

DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Self-Study

Spring 2006

Introduction and History

Nature and Character of Discipline

Criminal justice is not an academic discipline; it is a field of study. Although the origins of academic criminal justice extend back almost a century, academics have yet to reach consensus on the appropriate content for criminal justice programs. The field combines law, sociology, public administration, political science, natural sciences and psychology. University-level criminal justice courses began in 1916 with summer offerings by the University of California, which ultimately approved a BA degree in 1933. At the instigation of California Attorney General, Earl Warren, and Berkeley Police Chief, August Vollmer, San Jose State College initiated a Police School and four-year degree in police science in 1935. Although the concept spread slowly for the next thirty years, it remained centered in California. V. A. Leonard's 1964 edition of *Police Organization and Management* lists twenty colleges and universities as conferring baccalaureate degrees in police science or related fields. Of these, seven were located in California and five were in the California State College System (Fresno, Long Beach, Los Angeles, San Jose, and Sacramento). These early programs generally employed faculty with practitioner backgrounds, most of whom lacked Ph.D. degrees. Baccalaureate and master's level programs expanded exponentially in the early 1970s as a result of federal funding from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration's Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) and have become a standard offering in most regional universities.

Typically called police science departments, most of the early programs defined their goal as pre-service preparation of police officers and included such vocationally oriented classes as firearms, unarmed combat and crime scene processing. Although many early pioneers foresaw University police programs developing into required accreditation for law enforcement employment in a pattern similar to nursing or K-12 education, this did not occur. The advent of state peace officer standards and training (POST) agencies, and their universal state requirement of pre-service police academy training as a prerequisite to certification and employment, significantly reduced the potential for universities fulfilling the accreditation role. Other factors in limiting the University certification role included the unwillingness of police and other criminal justice bureaucracies to allow lateral entry at the supervisory or middle management level, academic hostility to vocational education, and academic unwillingness to subject curriculum to POST oversight and certification. Although a few universities in other states have successfully integrated POST certification with their academic programs, none in California have.

From their inception, university-level criminal justice programs included courses on administration, forensics, abnormal psychology, sociology or criminology, and

law. As new programs began to proliferate in pursuit of students and federal dollars, schools of social science emerged as the dominant force in shaping the new programs. Little or no agreement existed regarding the desirable content for a criminal justice program or the appropriate preparation for teaching in such a program. In many cases, departments of sociology offered criminal justice degrees. Although the number of criminal justice students in their undergraduate programs often quickly exceeded the number of sociology students, these programs remained oriented toward sociology. These programs usually displayed little interest in recruiting faculty with practitioner backgrounds in criminal justice, law or other aspects of the justice system. Other programs grew out of departments of political science or public administration. In each case, the department's origin was likely to influence its orientation, and in most cases social science Ph.D.s gradually replaced practitioner faculty with MAs.

Conflict over orientation and scholarly content of criminal justice programs has a long history. Although the University of California formed a School of Criminology in 1950, and occupied the preeminent position in the field for many years, efforts to eliminate the school as too vocational began as early as 1957. This effort failed as a result of strong political support from sources outside the University, but the program's subsequent evolution toward sociology with an emphasis on critical criminology eroded its support. The University of California phased out the criminology program in the mid-1970s. The tension between a focus on pragmatic administration, theoretical critique and research remains alive and well.

The field of criminal justice can be roughly divided into four distinct but overlapping disciplines: law, administration, criminology and investigation/forensics. Undergraduate criminal justice programs usually consist of composite of these, although victimology, social justice studies and conflict resolution have also emerged as subsidiary areas of study within the field. At the graduate level, management/administration, research/evaluation and criminology usually dominate criminal justice programs. Schools of law have long dominated the advanced study of law, and the field of criminalistics (forensic science) requires advanced level training in biology, chemistry and physics obtainable only in the science departments of major research universities.

Since virtually all universities have rejected a vocational training model, four paths remain open for structuring a criminal justice program. One pursues a strict social science model focused on crime causation and the development of skill in research methodology. A slight variation on this model focuses on a more macro examination of justice in society with far greater emphasis on qualitative research, an approach favored by critical and conflict theorists. These models are most commonly found in the few research one institutions which offer degrees in the field. An alternative model focuses on the administration and management of criminal justice organizations, essentially creating a specialized public administration program; this model is favored by departments dominated

by political scientists and public administrators. Neither of these models require faculty members to have any applied skills or practical experience in the field and are thus often advocated by individuals and programs lacking such skills. The third approach involves merging practical knowledge of the field with some component of research and management theory. This approach recognizes that criminal justice majors assume a wide variety of roles upon graduation. These roles vary from graduate study in law or criminology to direct entry into practitioner positions in police, investigative, corrections and social welfare organizations. Additionally in a pattern similar to psychology and communications studies, a significant number of criminal justice graduates do not remain in the field. Because Ph.D. degrees in criminal justice were uncommon until the early 1990s, most faculties consist of a mix of terminal degrees. Even now, UC Irvine is the only California research one university that offers a Ph.D. in the field.

The Division of Criminal Justice, at California State University, Sacramento, has chosen the latter approach with the recognition that the majority of our students intend to pursue employment careers as criminal justice practitioners upon graduation. It is our goal to produce students with writing and analytical skills who have a general understanding of the justice field and a body of specific knowledge in areas such as law, management and investigations. Employment opportunities in policing, investigations, corrections and probation remain strong in this area, and this Division continues to supply large numbers of graduates to local, state and federal justice agencies across the region. As a result, we have continued to recruit faculty members with a variety of educational and professional backgrounds.

History and Mission of the Division

CSUS first offered police science and administration in the form of four evening courses in 1949. By 1952, the Department of Government, which housed the police science offerings within the emphasis in the public administration, hired the first full-time criminal justice professor and program coordinator, Allan Gammage, and began offering regular day classes. By 1957, the program graduated 17 students; two years later Paul B. Weston became the second program coordinator. By the mid-1960s the program had doubled in size and the student population had shifted progressively from in-service law enforcement personnel to undergraduates without prior police experience. In 1969, the program moved to an independent Department of Police Science and Administration, which subsequently was re-designated the Division of Criminal Justice. In 1971, the proposal for a masters of science in criminal justice was approved, and in 1982 the Division was moved to the new School of Health and Human Services. Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, the Division offered both a BS in criminal justice and a BS in forensic science but began phasing out

the forensic science program in the early 1990s after a review revealed that it was not able to provide adequate scientific training, particularly in chemistry.

The Division experienced rapid growth during the 1980s and has fluctuated between 1200 and 1500 undergraduate majors during the past decade, making it one of the largest criminal justice departments in the country and one of the most popular majors on this campus. Although its early students were almost universally white males, they are now racially and ethnically diverse and more than half are female.

The Division's faculty is one of the most interdisciplinary and diverse faculties of any criminal justice programs in the nation. Its criminologists, justice managers, attorneys, and investigators reflect the Division's emphasis on a criminal justice education that contains social science theory, law, management theory and justice practice. Graduates of the program dominate justice agencies throughout Northern California and include the three of the past four Sacramento County Sheriffs, the Placer County Sheriff, the Sacramento and Roseville Police Chiefs, the Stockton Mayor, the current and former Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol, as well as numerous additional local, state and federal justice professionals, attorneys and judges.

Mission

The Division mission statement reads as follows:

The mission of the Division of Criminal Justice is the preparation of students for professional and academic careers related to criminal justice. The Division of Criminal Justice fosters and encourages a learning environment inclusive of interests of race, gender, ethnicity, and class. The Division of Criminal Justice's primary responsibility is teaching. Division faculty enhance their teaching effectiveness by engaging in scholarly and creative activity and service to the University and the greater community. The Criminal Justice faculty acknowledges that the mission of the Division should occur within an atmosphere of collegial governance.

