented.	4.68	0.64	4.47	0.98
2. The classroom activities were supportive of the objectives.	4.67	0.68	4.49	0.99
3. The presentation followed a logical pattern of organization.	4.64	0.70	4.46	1.00
4. The presentations helped me to understand the material.	4.59	0.76	4.40	1.05
5. I had opportunity to participate in class.	4.72	0.66	4.56	0.89
6. The instructor emphasized key points.	4.68	0.67	4.55	0.86
7. In general, the course stimulated my thinking.	4.52	0.81	4.41	0.95
8. The instructor's explanations seemed clear...	4.56	0.77	4.43	0.95
9. Teaching aids helped to clarify the ideas presented.	4.67	0.76	4.26	1.32
10. The instructor used class time effectively.	4.65	0.71	4.47	0.98
11. The instructor treated me with respect and regard.	4.86	0.50	4.79	0.65
12. Outside-the-class assignments contributed to my understanding of the...	4.63	0.82	4.29	1.32
13. My work was graded according to announced guidelines.	4.78	0.59	4.68	0.80
14. The tests covered the content presented in the course...	4.71	0.68	4.57	1.03
15. This course added to my knowledge of the subject.	4.70	0.69	4.59	0.85
16. This course presented new knowledge or skills.	4.65	0.73	4.56	0.88

i. Regular Faculty

Students, faculty peers, the department chair, and the dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences periodically evaluate all regular, full-time faculty. At least once per year, students evaluate all regular faculty on the sixteen evaluation criteria listed above. As the table below demonstrates, students rated regular faculty very favorably in face-to-face courses, with most ratings averaging at or above 4.3.

Face-to Face Courses—Regular Faculty				
	Fall 2011-Spring 2013		Fall 2013-Spring 2016	
<i>Question</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. The objectives of this course were clearly presented.	4.68	0.62	4.50	0.87
2. The classroom activities were supportive of the objectives.	4.66	0.67	4.45	1.03
3. The presentation followed a logical pattern of organization.	4.65	0.67	4.42	1.05
4. The presentations helped me to understand the material.	4.57	0.76	4.35	1.10
5. I had opportunity to participate in class.	4.67	0.69	4.54	0.93
6. The instructor emphasized key points.	4.65	0.67	4.53	0.88
7. In general, the course stimulated my thinking.	4.45	0.85	4.39	0.96
8. The instructor's explanations seemed clear to me.	4.54	0.76	4.38	0.97
9. Teaching aids helped to clarify the ideas presented.	4.59	0.71	4.25	1.31
10. The instructor used class time effectively.	4.64	0.71	4.42	1.03
11. The instructor treated me with respect and regard.	4.83	0.54	4.78	0.66
12. Outside-the-class assignments contributed to my understanding of the material.	4.51	0.84	4.24	1.35
13. My work was graded according to announced guidelines.	4.77	0.60	4.67	0.80
14. The tests covered the content presented in the course.	4.67	0.69	4.54	1.04
15. This course added to my knowledge of the subject.	4.66	0.73	4.56	0.88
16. This course presented new knowledge or skills.	4.60	0.77	4.53	0.90

Faculty peers evaluate teaching effectiveness in accordance with the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Policy on Tenure and WSU PPM 8-11. In the third and sixth years, a departmental review committee observes tenure-track faculty in their classrooms. The departmental review committee also observes tenured faculty when they go up for promotion to full professor.

The dean and the department chair review teaching effectiveness of full-time faculty annually via self-reported annual reviews provided by each faculty member not up for tenure review or promotion in that year.

ii. Adjunct Faculty

Each time adjunct faculty teach a course, students evaluate them on the sixteen criteria discussed above. The table below demonstrates that students rate adjunct faculty favorably in face-to-face courses, with evaluations of most criteria

averaging at or above 4.3.