Although the Division offers baccalaureate and master's degrees in criminal justice, a minor in criminal justice, and limited general education courses, it has long defined its primary mission as the undergraduate education of students intent on the pursuit of careers in criminal justice or related fields. Largely as a result of this strategy, the undergraduate program at CSUS has become one of the largest in the United States and the largest in the state. Unlike many other criminal justice programs, we do not offer formal concentrations within the degree. As an alternative, we focus on a required core that we believe provides all graduates with a basic knowledge of the field and allow the student to use their 21 elective units to shape their individual program in conjunction with an advisor. We offer a balanced graduate program that will serve both students

seeking advanced education before pursuing a career and mid-career professionals.

Although interest in forensic science has been particularly strong in recent years due to media portrayal of forensic investigation, we have not considered reinstating our forensic program. Forensic science is first, and foremost, science. We encourage students expressing an interest in this field to major in chemistry with a minor in criminal justice. Students must first master advanced chemistry or biology before developing the applied skills necessary in forensic science. We do believe grounding in law and investigation acquired through a criminal justice minor can prove useful to the forensic scientist; thus we have instituted a minor in forensic science open to both chemistry and biology majors.

Changes in Response to Last Review

During the past six years, this division has undergone extensive change in its curriculum, advising process, staffing, and graduate program. Many of these changes were, at least in part, in response to the last review. Our assessment process revealed that many students were entering upper division courses without the appropriate prerequisites and that a majority of students were in need of more advising and guidance. We were unable to institute automated screening for lower division prerequisites because many students took these courses in community colleges. We addressed this and the advising issue by instituting a pre-major. Students must complete CRJ 001, 002 and 004 (or comparable community college courses) and take a pre-test before becoming majors. Non-majors are barred from enrolling in upper division courses, with the exception of those designated for general education credit. This process has vastly increased our ability to get students in for advising and to attend orientations. The pre-test, in conjunction with a post-test administered in the capstone course, will also provide data to allow extensive assessment of the changes in student knowledge and writing skill.

This emphasis on advising has been reinforced by opening a student assistance center, staffed by a student services professional and graduate students, and the creation of the cohort advising model. Each year, four faculty members volunteer to serve as cohort advisors, for which they receive three units of assigned time. In return, they attend summer orientations, conduct summer office hours in July and August and conduct extended office hours during the academic year. The student services professional assigns all of the year's incoming students, freshman or transfer, to one of these four advisors. The students are tracked with a data base and notified if they do not see the advisor during their first year. All probationary students are also advised and their registration restricted if they do not comply. Our intention is to create a bond between the advisor and the student as early as possible. The orientation is the first step in this process. The orientation is conducted by the Chair, who introduces the student services professional and all cohort advisors. After group orientation, the students break

up in small groups with their respective advisors. At this time students may make appointments for advising during the summer.

In addition to this effort in advising we have revised our undergraduate curriculum by instituting a courts course (175), a research course (100) and a capstone (194) in the core, and strengthened our faculty through new hires to support our revised curriculum. Since the last review, three faculty have completed FERP, three have fully retired and six have initiated FERP. Two of those retiring and four of those beginning FERP were attorneys, an area where we were overstaffed. We have hired 13 tenure track faculty and one full time lecturer in that same period, although two of the tenure track hires have already taken jobs at other institutions. Only two of the new hires are attorneys; one is a research methods specialist; one is a data systems and crime analysis specialist; and the rest are generalists with emphases in corrections, management, investigations, criminology or policing. These hires have added to the skill diversity of an already diverse faculty.

We have also made significant progress in assessment of our program and, less visibly, in viewing our Division as a collective enterprise. For the first time in over a decade, we have reviewed and updated our policies and procedures, and instituted a new student evaluation of faculty. We have increased the admission standards for our graduate program and established a mechanism for limiting admissions to match our resources for supporting graduate students. In addition, we have restructured the program to require graduate students to take the core courses first and have offered several new courses. These changes are both the result and the cause for a revitalized and more activist Division. The specific responses to proposed changes in the last review follow.

Recommendation 1: *The Review Team recommends that the College of Health and Human Services consider modifying its organizational nomenclature to distinguish its academic units on the pragmatic basis of their relative size and productivity so that units terminologically distinguished as divisions, departments, and programs will constitute structurally and operationally different types of administrative entities; moreover, we recommend that within the context of this effort the Division of Criminal Justice either be elevated to the status of a school within the college or accorded the opportunity to explore alternatives to the conventional department model and adopt a governance structure that might better suit its needs.*

There has been no change in the Division's status within the College and this change is not under control of Division.

Recommendation 2: *The Review Team recommends that the Division of Criminal Justice explore organizational alternatives to the department model and consider developing a governance structure that might better suit its needs.*

The Division does not have the authority to reorganize on its own. Other than the creation of an independent School within the College of Health & Human Services, or establishing a new and separate College, we know of no other options. Neither of these are within the purview of the Division to accomplish and neither the College nor the University has addressed this issue.

Recommendation 3: *The Review Team recommends to the College and the University that funding formulas be modified as necessary to increase the level of budgetary support for the Division over the next several years commensurate with efforts to improve and modernize its program. This should include, but not be limited to: supporting and, if necessary augmenting, the Division's hiring plan; underwriting the creation of a more efficient management structure; supporting the establishment of a research and development arm of the Division; and upgrading the Division's equipment and technological resources as required.*

The College has strongly supported the Division by funding increased office staff, additional faculty, assigned time for cohort advisors and support for an advising center since the last review. However, the lack of external accreditation requirements and the clinical nature of other programs in College continue to result in the Division having by far the highest student-faculty ratio in the College.

Recommendation 4: *The Review Team recommends that on an annual basis the Division review and, if necessary, modify its hiring plan to assure that it is able to: a) implement needed changes to bring the curriculum into compliance with nationwide practice and to meet the student learning outcome goals identified in its assessment plan; b) expand the curriculum to cover new areas and foster the growth of research and development activities in the Division; c) adjust to changes in faculty retirement plans; and d) make suitable progress in reducing the Division's reliance upon part-time faculty.*

The Division has continued to reevaluate its hiring plan each year in light of enrollment and curriculum changes and maintains a five-year projected hiring plan. All hires in the past six years have reflected our best judgment on future needs.

Recommendation 5: *The Review Team recommends that Division office capabilities be reviewed periodically and that needed staff augmentations and equipment upgrades be given suitably high priority. Computer hardware upgrades should be a top priority.*

The administrative staff has expanded to four and computers have been enhanced.

Recommendation 6: *The Review Team recommends that with oversight and assistance at the College level the Division develop a formal plan to develop contract and research opportunities with state and federal agencies in the*

Sacramento area. To facilitate this, we recommend that the Chair activate a task force of interested faculty to adopt or create an appropriate institute or center model; to identify a set of development and funding strategies; and to establish an implementation timetable.

The College has created an institute. Members of the Division faculty have conducted a number of research efforts for state agencies.

Recommendation 7: *The Review Team recommends that the Division make it a top priority to revitalize its homepage and to begin using it to disseminate useful information to majors and prospective majors. To facilitate this, the Division should obtain funding and technical assistance from the College of Health and Human Services and University Computing and Communication Services sufficient to assure the creation of a first-rate web page that is sophisticated in design, yet user-friendly and easy to maintain.*

The Division has revised its homepage and continues to upgrade it on a regular basis.

Recommendation 8: *The Review Team recommends that the Division implement a mixed, multi-layered approach to undergraduate academic advising containing the following four components:*

- *A Homepage Advising Link for Criminal Justice Majors listing:
 - pertinent filing deadlines
 - suggested combinations of elective courses to fit student career goals
 - an FAQ (frequently asked questions) link
 - email hotlinks to the undergraduate advisor or list of faculty advisors
 - (consider) a ListProc link which would enable students to ask questions*
- *Distribution of printed packets containing the Major Planning Worksheet, along with a list of suggested combinations of elective courses to fit a selection of career goals.*
- *Mandatory Targeted Advising (in person) initiated by faculty advisors for students with grade deficiencies.*
- *Traditional drop-in advising*

During the past three years the Division has initiated one of the most aggressive and comprehensive advising programs on campus by:

- opening a full-time advising center staffed with a student services professional

- instituting a pre-major
- creating a rotating cohort of four advisors to assume responsibility for all incoming students each year and follow through with those students for their careers at CSUS
- building a data base to track all student advising
- requiring all students to see their advisors during the first year
- strongly encouraging attendance at transfer or freshman orientation and providing advising during the summer
- creating advising guides/work sheets specific to various criminal justice occupations and placing all these on the Criminal Justice website.

Recommendation 9: *The Review team recommends that sufficient resources be obtained to upgrade and computerize the Criminal Justice Career Center, and that a campaign be mounted within the Division to encourage majors to use the center early in their careers at CSUS*

The Division faculty concluded that the career center, staffed by students, can do little more than collect recruiting material and job announcements. Thus, the decision was made to close the center. The student assistance center and cohort advisors have assumed responsibility for this role. We have built hot links from the Division website to a variety of potential employer websites. This allows the Division to provide the most current information without constant updating.

Recommendation 10: *The Review Team recommends that in continuing to develop and implement its assessment plan, the Division place some priority on the question of whether the program assures that majors acquire the skills and abilities presently listed as program outcome goals and objectives, particularly the skills and abilities associated with conducting research, analyzing information, interpreting and using criminal justice and criminological data, and critically interpreting and comprehending research reports.*

The Division has continued to refine its assessment plan. We have implemented the pre-test with writing sample and will begin our post-test as soon as the first pre-tested cohort reaches CRJ 194. We developed a capstone course to integrate knowledge from the entire curriculum and a research methods course to strengthen research skills. We have also instituted a senior survey and focus group. In addition, the teaching cohorts meet yearly to evaluate course content, learning objectives, texts, and assessment mechanisms.

Recommendation 11: *The Review Team recommends that an upper division course on research methodology be added to the core. The course should either include a significant unit on basic probability statistics or have a statistics prerequisite.*

This was accomplished, beginning with the 2002-2004 Catalog.

Recommendation 12: *The Review Team recommends that the Division consider adding an upper division course on law adjudication (i.e., a courts course) to the core.*

This was also accomplished, beginning with the 2002-004 Catalog.

Recommendation 13: *The Review Team recommends that the Division add to its ongoing program assessment activities the task of addressing problems of course overlap focusing especially on the following pairs of courses: CRJ 5/167; 161A/161B; 163/164.*

The overlap of CRJ 5 and 167 was eliminated with the modification of the CRJ 5 course description and learning objectives to focus primarily on community as it relates to the entire justice system. After careful consideration, the faculty decided to retain CRJ 161A and 161B as distinct electives. The former course is specifically focused on managing police agencies, while the latter addresses specific contemporary issues. In the case of CRJ 163 and 164, both have been retained as core courses. CRJ 163 addresses organizational behavior in justice organizations. CRJ 164 addresses organizational theory. This is a classic structure for addressing both public and private organizational management. The CSUS criminal justice faculty possesses substantial managerial experience and education. In fact, numerous members of our faculty have far more experience in management of justice agencies than the principal external reviewer. Based on this experience, the faculty decided to retain the existing curriculum, although this issue continues to receive examination by the curriculum committee. We have proposed requiring 164 as a pre-requisite to 163 and are awaiting action by the University Curriculum Committee.

Recommendation 14: *The Review Team recommends that the Division publish and make available to students suggested combinations of elective courses, as well as a list of particular minors, fitting various career goals.*

The Division has developed student guides for a variety of career options that contain both suggested criminal justice electives and general education courses.

Recommendation 15: *The Review Team recommends that the Division consider ways to assure that criminal justice majors exit the degree program with basic competencies in common types of computer applications in the field of criminal justice.*

The Division conducted an extensive curriculum review. The collective decision was that computer competencies required for specific careers vary greatly and are in a constant state of change. The faculty currently requires computers for a variety of tasks. This issue will be further addressed in the assessment process.

Recommendation 16: *The review team recommends that the Division consider restoring CRJ 168 to a place of prominence in the major, if not within the required core, then perhaps by flagging it as "highly recommended" for all majors.*

For the reasons stated above CRJ 168 was not returned to the core. However, we have added one faculty member with a specialization in application of data systems to crime analysis to our faculty. We offer both additional courses and advising in this area.

Recommendation 17: *The Review Team recommends that as the Division progresses with the implementation and refinement of writing requirements in the upper division courses, it adopt a practical assessment rubric that can be used with some consistency across the curriculum. In conjunction with this, the faculty as a group might also consider whether in addition to the standard college essay and term paper there are other genres of professional writing (e.g., briefs, narrative reports) that majors should master, and, if so, into which courses they should be introduced.*

The Division has developed several rubrics to assess specific types of writing as a part of the assessment process. Separate rubrics will be required for research papers, legal briefs, and essays. Each teaching cohort and faculty member must decide on the appropriateness of the rubric for their class. Although the cohort can recommend a single rubric, the faculty have the freedom to utilize their own if they deem this most appropriate. The graduate handbook section on format and writing has been revised.

Recommendation 18: *In conjunction with the foregoing recommendation, we recommend that the Division publish a Division-wide style sheet containing the basic format, citation, and reference standards for writing in criminal justice courses. This style sheet should also be made available on the Division's web page.*

The portion of the graduate handbook relating to this subject is currently under revision. For the reasons stated above we have not followed this recommendation.

Recommendation 19: *The Review Team recommends that the Division empanel a committee to examine the disparity in grade distributions between part-time and full-time faculty.*

An ad hoc committee examined the disparity in grades and found that disparity exists among the full-time faculty distributions, as well as between the part-time and full-time faculty distributions. The Division voted a change in the Division Policies and Procedures to require inclusion of grade distribution as a component of part-time faculty performance. Part-time faculty have since begun to bring their grades more in line with those of full-time faculty. However, the faculty

voted down a proposal to include the same information in tenure track RTP process. Although the topic has been discussed, no mechanism exists to bring grades profiles into any sort of conformity within this Division any more than it has been brought in conformity across departments and colleges. It should be noted that every Department/Division in the College of Health & Human Services has a higher grade profile than Criminal Justice.

Recommendation 20: *The Review Team recommends that the Division attend to the relatively high proportion of NC ("No Credit") grades awarded to students enrolled for internship credit (CRJ 195), and to reflect on potentially negative ramifications for the program.*

We found no such problem. A survey of three semesters revealed 147 students received credit and 3 did not.

Recommendation 21: *The Review Team recommends that the Division and the Graduate Committee deliberate on some of the questions raised by Dr. Gaines regarding the focus of the graduate program and consider narrowing the range of student and career needs the program currently endeavors to meet.*

The Graduate Committee reviewed the proposal to focus the master's program. We are continuing to review our graduate program and are considering an expansion of the core requirements. The current budget limitations have severely limited our ability to admit students and offer electives. Thus, creating more focused formal concentrations is not an option at this time. The admission requirements for the graduate program have been significantly revised and all graduate students are now required to complete the core requirements before taking any elective courses. Several new graduate courses have been offered during the past three years. The graduate committee has become more active during recent years and is continually considering options for improvement.

Recommendation 22: *The Review Team recommends that the Division establish a set of procedures to assure that upon admission to the graduate program each new student is paired with at least a temporary advisor whose responsibility it will be to assist the student in crafting a tentative course of study, and that every graduate student be officially assigned to an advisor prior to the end of the first semester of enrollment.*

We have limited our enrollment to approximately 18 students per semester. The graduate coordinator has assumed this role for these students.

Recommendation 23: *The Review Team recommends that the Division activate a Homepage Advising Link for Criminal Justice Graduate Students, similar to that recommended above for undergraduates; and that it also include an online rendition of the forthcoming graduate handbook.*

The graduate handbook and graduate application and advising information have been added to the Criminal Justice website.