Face-to Face Courses—Adjunct Faculty				
	Fall 2011-Spring 2013		Fall 2013-Spring 2016	
<i>Question</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. The objectives of this course were clearly presented.	4.68	0.67	4.38	1.24
2. The classroom activities were supportive of the objectives.	4.66	0.69	4.59	0.87
3. The presentation followed a logical pattern of organization.	4.63	0.74	4.59	0.84
4. The presentations helped me to understand the material.	4.60	0.76	4.55	0.89
5. I had opportunity to participate in class.	4.76	0.61	4.62	0.75
6. The instructor emphasized key points.	4.70	0.66	4.63	0.80
7. In general, the course stimulated my thinking.	4.60	0.74	4.49	0.90
8. The instructor's explanations seemed clear...	4.58	0.78	4.55	0.88
9. Teaching aids helped to clarify the ideas presented.	4.63	0.73	4.29	1.36
10. The instructor used class time effectively.	4.66	0.70	4.61	0.80
11. The instructor treated me with respect and regard.	4.88	0.43	4.81	0.62
12. Outside-the-class assignments contributed to my understanding of the...	4.64	0.70	4.43	1.21
13. My work was graded according to announced guidelines.	4.79	0.57	4.72	0.78
14. The tests covered the content presented in the course...	4.73	0.64	4.65	0.98
15. This course added to my knowledge of the subject.	4.73	0.64	4.68	0.76
16. This course presented new knowledge or skills.	4.70	0.67	4.63	0.82

Mentoring Activities

The department informally mentors new faculty. All new faculty are encouraged to go to the new faculty retreat. In addition, senior faculty mentor by answering questions on an as-needed basis and taking candidates for third-year review out to lunch to discuss the tenure and promotion process

Diversity of Faculty

Eighty-two percent of the department's faculty identify as male and eighteen percent identify as female. The department's tenured and tenure-track faculty consist of seven males (four of whom are tenured) and two females (assistant professors). The three full-time contract faculty are all male, and of the adjunct faculty, seventeen are male and four are female. While almost seventy-nine percent of the faculty identifies as predominantly white or Caucasian, the department has increased its racial and ethnic diversity since the previous program review. Of the department's nine tenured and tenure-track faculty, one individual identifies as Native American (tenured) and one identifies as Asian (assistant professor). The three full-time contract faculty identify as black, Asian, and white. The adjunct faculty consists of nineteen people who identify as white or Caucasian, one who identifies as Asian, and one as Hispanic.

Ongoing Review and Professional Development

All tenured and tenure-track faculty are reviewed annually, as well as at the times specified in WSU PPM guidelines for tenure and promotion. Each year, those faculty not up for tenure or promotion submit a review of their teaching, scholarship, and service in the previous calendar year. The department chair assesses those annual reviews, provides feedback to each faculty member, and submits the reviews to the dean. Faculty are also reviewed in their third year to assess progress toward tenure. The third-year review involves an in-depth, extensive review of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service. A departmental peer review committee, a college tenure and promotion committee, and the dean rate each area as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, or excellent according to college guidelines for tenure. Faculty undergo a similar process when they go up for tenure and promotion in their sixth year. Once tenured, faculty are reviewed when they go up for promotion and every five years after that.

Contract faculty are hired to one-year appointments, renewed each spring by the Dean if they appear to be performing satisfactorily. Adjunct faculty are hired on a course-by-course basis. The Chair reviews their appointments on a regular basis to determine their eligibility for reappointment.

The department supports professional development by providing funds to engage in professional and scholarly activities. For instance, each year, the department allocates funds for each faculty member to attend professional conferences in order to present their work, learn about the latest trends in faculty members' respective fields, and improve their teaching through teaching-oriented sessions. In addition, the department fully funds faculty attendance at the Western Association of Criminal Justice annual meeting. The department instituted a Faculty Vitality grant in 2011, and five faculty members have since received this grant. The grant funds attendance at workshops and institutes that help develop teaching and scholarly activities. Finally, the department supports professional development by paying membership dues for one professional association per faculty member. All of these activities facilitate ongoing professional development among the faculty.

STANDARD F. PROGRAM SUPPORT

Support Staff: Our Department secretary, Faye Medd, has a B.S. degree in Computer Information Systems from Weber State University. She single-handedly staffs an office that serves a very large undergraduate program as well as a Master's Degree program. Ms. Medd's computer systems background is an invaluable asset to our department, as she is very "tech savvy" and consequently a great resource for those faculty who are less technologically gifted. She also serves as a front-line academic advisor, fielding questions about Cattracks (WSU's degree evaluation tool) and/or connecting students with faculty advisors who can answer academic program questions. She makes all changes and exceptions into Cattracks as CJ faculty have no authority to enter exceptions into the Cattracks system. She attends ongoing training as needed.

Administration: The Department of Criminal Justice has a Department Chair, Dr. David Lynch, as well as a Director of the Graduate Program, Dr. Bruce Bayley. Additionally, Professor Jean Kapenda directs our outreach program at Salt Lake Community College and Professor Brian Namba does the same at the WSU Davis Campus location in Layton, Utah.