Academic Programs

Learning Expectations for Undergraduates

The undergraduate learning objectives are defined in the assessment plan within three critical areas of student performance and development:

- What a student knows
- What a student cares about
- What a student can do

What a Student Knows - Goals

Graduates of the CSUS Criminal Justice Program should possess a knowledge base that includes:

- criminal and juvenile law
- judicial process and law of adjudication
- criminology and crime theory
- law enforcement structure and process
- correctional structure and process
- management and leadership theory

What a Student Cares About - Personal Growth and Citizenship - Goals

Graduates of the Criminal Justice Program should have developed:

- interpersonal and leadership skills
- an acute sense of one's personal identity and potential
- cultural awareness, flexibility, and sensitivity to fully appreciate the values and differences of a diverse society
- the ability to recognize the rights, responsibilities, and privileges of a citizen

What a Student Can Do - Goals

Graduates of the CSUS Criminal Justice Program should be able to:

- analyze information
- think critically
- read effectively
- speak effectively
- write effectively
- research effectively
- solve problems

The following are examples of objectives that relate to goals defining "What a Criminal Justice Graduate Can Do."

Goal: Graduates should be able to analyze information

Specific Learning Outcomes - Criminal Justice graduates will be able to:

- a. Identify and examine a complex whole on the basis of its respective parts and on the relationship between those parts.
- b. Read, interpret and use criminal justice and criminological data skillfully.
- c. Read, interpret, and comprehend research reports, and identify the strengths and weaknesses of these reports.
- d. Adopt and express a scientific orientation in which everything is open to further testing, reinterpretation, or refutation.
- e. Read, interpret, and restate the meaning of legal statutes, associated case law, and legal dispositions.

Goal: CSUS graduates should be able to think critically

Learning Outcomes - Criminal Justice graduates will be able to:

- a. Evaluate (assess the credibility of communication and the strengths of its claims and arguments) criminological explanations and criminal justice policies.
- b. Identify and interpret (understand and express the meaning of) ethical problems they may confront in criminal justice practice.
- c. Identify and evaluate the assumptions underlying criminal justice policies and assess their empirical basis.
- d. Identify and avoid errors in reasoning, such as provincialism, overgeneralization, and emotional identification relative to argument.
- e. Apply deductive and inductive approaches to the construction of theories to account for crime and justice phenomena.
- f. Evaluate criminal justice programs on the basis of the relative efficiency and effectiveness of the program's processes and outcomes.

Goal: CSUS Criminal Justice graduates should be able to read effectively

Learning Outcomes - Criminal Justice graduates will be able to:

- a. Read, comprehend, and evaluate information contained in texts, technical reports, instruction manuals, computer media, data in graphs and charts, periodicals, journal articles, and memos.

- b. Read for content by identifying themes, recognizing relationships, understanding the use of devices such as metaphor, irony and humor, conceptualizing abstractions, and recognizing confusing, vague, and ambiguous language.
- c. Read for analysis by identifying the explicit and implied features of the text, especially the arguments or positions that put forth a conclusion.
- d. Read for evaluation by judging and assessing the credibility of a text and the strength of claims or positions.
- e. Read for inference and reasoning to form new knowledge, draw conclusions, solve problems, explain, decide and/or predict.
- f. Read with reflection to monitor one's comprehension and to correct one's process of thinking.

Goal: Criminal Justice graduates should be able to speak effectively

Learning Outcomes - Criminal Justice graduates will be able to:

- a. Demonstrate mastery of the processes of basic speech communication (the selection and arrangement of elements to produce spoken messages).
- b. Demonstrate mastery of interpersonal and group communication (the management of human relations)
- c. Demonstrate mastery of communication codes (the ability to use and understand spoken English and non-verbal signs)
- d. Demonstrate mastery of oral message evaluation (the evaluation of oral messages and their effects)
- e. Distinguish and avoid language-indicating bias.
- f. Outline key points and sub-points of their spoken messages.
- g. Use pronunciation, grammar, and articulation appropriate for designated audience.
- h. Adapt to changes in audience characteristics.
- i. Support arguments with relevant and adequate evidence.
- j. Restate assumptions, evidence, and conclusions of an argument.

Goal: Criminal Justice graduates should be able to write effectively.

Learning Outcomes - Criminal Justice graduates will be able to define, explain, criticize, propose, recommend, review, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate.

Their writing should be characterized by:

- a. well-developed main idea
- b. major points developed with multi-level elaboration

- c. relevant generalizations
- d. clear organizational plan that is suited to the topic
- e. development of all parts of the composition with no digressions
- f. use of vocabulary specific to the purpose of the paper
- g. compliance with the conventions of grammar, punctuation, formatting, and spelling.

Learning Outcomes Matrix

What a Student Knows

Criminal law	1, 2, 175
Criminal procedure	1, 174A, 175
Judicial process	1, 174A, 175
Criminological theory	1, 110
Law enforcement	1, 4, 167
Corrections	1, 120
Management theory	163, 164

What a Student Can Do – Goals

Analyze information	Entire core
Think critically	Entire core
Read effectively	Entire Core
Speak effectively	Entire Core
Write effectively	Entire Core
Research effectively	Upper division core
Solve problems	120, 163, 164, 167, 174A, 175, 194

What a Student Cares About - Personal Growth and Citizenship – Goals

Interpersonal and leadership skills	5, 163, 194
Sense of personal identity and potential	5, 163, 194
Cultural awareness	1, 5, 110, 120, 167, 194
Recognize the rights, responsibilities, and privileges of a citizen	1, 2, 4, 5, 174A, 175, 194

Individual faculty members are responsible for insuring that students attain appropriate knowledge, values and skills in their classes. Reading, writing, critical thinking, computer skills and ethical values are incorporated in the core classes. Individual faculty members are also responsible for communicating expectations to students via their syllabi and other mechanisms.

We have based our learning goals primarily upon the judgment of our faculty as informed by their professional experience, informal and formal contacts with current criminal justice professionals and surveys of the professional literature.

We have also incorporated student and alumni feedback and input from the Criminal Justice Community Advisory Committee. The dispersed patterns of post-baccalaureate activity by our graduates, combined with the lack any uniform industry standard, offers us few choices. There are no discernable trends within the field that might assist us, with the possible exception of the rising interest in terrorism.

Because of the size of our Division and the extreme diversity of our courses and faculty, it is impossible to cite which teaching strategies work best. In general, our students respond to applied, practical approaches to learning, but unlike other departments we lack the resources to build our program primarily around such strategies. As examples, moot court or simulated crime scenes are the sort of approaches to which our students would most enthusiastically respond. Properly conducting a simulated crime scene would require approximately one instructor for every four or five students. We teach sections of 45 students in the fundamentals of investigation. To conduct a scene during a scheduled lab period would require nine instructors and nine separate locations. We have nothing approaching these resources. In addition, many of our courses do not lend themselves to such applied teaching. Faculty members have used a variety of approaches, including field trips, observations, practitioner interviews and guest lecturers to try and bridge this gap.

Undergraduate Student Performance and Assessment

We have endeavored to standardize our expectations of student performance and assure their communication to students through our assessment procedure. We have adopted a Division policy that all classes shall require a writing assignment appropriate to that particular class. We have not standardized writing styles, as requirements vary between classes requiring research papers, law briefs and other forms of written work (essays, journals, reaction papers, research proposals, etc.).

Our assessment plan addresses learning objectives, writing requirements and section uniformity. The entire faculty is divided into course cohorts that are responsible for all undergraduate courses in a given category, such as law. The cohorts meet yearly to review learning objectives, texts, writing assignments, assessment mechanisms and developments in the content material. The cohorts will either certify the learning objectives for the course or recommend new learning objectives to the Assessment and Academic Standards Committee, which adopts any new learning objectives. This yearly cycle provides a well-structured mechanism for revision of course content, objectives or assignments. We would be less than candid, however, if we asserted that it assures uniformity in content. With between five and 14 sections of all core courses offered every semester, we lack the resources, structure and organizational culture to accomplish such a task. In fact, we doubt that any department of our size in a field such as ours could do so. Oversight of assessment rests in the hands of a

part-time committee and the Chair. Both lack authority to require faculty to comply with their directions or even to reward faculty for doing so. We have slightly more leverage with part-time and non-tenured faculty, but recent changes in the contract have eliminated much of this leverage over part-time faculty. We know from student evaluation narratives, grade distribution disparity and other data that all sections of courses are not uniform. There is even a serious question as to the advisability of such a goal. Faculty members are selected partially for their unique knowledge and background. Any rigid system of assuring uniformity would consume significant resources, generate conflict and stifle originality.

What the Division has provided is a structured plan to encourage and facilitate a minimum level of uniformity in courses. Individual faculty members must provide the motivation to support and implement such a system. We believe we have made great progress in shifting our program from a collection of courses to a unified effort over the last decade, but we are under no illusions that we have, or will ever, accomplish total integration.

Our greatest strides in assessment and program uniformity are the implementation of the pre-test and post-test in conjunction with a capstone course and a pre-major. This year's entering cohort of majors provided the first pre-test data. We will begin the post-test in the capstone course in the 2005-06 academic year, although we piloted the test this year. In the interim, the Assessment and Academic Standards Committee will begin examining the pre-test data for information on student needs. In addition to this data, we have initiated a senior survey and graduating senior focus group to develop additional student feedback.

We believe that our current curriculum contributes substantially to each student's development of a broad general knowledge of the justice field, appropriate skills for employment in this field and others, and an awareness of moral and ethical issues, including those generated by a diverse culture, which is common to the field. Our current program requires all entering students to complete our most pragmatic and least theoretical courses (CRJ 1, 2 and 4) before becoming a criminal justice major. As just one example of how such fundamental courses can support higher level concepts, students are introduced to the ethical requirements for investigators and prosecutors to disclose exculpatory evidence to the defense and the consequences of overlooking such evidence. Typically, lower division students more readily relate to the conviction of an innocent person than to abstract legal theory. These courses provide the student with an introduction to the history and theory of the field, provide basic knowledge about structure and function of justice organizations, and provide instruction in the pragmatic areas of law and investigation. These courses also introduce the student to university writing, with assignments that are more likely to focus the attention of lower division students and begin the examination of ethics within the field of criminal justice by using an applied context.

Majors must subsequently take a balanced core of courses that address diversity (CRJ 5), research (CRJ 100), social theory of crime (CRJ 110), the development and nature of the three core functions in the field (CRJ 120, 167 and 175), management and leadership (163 and 164) and law/legal process (2 and 174A). In addition to specific topic content, each of these courses requires analytical thinking and more advanced writing while integrating ethics and diversity. In fact, no criminal justice course can be fully addressed without examining these latter two topics. We allow students to use the remaining 21 units to shape their individual programs, but encourage expansion into related disciplines in two ways. First, students may take up to 15 units of their supporting courses from a list that includes the social sciences, ethnic studies, social work and history. At least three units of their CRJ electives must come from this list. Students may also substitute 12 units from an approved major as upper division CRJ electives. We routinely approve electives in social science, history, business and foreign language.

We utilized both a senior survey and focus groups (reports attached) to obtain feedback from seniors in the spring and fall of 2004. Institutional Studies also conducted an alumni survey during the fall of 2004. The results from these studies provide substantial support for the conclusion that students believe we are enhancing their knowledge of the field, their critical thinking and communications skills, their ethical focus and their awareness of diversity. The research also supports the conclusions that our students are over-committed, do not read all that is assigned to them and make course selections primarily based on schedule convenience. Students typically try and take a full academic load while working extensive hours. More than eighty percent of the seniors responding to our surveys reported working more than twenty hours per week while carrying twelve or more units. Almost forty percent reported working forty hours or more. When combined with commuting time for students who live as far away as the East Bay and Lake Tahoe, the external demands leave limited time for study. As a result, more than two-thirds of the respondents report spending less than four hours average per week studying for criminal justice courses and only five percent report having always done the assigned reading.

Student assessments of courses consistently rate part-time faculty and the courses they teach more highly than full-time faculty. Although this divergence is reduced by removing one or two low outliers among the full-time faculty, it further supports a conclusion that many of our majors are less than fully engaged with the more abstract and intellectual aspects of the field of criminal justice and prefer less theoretical, more pragmatic courses. This same ranking pattern has been reported for other universities in the literature. How to generate greater interest and engagement with the theoretical and intellectual aspects of the field among our majors has been a continuing discussion within our faculty and the field. To an extent, it may reflect the nature of many students at this institution, who pursue a university education primarily as a means of enhancing

employment, and not for intellectual reasons. Our assessment data have also revealed some apparent faculty weaknesses that disproportionately impact one core area.

Program Improvement

We have considered structuring the major to an even greater degree, for instance by establishing a prescribed sequence for courses. Although we believe that students would benefit from such an arrangement, we have rejected it for practical rather than pedagogical reasons. The majority of our students are employed, and virtually all our classes are full. To impose a rigid sequence structure for upper division classes would very likely delay graduation for many students. We have compromised by requesting to make CRJ 110 a prerequisite for most of the upper division courses and CRJ 164 a prerequisite to CRJ 163. The University is currently debating a new course numbering system. If this is approved we will renumber courses to make course sequence more obvious. We have also discussed pursuing greater uniformity in grading and course assignments; however, we have not reached consensus on any acceptable means to accomplish these ends.

Realistically, our options for altering student outcomes face several limitations. Our classes are large and teaching load heavy, resulting in the highest student to faculty ratio of any department in the University (34.2:1). In fact, this ratio has increased significantly over the past three years as a result of more efficient scheduling. Yet, given the current budget and the dependence of HHS on this Division to fulfill FTEs expectations, few options exist for changing the work load. We exercise limited influence over the academic preparation, motivations and scholarly abilities of our incoming students. Although we have substantial control over new hires, neither the faculty as a whole nor the Chair can exercise much control over a tenured faculty member. We maneuver in a rather narrow channel.

General Education, Minors and Service Courses

With the exception of CrJ 146, which is required for a forensic chemistry major, the division provides no service courses for any other department or division. We do offer several general education courses in area D2. Of these, the course most often taken by non-majors is CRJ 1, of which we offer 12 to 14 sections per semester. The upper division GE courses are primarily criminal justice electives taken by our own majors. We utilize the same class cohort review to control content in these courses that we use for all our courses. In addition, individual faculty test for learning outcomes related to general education, usually by assuring that such evaluation is imbedded in the regular testing and evaluation process. In January 2004 the review of the Division's D2 courses was completed. In the process, the Chair collected and reviewed all syllabi and all learning assessments for all our GE courses. Individual faculty will continue to

assess learning in the interim period until the next form review. Most faculty do not view this separate assessment process with a great deal of favor, as they consider their normal grading process to be the appropriate means for evaluating student learning and perceive this process as an unnecessary added administrative burden. The primary general education learning objective, to relate to crime as a contemporary issue, is inherent in all our GE courses. The requirement to address the diverse nature of society is virtually unavoidable. The final requirement, to address contributions of two or more of the defined groups, does not seem quite such a natural fit in courses such as terrorism and gang violence.

We have approximately 60 minors with a variety of majors. The majority are social science majors with an interest in justice, science majors with an interest in forensics or students preparing for law school. The minor is designed to provide the student a basic core knowledge regarding criminal justice practice and procedures. We have proposed a specific minor for biology and chemistry majors that focuses on their needs. This minor is in the approval process at this time.

Distance Education and Program Access

We currently offer CRJ 2, 164 and 175 as distance education courses. In addition, several faculty members offer web-based components within their courses. We are also providing one GE course, CRJ 132, as a portion of the Roseville offsite program. The Assessment and Academic Standards Committee has not yet established a distinct assessment process for distance education.

In addition to distance education, the Division has a long history of assuring access through offering courses at night and during summer terms. We offer all required courses on a rotating basis in the 5:30 PM and 7:00 PM time slots. We also offer a variety of electives in the evening to assure that a night student can graduate without attending day classes. We have been the most supportive unit on campus in YRO offerings. As a result of our experiences during summer 2002, the Curriculum and the Assessment and Academic Standards committees recommended, and the Chair decided, to schedule summer classes only in a twelve week format with at least one intervening day between class sessions for pedagogical reasons.