Facilities: The Department of Criminal Justice is housed in the Social Sciences Building of the main campus in Ogden, Utah. All criminal justice classes at the main campus are held in this same building and all faculty offices are next to one another in this building. The building has its own, large computer lab in the basement as well as its own testing center in the basement. The Department also has its own forensics lab within the building, which has adequate equipment (see below for further description of lab equipment) but is currently unsafe and insufficient due to space considerations. Designs for the new forensics lab in the planned renovated building (pending funding approval by the Utah legislature) will address many of the safety issues with the current lab and layout. The Department also has a presence at the Davis County Campus of Weber State University in Layton, Utah as well as at the Larry Miller Campus of Salt Lake Community College in Sandy, Utah. At both of these sites, we have a full-time, on site director, and offer many courses leading to the B.S. degree.

Equipment: All full-time faculty have desk-top computers as well as Ipads furnished by the department. All classrooms used for criminal justice courses have audio-visual equipment including document cameras and projectors, computers, and internet connectivity.

Of special note is the equipment found in our forensic science lab:

Multiple Nikon digital SLR cameras

Fuji Infrared digital SLR camera

Multiple polarizing light microscopes
Multiple stereomicroscopes
American Optics Comparison microscope
Bullet recovery tank
AFIX Automated fingerprint identification system
Ocean Optics Visible spectrometer
Various pieces of chemical laboratory equipment (hoods, beakers, hot-plates, pipets, chem fridge)
Electrostatic dust lifting apparatus
Superglue fuming chamber
3D laser surveying station

Library: Weber State University has an excellent library with extensive collections and services. Dr. Wade Kotter, who has a graduate degree in library science as well as a PhD in Anthropology, is the social sciences librarian and is very helpful and resourceful. Dr. Kotter also regularly offers to teach our criminal justice students a class on social science library research.

STANDARD G. RELATIONSHIPS WITH EXTERNAL COMMUNITIES

The Department of Criminal Justice has some significant relationship with various external communities, as follows:

1. WSU Police/Corrections (“POST”) Academy– The POST Academy is not part of our department (it is part of the College of Continuing Education). Nevertheless, our department maintains friendly ties with POST. As part of this endeavor, two Criminal Justice Department faculty– Drs. David Lynch and Bruce Bayley--(as well as the Dean of The College of Social Sciences) now serve with various local police chiefs and sheriffs on a POST Advisory Board which meets quarterly to give advice to the Director of the WSU POST Academy. This service not only increases our bonds with POST but with the various chiefs and department heads who also serve on this advisory board. The Criminal Justice Department has also begun to sponsor an award (a plaque) presented by the Department at each POST graduation. This award is given to

the graduating class's top graduate. Also Drs. Monica Williams and Molly Sween are working with the Director of POST to assess the effectiveness of Utah's POST curriculum.

2. Dr. Bruce Bayley is heavily involved with external communities, including:

- Council member: Utah POST (Peace Officer Standards and Training) Council
- Consultant/researcher for the state-wide POST office in the area of ethics training
- Ad hoc researcher: Utah Sheriff's Association
- Ad hoc researcher: Weber County Sheriff's Office
- Ad hoc researcher: Weber State University Law Enforcement Academy
- Adjunct Instructor at the Weber State University Law Enforcement Academy
- Board Member: Weber State University Law Enforcement Academy
- Ethics columnist: CorrectionsOne.com
- Corrections writer: National Tactical Officers' Association

3. Dr. Brent Horn works with the Utah State Crime Lab, Weber Metro CSI, and Layton PD, each of whom provide student and faculty support for teaching, high-impact learning, and research. He has also worked with Salt Lake City PD and the National Science Olympiad (including the Utah State and University of Utah Science Olympiads) which have provided support for high-impact learning, and additionally with the Olympiads, opportunities for recruiting. He also maintains relationships with the BYU Department of Chemistry, with has provided faculty research support, and the Henderson, Nevada PD, which has provided teaching support.

4. Dr. Molly Sween is a committee member on the Weber County work group for disproportionate minority contact, which is a focus of the Utah Board of Juvenile Justice.

5. Dr. Monica Williams is collaborating with WSU students and Ogden PD to survey Ogden residents about their opinions on policing in Ogden. She also serves on the national board of the Consortium for Undergraduate Law and Justice Programs.