Graduate Program

Although the vast majority of the resources from the Division are devoted to undergraduate education, the Division has long offered an MS in Criminal Justice. That program requires three core courses in research methods, criminological theory and organizational theory. In addition, students must complete 18 additional units of electives and submit a thesis or project. No defined options have been offered within the graduate program; students have

devised a program in conjunction with the graduate coordinator. In reality, students have had great latitude in deciding which electives to take. With the appointment of a new Graduate Coordinator in 2004 and revised admission requirements, the Division has embarked on an effort to impose more structure on the graduate program.

Beginning with the 2004-2006 catalog, applicants were required to take the GRE and score at least 4 on the analytical writing portion, and have at least a 3.0 GPA in their major and the last 60 units of undergraduate work in addition to the previous requirements. Provision was also made to rank applicants when applications exceed available space. All applicants are required to complete the core as pre- or co-requisites for any elective. Only one cohort of graduate students was admitted in the fall of the 2004-2005 academic year. This same practice will be followed in 2005-2006. In addition, we have added two new electives in policing and personnel to the curriculum and offered several electives that had been dormant for some time. Assessment of individual students remains largely in the hands of individual professors and the readers of the theses and projects. Assessment of the graduate program has been largely internal. We have embarked on a thorough internal review of the program and are considering a number of options, including increasing the core. To date, our resources and energies have primarily been focused on the assessment and evaluation of our undergraduate program.

STUDENTS

Student Profile

Two trends noted in the last self study continue. As a percentage of our majors, female and non-white students continue to increase while white males decrease. A program that was once almost 100% male is now 52% female. Gains in minority population are primarily in Hispanic students (21.6%) and Asian/Pacific Islanders (12%). African American students have declined slightly as a percentage of our majors (7%) as have whites (46.6%). This profile closely parallels the University as a whole. Our proportion of women is slightly less than the University as a whole, but much closer than one would expect by examining employment patterns in criminal justice. Hispanics constitute a somewhat higher proportion of our students and Asian/Pacific Islanders a somewhat lower proportion than they do in the general University population. In general, our Division appears to reflect both the population served and the University as a whole. The vast majority of our students continue to come from the Sacramento and adjacent foothill areas. Approximately one-third are from the San Francisco Bay area. About 10% come from the remaining areas of California and only about two percent from outside the state. Fifteen percent of our undergraduate majors are part-time; significantly below the 25% figure for the University. Although the proportion of our students that are admitted as first-time freshmen has risen over the past few years to 38% in the 2003-2004 academic year, these students continue to leave the University and the major at a higher rate than transfer students.

An examination of the retention and graduation rates for majors in comparison to the university overall discloses a slightly lower rate for criminal justice majors. About 11% of entering freshmen and 7% of transfer students declaring a criminal justice major eventually change their major, while remaining in the university. Adding these figures puts the Criminal Justice retention rate at five years approximately equal to the University total. It appears that this change of major phenomenon does not entirely explain the disparity between graduation rates for all students and for Criminal Justice students. First-time freshmen lag the University rate by 10%, and transfers by half that. Although change of major explains virtually all the disparity in transfer students, it explains only about half the disparity for entering freshmen. We suspect some of this disparity will disappear with the better advising instituted by the Division. We also suspect that the major draws some freshmen who lack maturity, a clear perception of the nature of our requirements and strong academic interest. As a field that has been widely romanticized and misrepresented in the media, we will likely continue to draw such students. We do note that the trend of disproportionately losing female students noted six years ago has ceased. As with the University as a whole, our highest drop out rates are among African-Americans, particularly males, though our numbers closely align with the overall numbers for the University.

As has long been the pattern, the division continues to issue a lower proportion of A grades and a higher proportion of B and C grades than the College or University as a whole. The contrast is particularly apparent when examining the disparity in lower division grades. The College as a whole issues 48% A grades in lower division courses versus our 17%. Although the disparity in upper division and graduate courses is only half as great, the pattern persists. The GPAs of our majors are very slightly below those of either the College or the University, .09 on a 4.0 scale below the University mean for undergraduates. We draw no conclusions about our students' academic performance or competencies from this data, because we lack evidence that a similar standard is being used for grading in different Departments and Colleges. In fact, we know from examination of faculty behavior in our own Division, that grades are as reflective of faculty expectations and philosophy as student performance. If one assumes that grades of B or higher reflect above average performance, our Division continues to issue excessively high grades and the College and University as a whole do so to an even greater degree. Historically, the combined A and B grades have been about 70% for the college of Health and Human Services and about 60% for the University.

Using the WPE pass rate as one standard measure reveals that our native freshmen pass at exactly the same rate as similar students in both the College and the University. Our pass rate for transfer students is one percent higher than that for the College and four percent lower than the University as a whole. The proportion of our majors on academic probation is identical to the University total, 16%. Although the graduation rate within the major is lower for our majors than for the University, our pattern is similar to other large majors such as Psychology and Communications Studies.

Overall, our majors appear to mirror the students of the University as a whole in demographic characteristics, geographic origin, academic preparation and academic performance.

STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT

The newly instituted advising program utilizing four cohort advisers each year to advise all incoming freshmen and transfer students has already been explained in some detail earlier in this report, as has the operation of the Criminal Justice Student Assistance Center. In addition, the Chair meets personally with every student applying for readmission or reinstatement. We are convinced that these changes have vastly improved our academic and career advising; however, our senior survey data provides only a base line for evaluation. Virtually none of the seniors surveyed were part of the advising cohorts and few utilized the advising center. Therefore, we lack valid data until those students that have benefited from these innovations are surveyed at graduation.

In addition to these efforts we have provided tutoring by graduate students using Education Equity funds as available. We have experimented with tutors for upper division law and theory classes and generic writing tutors. The latter appears to be the most utilized, although student utilization of this asset remains far lower than we hoped. We placed the writing tutor in the Student Assistance Center with fixed office hours and publicized this to both students and faculty. Our experience shows that demand tends to be concentrated late in the semester, when papers are due. There is little doubt that our large class sizes and limited resources are not conducive to individual attention for students. With the exception of research methods and capstone courses, classes typically have over 45 students per section. Faculty teaching four sections hesitate to assign writing assignments that generate multiple evaluations and re-writes. This makes student weakness more difficult to detect and ameliorate.

Student Professional Development

As previously addressed, our faculty possesses a diverse cadre of professionals from the various occupations within the justice system. By combining this resource for advising with our cohort advising system, Student Assistance Center, and career advising guides, we have constructed a very strong base for career advising. In addition, we offer numerous internships in a variety of criminal justice agencies, with about 80 students participating each semester. We coordinate and supervise all internships through one designated internship coordinator. We also expose students to practitioners in a variety of other ways. Our two student organizations, Alpha Phi Sigma and LAE Lambda Alpha Epsilon both feature multiple speakers from various agencies as do numerous faculty members. In addition, LAE sponsors a criminal justice career fair every fall. In the past, this event has drawn agencies from as far away as Arizona and Washington. In the spring, the Division and APS sponsor a mixer for juniors and seniors to meet representatives from local justice agencies in an informal setting.

During the past two years, the Division has taken the lead for the entire University in advising and assisting pre-law students. With multiple licensed attorneys in our faculty, we are uniquely suited to this role. Professor Kubicek, in particular, with support from other faculty and staff has made great strides in this area by scheduling practice LSAT exams, law school career days, workshops on law school application, practice interviews, career panels and direct liaison with local law schools.

FACULTY

As previously stated our faculty is both sizeable and diverse. It is particularly diverse in discipline and background. Our faculty as of August 2005 will consist of :

- one tenure-track vacancies

- one full-time lecturer
- 8 full professors
- 5 associate professors
- 10 assistant professors
- 4 FERP faculty
- 12-15 part-time lecturers (dependent on need)

Between 1996 and 2005, nine tenure-track faculty have fully retired, and the Division hired one full-time lecturer and 17 tenure-track faculty members. Two additional tenure track faculty members will tentatively begin August 2005. Two of these new hires have departed for other positions, and one has retired to a FERP position. This has resulted in significant rebuilding of a faculty too heavily dependent on part-time staffing and rejuvenation of a faculty that had stagnated and eroded over a period of five years without hiring. A faculty over-weighted toward law has become far more diverse in faculty skills. Four of the full retirements and three of our current FERP faculty are attorneys; of the new hires, only two are attorneys. Many of our more recent hires have multiple specialties and can shift their assignments to adjust to Division needs.

Although this support by the College and University has rectified the historic over-dependence on part-time faculty, the solution will not likely be long-term. Because the Division has sought practitioner experience in new faculty hires to teach investigation and management courses, several of the more recent hires are already eligible for retirement. In addition, a number of the tenured faculty have experienced serious health problems. As the 2004-05 academic year ends, one tenure track faculty member is on medical leave, and another is just recovered from multiple surgeries. The Division will have to continue hiring one or more full-time faculty members every year for the foreseeable future. Our most immediate needs are for a professor qualified to teach management classes and a professor to teach law classes. We recruited for the management position during both the 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic years. On both occasions the pool of applicants was small and few possessed the desired justice management experience. On both occasions, the best qualified candidate declined the offer of a position because of salary. The position remains open, and we hope to fill it in the coming year. With one of our FERP faculty, an attorney, approaching full retirement and a second having terminated this year, we will also need an additional attorney. Currently, we are reasonably well-balanced to teach our curriculum. However, given the age of our faculty and current health issues, that balance is subject to rapid change.

Our full-time faculty as of fall 2005 will consist of 14 men and ten women. All four of the FERP faculty are white males. In the past six years, African-Americans (4) and white males (8) have declined as a proportion of our faculty, though both continue to exceed their proportions in the labor force. During the same period, the proportions of women, Asian-Americans (4) and Hispanics (2) have increased. This increased diversity reflects the changing face of the field rather

than deliberate preference in hiring for persons of any demographic group. The Division has strictly adhered to California law in its recruiting and selection activities. We project that future hiring and our pending retirements will continue this trend.

Although the College has supported substantial new hiring for the Division, the student-faculty ratio remains far above both the College and University means. In fact, the ratio has increased significantly over the past three years through more careful scheduling and stood at 34.2 for the 2003-2004 academic year. As has long been the case, the Division provides the FTEs that allow the entire College to meet University targets. This trend was even more pronounced in 2004-2005. The Division has maintained this ratio for a variety of reasons. We do not offer any laboratory classes or clinics that require very low ratios. The decision to teach criminal justice as a classroom discipline and eliminate most practice classes and all labs has facilitated this. The lack of any official recognized external accreditation body has also put the Division at a disadvantage in a College dominated by departments with such bodies. Although the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) has long attempted to create accreditation for Criminal Justice programs, it has only succeeded in advancing a plan for certification. To date, this certification has not gained acceptance. No employer or licensing body accepts external accreditation, because no employer or licensing body requires a criminal justice degree.

The rich diversity of our faculty has allowed us to offer a program that encompasses both theory and practice and includes a wide variety of courses. Our capacity to include practice experience in our tenure-track faculty has been challenged by the difficulty of recruiting candidates who possess both Ph.D.s and experience. To date we have been able to adjust with only minor modifications to our core curriculum; however, recruiting may drive future changes in our curriculum.

Teaching

The Division has set the size limit for most classes at 45 students and most faculty accept more if the room allows. Exceptions to this rule are writing intensive classes, CRJ 157 and 194, and the research methods course (CRJ 100), which are all set at 30. Graduate courses are capped at 15, though routinely go over the cap. CRJ 1 classes have historically been set at 45 but were temporarily raised when the rooms allowed during the current funding crisis. The Division had few other options for sustaining FTEs while cutting expenditures. We have no Undergraduate Coordinator; the Graduate Coordinator gets only 6 units of assigned time per year; and the Chair teaches three units every semester. Other than the cohort advisors and the Graduate Coordinator, no Criminal Justice faculty member has received assigned time funded by the College for several years.

In spite of the heavy teaching load, the faculty in the Division has worked to create an environment commensurate with the University's mission of teaching and learning. Many faculty members employ technology in their lectures with the use of PowerPoint presentations and other visual media. Each course in the Division requires students to produce a writing assignment and many of those assignments require comprehensive research. Student evaluation of the faculty is an important tool that is utilized to assess the quality of teaching in the Division and the results of the evaluations for the faculty are attached to this report as an appendix. The Division Assessment Committee developed a new evaluation instrument that was first introduced in the fall of 2003. This new instrument was designed to produce qualitative data on the experience of students in criminal justice courses by emphasizing student narratives and precluding production of a single numeric "average" for a faculty member's performance.

The Division requires student evaluation of faculty in all classes. For fall 2004, students' responses for individual faculty to the statement, "this was an excellent class", ranged from six to ninety-five percent agreement and to the statement "this was an excellent teacher" ranged from seventeen to ninety-six percent agreement. The median support was 82.5 and 76.5 for these questions respectively. Likewise, students widely supported the contention that classes were well-organized and presented at an appropriate level of complexity.

Some of the innovative pedagogical tools being employed by Division faculty include mock trials, appellate briefs, and appellate arguments in the law courses. Oral presentations are required in many of the other courses in the Division. The law faculty employ the case briefing method of study in all of the Division law courses, providing a framework for teaching critical thinking and analytical reasoning in a Socratic format. Students are required to create and present PowerPoint presentations in Dr. Capron's courses. In the course on court structure, students are required to spend a significant amount of time visiting local criminal court proceedings, researching law review articles on those proceedings, and writing a comparative report on the experience. Corrections students participate in field trips to nearby prison facilities.

In the master's program, Dr. Yvette Farmer taught a course on evaluations research, the substance of which was a real program evaluation of the Division of Criminal Justice at CSU, Sacramento. The students engaged in the creation of a survey tool, the collection of data, the analysis of that data, and production of the final report for the Division. They also ran focus groups as a part of the project.

Scholarly Activity

The Division faculty engaged in a wide variety of scholarly work over the past six years. This work includes articles for peer reviewed journals, professional industry publications, and the presentation of papers at professional conferences. In summary the faculty as a whole have completed 44 evaluation research

projects, published 14 peer reviewed journal articles and have numerous others published in industry periodicals and manuals, made 15 contributions to academic publications such as encyclopedias, have published 10 books, 7 book chapters, and made presentations of scholarly work at 92 professional conferences or meetings.

Dr. Ernest Uwazie is internationally recognized for his work in the area of conflict resolution and mediation in Africa, with specific interest in Nigeria. He has been awarded nearly \$1 Million in grants for his work in mediation and alternative dispute resolution. Xin Ren is widely recognized for her work in the area of human trafficking. Miki Vohryzek-Bolden has conducted evaluation research on a wide variety of activities in corrections and law enforcement as well as co-authoring a book on terrorism and publishing in peer reviewed and scholarly journals on issues related to corrections and domestic terrorism. She has acted as the lead researcher in a number of evaluation studies conducted by members of this division, most recently an evaluation of multi-jurisdictional drug task forces conducted jointly with Dr.s Vizzard, Capron and Farmer. Dr. Jim Hernandez has done a large number of evaluation studies for use in court proceedings on gangs and related issues. He and other faculty have served as expert witnesses in a variety of trials.

There is significant breadth and diversity in the areas of research and scholarship as a result of the diversity of the Division faculty. Those members with management experience in law enforcement write and speak widely on related issues in policing in America and abroad. The new members of the faculty teaching law courses have done research, writing and presentation in areas of criminal procedure focusing on search and seizure, and juvenile law focusing on the transfer of juveniles to adult criminal court in California.

New members of the Division faculty, those joining between 2000 and 2002, have taken an aggressive approach to scholarship and research. Don Dixon has worked extensively in his first three years to present widely on geographic information systems. The faculty has presented numerous papers at local, regional and national academic conferences. Tim Capron and Sue Cote have written widely used text books, and Hugh Wilson, a recognized authority on drug issues, edits an annual on this topic used by universities throughout the nation. William Vizzard is a nationally recognized expert on issues relating to gun control and federal law enforcement having published both books and articles in those areas as well as appearing on NPR, the News Hour, the History Channel, the Discovery Channel and numerous national newspapers. Marlyn Jones has written extensively on issues of drug policy and criminal justice in the Caribbean. Donald Dixon has emerged as a pioneer in the developing field of crime analysis. Ricky Gutierrez has recently published a book on community policing. Bruce Bikle has edited a book on prison life and Cecil Canton has contributed a chapter to a book on Black experience in America.