6. Dr. Heeuk Lee serves as an auditor and faculty counselor for The Korean Society of Criminology in America (KOSCA), as well serving on KOSCA's newsletter editorial board. As faculty counselor he is responsible for counseling and guiding any Korean international students in the organization in meeting their respective educational, personal, vocational goals, providing professional assistance and mentoring to first-year students as well as providing consultative support services to ABDs.

7. Several of the CJ faculty at WSU are active with the regional and national associations pertaining to criminal justice, including the Western Association of Criminal Justice (WACJ),

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS), Law and Society Association (LSA), and American Society of Criminology (ACS).

STANDARD H. PROGRAM SUMMARY

Results of Previous Program Reviews

Problem Identified	Action Taken	Progress
Issue 1 – Night Program	Previous 5 Year Program Review:	
	Year 1 Action Taken: Tenure-track faculty were encouraged to consider fulfilling their teaching duties by teaching at least one night class in the spring or fall semester each academic year	One tenured faculty member began teaching one night class in both the fall and spring semesters
	Year 2 Action Taken: Tenure-track faculty were encouraged to consider fulfilling their teaching duties by teaching at least one night class in the spring or fall semester each academic year, and, if that class were located at the SLCC campus, would receive additional compensation in the amount of \$1,000 per class	One tenured faculty member began teaching one night class in both the fall and spring semesters and received additional compensation in the amount of \$1,000 per class
	Year 3 Action Taken: Tenure-track faculty were encouraged to consider fulfilling their teaching duties by teaching at least one night class in the spring or fall semester each academic year, and, if that class	A second tenured or tenure-track faculty member began teaching one night class in either the fall and spring semesters

	were located at the SLCC campus, would receive additional compensation in the amount of \$1,000 per class	
	Year 4 Action taken: Tenure-track faculty were encouraged to consider fulfilling their teaching duties by teaching at least one night class in the spring or fall semester each academic year, and, if that class were located at the SLCC campus, would receive additional compensation in the amount of \$1,000 per class	A third tenured or tenure-track faculty member began teaching one night class in either the fall and spring semesters
Issue 2 – Distance Campuses	Previous 5 Year Program Review:	
	Year 1 Action Taken: Tenure-track faculty were encouraged to consider fulfilling their teaching duties by teaching at least one class in the spring or fall semester at one of the distance campuses	One tenured faculty member began teaching at one of the distance campuses in both the fall and spring semesters
	Year 2 Action Taken: Tenure-track faculty were encouraged to consider fulfilling their teaching duties by teaching at least one class in the spring or fall semester at one of the distance campuses and would receive additional compensation in the amount of \$1,000 per class for doing so	One tenured faculty member began teaching at one of the distance campuses in both the fall and spring semesters and received additional compensation in the amount of \$1,000 per class
	Year 3 Action Taken: Tenure-track faculty were encouraged to consider fulfilling their teaching duties by teaching at least one class in the spring or fall semester at one of the distance campuses and would receive additional compensation in the amount of \$1,000 per class for doing so	A second tenured or tenure-track faculty member began teaching at one of the distance campuses in both the fall and spring semesters and received additional compensation in the amount of \$1,000 per class
	Year 4 Action taken: Tenure-track faculty were encouraged to consider fulfilling their	A third tenured or tenure-track faculty member began teaching at one of the distance campuses

	teaching duties by teaching at least one night class in the spring or fall semester each academic year and would receive additional compensation in the amount of \$1,000 per class	in both the fall and spring semesters and received additional compensation in the amount of \$1,000 per class
Issue 3 – Outcomes’ Assessment	Previous 5 Year Program Review:	
	Year 1 Action Taken: Commitment by department faculty to develop a global, objective assessment instrument which will reflect nationally accepted and recognized content	Formation of a departmental committee to study the proposal
	Year 2 Action Taken: Communications underway by all department faculty as to faculty input regarding the assessment proposal	Input is received from the faculty and the input is organized into a summary format
	Year 3 Action Taken: All faculty assigned specific tasks to draft assessment questions from each faculty members’ respective area of specialization	Faculty members engage themselves in the process of writing specific test questions which reflect the primary principles within their respective areas of specialization
	Year 4 Action taken: Full implementation of senior seminar course where all students are required to participate in the completion of the assessment instrument	Coordination, organization, and tabulation of assessment results from new senior seminar assessment instrument
Issue 4 – Forensic Science Emphasis	Previous 5 Year Program Review:	
	Year 1 Action Taken: Created Director position for Forensic Science programs oversight, including stipend and other benefits to be paid to the Director	Dr. Brent Horn appointed as Director for a 3 year term
	Year 2 Action Taken: Continuous investigation, and periodic inclusion of forensic science faculty in the teaching of other CJ courses (CJ 1010,	Forensic science faculty were contacted and arrangements were made to have forensic science faculty teach either CJ 1010 or CJ 2350

	2350), as allowed by forensic science student enrollment profile	
	Year 3 Action Taken: Continuous investigation, and periodic inclusion of forensic science faculty in the teaching of other CJ courses (CJ 1010, 2350), as allowed by forensic science student enrollment profile	Forensic science faculty were contacted and arrangements were made to have forensic science faculty teach either CJ 1010 or CJ 2350
	Year 4 Action taken: Continuous investigation, and periodic inclusion of forensic science faculty in the teaching of other CJ courses (CJ 1010, 2350), as allowed by forensic science student enrollment profile	Forensic science faculty were contacted and arrangements were made to have forensic science faculty teach either CJ 1010 or CJ 2350
	Explore the feasibility and desire to renew the forensic science director position	Renewal of forensic science Director position
Issue 5 – High Teaching Loads	Previous 5 Year Program Review:	
	Year 1 Action Taken: Department meeting agenda specifically identifies the issue of high teaching loads and the impact of high teaching loads on faculty goals for research endeavors	Department faculty comprehend the importance of issue and commence department communications and discussion of the issue; possibilities and options are explored
	Year 2 Action Taken: Teaching loads remain the same pursuant to each faculty members' legally binding contract with the university, however, various forms of greater support for faculty research begin to develop	Faculty are invited to participate and present research at an out-of-state criminal justice conference and the department pays 100% of all faculty expenses. This plan is for the purpose of advancing a research culture within the department
	Year 3 Action Taken: Teaching loads remain the same pursuant to each faculty members' legally binding contract with the university, however, various forms of greater support for faculty research begin to develop	Funding for faculty travel to research conferences is protected and maintained

	Year 4 Action taken: Department-based discussion ensues regarding the various possibilities for faculty course buy-outs. Faculty consider the various ramifications of course buy-out plans and options	Additional funding is made available for faculty travel. The travel funds' increase is designed to support faculty travel to research conferences for the purpose of advancing a research culture within the department
Issue 6 – Changes to Undergraduate Curriculum	Previous 5 Year Program Review:	
	Year 1 Action Taken: Re-introduction of query for breadth of undergraduate curriculum	Re-visit of detailed discussion regarding the credit requirements for the major (this did not include the minor)
	Year 2 Action Taken: Determination of consistency of undergraduate program with national standards	Comparative analysis is taken to compare our undergraduate program with other, comparable undergraduate programs
	Year 3 Action Taken: Review of budgetary considerations	Computation of funding distributions to the undergraduate program in comparison with the funding distribution that goes to the graduate program
	Year 4 Action taken: no action taken	Not applicable
Issue 7 – Primary Focus	Previous 5 Year Program Review:	
	Year 1 Action Taken: Emphasis on department undergraduate outcomes assessment	Specific committee formation is done to create a detailed measurement tool for the accurate analysis of undergraduate outcomes
	Year 2 Action Taken: Integration of tenure-track faculty into night classes program	Department awareness of need has led to more faculty volunteering to teach classes at night
	Year 3 Action Taken: Diversity issues are better introduced into the undergraduate curriculum	Tenure track female professors teach elective courses in their specializations such as sexual assault victims, and, gender and crime issues
	Year 4 Action taken: Expansion of faculty integration into undergraduate program decision making	Number of department meetings increased and the agenda for each meeting is lengthened

Summary Information (as needed)

In the time period since the 2012 undergraduate program self-study, the department has gained an important comfort level with paying attention to program and administrative features such as the form and scope of our distance programs, outcomes assessment, our night program, online program, etc. There is a constructive “helpfulness culture” where department faculty have integrated the role of examining and working on department programs and policies. This role operates in tandem with the role of daily teaching duties and publishing research. Therefore, an impressive range of progress has been made in the last five years in the Criminal Justice undergraduate program and equally important, no hesitation appears to exist to the furtherance of even greater program improvement.

Action Plan for Ongoing Assessment Based on Current Self Study Findings

Action Plan for Evidence of Learning Related Findings

Summary Information (as needed)

Problem Identified	Action to Be Taken
Issue 1: Method of Undergraduate Assessment	Current 5 Year Program Review:
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: Begin the discussion among the department faculty for the major weaknesses and/or shortcomings of the present undergraduate assessment policies and procedures
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: Specifically identify what needs to be changed and what needs to be accomplished while making changes to the undergraduate assessment policies and procedures
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken: Full implementation of new, improved methods for undergraduate assessment
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken: Continue to administer and implements the new, improved methods of undergraduate assessment and simultaneously collect qualitative data informally as to the relative effectiveness of the new methods for undergraduate assessment
Issue 2: Capstone Course	Current 5 Year Program Review:
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: Study how other, comparable university CJ programs such as the Boise State Criminal Justice undergraduate program administers a capstone course
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: Present to the CJ faculty the different options that are available to administer an effective undergraduate capstone course
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken: Make a determination and decision about the CJ undergraduate capstone class and begin implementation of improvements to the course
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken: Continue with the implementation of the new capstone course and also informally monitor and assess the usefulness and effectiveness of the class

In the Criminal Justice Department undergraduate program, Assessment (“Undergraduate Assessment”), and the Capstone Course are very good examples of features of the department that, taken all together,

can reflect the overall quality of our undergraduate program. Therefore, this Action Plan emphasizes the changes that we intend to make to both undergraduate assessment and the capstone

Action Plan for Staff, Administration, or Budgetary Findings

For the 2016 Self-Study, Section H here does not address “Staff, Administration, or Budgetary Findings.” As a general matter, the Criminal Justice Department has not experienced any salient issues or problems when it comes to staff, administration, or budgetary findings. One final note: it is advisable to review other sections of the Self-Study for the possible inclusion of information related to staff, administration, or budgetary findings.

Problem Identified	Action to Be Taken
Issue 1	Current 5 Year Program Review:
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken:
Issue 2	Current 5 Year Program Review:
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken:

Summary Information (as needed)

Summary of Artifact Collection Procedure

At this time, the Criminal Justice Department is not collecting artifacts for its undergraduate program self-assessment. We stand ready to do so, however, since the collection of artifacts can provide evidence of our various program assessments and can assist us in the creation and development of new procedures that we can use to improve our undergraduate programs.

Artifact	Learning Outcome Measured	When/How Collected?	Where Stored?
(i.e. Final Project Rubric)		(i.e. end of semester)	(i.e. electronic copies)
(i.e. Chi Tester Outcome Report)		(i.e. 2-3 times per semester)	(i.e. electronic format, chi tester warehouse)

Summary Information (as needed)

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Student and Faculty Statistical Summary

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Student Credit Hours Total	12,375	13,014	11,432	10,842	10,480
Student FTE Total	412.50	433.80	381.07	361.40	349.33
Student Majors	828	925	846	798	729
Program Graduates					
Associate Degree	12	10	10	19	12
Bachelor Degree	100	119	160	122	113
Student Demographic Profile					
Female	389	421	418	399	351
Male	439	503	428	399	378
Faculty FTE Total	22.44	21.3	20.38	19.56	n/a
Adjunct FTE	11.33	10.19	8.71	7.45	n/a
Contract FTE	11.11	11.11	11.67	12.11	n/a
Student/Faculty Ratio	18.38	20.37	18.70	18.48	n/a

Note: Data provided by Institutional Effectiveness

Appendix B: Contract/Adjunct Faculty Profile (prepared by Dr. Monica Williams) – See “Standard E”

Appendix C: Staff Profile (prepared by Dr. Monica Williams) – See “Standard E”

Appendix D: Financial Analysis Summary (NOTE: You will only see the “Total Expenses” below since instructional support and other

Costs are all lumped together as total expense – per Provost Office)

Department	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Undergraduate					
Instructional Costs					

Support Costs					
Other Costs					
Total Expense	886,165	915,387	985,750	988,638	1,052,829

Note: Data provided by Provost's Office

Appendix E: External Community Involvement Names and Organizations: (Prepared by Dr. Mark Denniston)-- See "Standard G")

Appendix F: Site Visit Team

Name	Affiliation
Paul "Lish" Harris, PhD	Dixie State University, Criminal Justice Program
Branden Little, PhD	Weber State University, Department of History

Appendix G: Evidence of Learning Courses within the Major or General Education (Prepared by Dr. Brad Reynolds)-- See "Standard C"