The Division faculty demonstrates a commitment to continued scholarship with numerous manuscripts and journal articles currently under review for publication in the coming year.

University Service

The Division faculty is very active in service to the University. We provide two representatives to the Faculty Senate, and two to the Administrative Council each year. Each faculty member is also responsible for serving on three to four Division Committees (see appendix for committee appointments). Many of the faculty have served on College- and University-level committees, and have volunteered as peer reviewers for the University's Research and Creative Activity Award and Pedagogy Enhancement Award Programs. Faculty members routinely volunteer to serve as advisors at the University's new student orientations and also participate actively in the commencement ceremonies each semester. Many faculty assist with thesis projects in our graduate program and have served the students as advisors to four different criminal justice related student organizations.

Some specific examples of faculty service to the University include Miki Vohryzek-Bolden, who served as the Associate Dean of Graduate Programs from 2002-2004 and then rejoined the faculty in the Division for the 2004-2005 academic year. Dr. Vohryzek-Bolden has served as a member for the Council on University Planning, on the Enrollment Management Committee, ACE Internationalization Project, Faculty Academic Liaison, Office of Research and Graduate Studies, and the Academic Senate Faculty Policies Committee. Roland Dart served as the Graduate Coordinator for the Division for five years and was responsible for oversight of over 30 thesis projects. Currently, Bruce Bikle is serving the Division as Graduate Coordinator.

Hugh Wilson has served on the University Committee for Reading and Writing and was involved in the hiring of a new University Writing Coordinator. Sue Cote was awarded the Outstanding University Service Award for the College of Health and Human Services in 2004-2005. She was honored for her extensive service to the University, for service on many College- and University-level committees, service in the University Advising Center, and work in the Faculty Senate. Dr. Cote co-chaired the Research and Creative Activity Awards Committee. Dr. Cote has also been the member of numerous University-level committees and has served in the New Faculty Mentoring Program. Many of the members of the Division have also served as mentors to the 7 new hires which have joined the Division during the self-study period.

In 2002, Laurie Kubicek was named the Sole Coordinating Pre-Law Advisor to the University by the Law School Admissions Council. She oversees the University's program of pre-law advising for students from across the disciplines, which provides students with events and information to prepare them for the

process of applying to law school. She is the advisor to the CSU, Sacramento Chapter of Phi Alpha Delta, a national pre-law fraternity.

Service to Community

The faculty in the division serve the greater Sacramento community in a variety of ways. Tim Capron is actively involved in HomeStart which provides housing to homeless families. This unique organization focuses specifically on families and requires that parents actively participate in completing their GED, job training, drug treatment and rehabilitation.

Roland Dart has served as a consultant for the California Commission on Peace Officers' Standards and Training, Pro Bono review of 5 year plan for California Department of Consumer Affairs, and on the panel to develop a police review process for the City of Sacramento.

Laurie Kubicek and Yvette Farmer have both focused their energy volunteering their time and talents to assist at-risk children in the community. Yvette Farmer has coordinated a donation program that collects school supplies from office supply stores and then distributes those supplies to schools in South Sacramento with significant numbers of at-risk children and children living in poverty. Laurie Kubicek provides advice and support to the Board of the GreenHouse Community Enrichment Center in South Natomas. She coordinated a silent auction in the spring of 2005 which raised over \$4,200 to fund after school tutoring programs for at-risk elementary, jr. high and high school students. Each summer since 2003 Laurie has taught an intensive four week legal research and writing course at the School of Law at UC Davis in their King Hall Outreach Program. This program is designed to assist disadvantaged students who want to attend law school.

Ricky Gutierrez administers a community outreach program that is affiliated with the division called "Sac-Mentoring." The program partners our college students with high school students from area schools who are at-risk. The program trains the college students to be mentors, and provides opportunities for them to meet with their mentees throughout the semester. The program is extremely successful and has been awarded significant grant support so that it can continue.

Lynette Lee provides area employers with interns through our division's internship program. It is an extremely effective teaching tool for our majors, providing them with field experience as part of their academic experience, while providing a valuable service to numerous state, federal and local agencies, as well as non-profit organizations.

Hugh Wilson meets monthly with the Director of the Drug and Truancy Prevention Program for the San Juan Unified School as an advisor. They discuss

means to discuss and reduce problems of drug abuse, truancy, and others issue placing students at risk within the school district. This relationship has resulted in placing CSUS Criminal Justice Students there as counselors. Hugh personally recruits, screens, and helps qualify CSUS students as part of a hiring out-reach program conducted by the Marin County Sheriff's Dept. after leaving there as a lieutenant to come to CSUS. He arranges the testing, oral interviews, and orientation processes which are all conducted at CSUS. CSUS now has numerous graduates employed as deputies there working in all capacities. Hugh also conducts drug abuse recognition training for public employers and schools and speaks publicly on drug abuse and fetal alcohol syndrome.

Currently Alice Choi is the vice president of the board of directors of Asian Pacific Community Counseling and a member of Asian/Pacific Bar Association of Sacramento. She joined the Board of Directors of Asian Pacific Community Counseling (APCC) in April, 2003. APCC is a nonprofit organization with a mission to provide mental health and social services to the underprivileged Asian/Pacific community. APCC also performs outreach by providing after-school drug prevention programs and educational seminars on health issues. Alice is a member of the UCLA Alumni Association, Scholarship Committee, for the Sacramento Region. She volunteered and assisted registrants at the First Annual Leveraging Our Diversity: A Multi-Cultural Business Forum organized by the Alliance and Valley Vision in Sacramento, CA in 2004. In she served as a judge in an appellate advocacy competition, Thomas Tang Moot Court Competition, held at the University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law.

William Vizzard has served as president of the Sacramento chapter of the American Society for Public Administration, Vice Chair of the Board of Directors of the Regional Community Policing Institute, reviewer for Law and Politics Review, advisor to the Sacramento City Manager of selection procedures for Chief of Police and witness for several legislative committees. In addition he has served as a source on gun control and federal law enforcement to numerous media including the New York Times, Los Angeles Times, Christian Science Monitor, New Hour, History Channel, Discovery Channel and National Public Radio.

Cecil Canton serves as the 2005-2006 President of the campus chapter of CFA, on the Board of Directors of Youth Guidance Connection of Sacramento and on the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission of Sacramento County.

Ernest Uwazie has a long history of service programs in conflict resolution for numerous African nations and has brought many high level officials and prominent litigators from Africa to this country for training in conflict resolution.

Examples of other faculty who have contributed their professional expertise to the larger community include

- Bruce Bikle has served as a volunteer advisor to Contra Costa County on jail reentry programs and reviewer of correctional training for the National Institute of Justice.
- Donald Dixon is playing a key role in developing the handbook and national accreditation process for crime analysts.
- David Swim serves as an advisor to numerous law enforcement employee organizations on labor issues.
- Michael McCrystle served on the Governor's Task Force on SWAT training standards.

GOVERNANCE PROCESS

The Division is governed by the Committee of the Whole, operating under the Division's policies and procedures, but most active decision-making is made at the individual Committee level, or by the Chair. The Chair exercises discretion over scheduling and assignments, appoints committee members to all Division committees with the exception of Personnel, ARTP and search committees. Members of these committees are elected by the tenure-track faculty. Among the key committees in faculty governance is ARTP, which conducts yearly reviews of all probationary faculty, as well as reviews of all faculty under consideration for promotion and subject to post-tenure review. Both the ARTP Committee and the Chair make independent recommendations to the College ARTP Committee and the Dean. The Personnel Committee reviews the performance of part-time faculty members and ranks all part-time applicants. The Chair conducts an independent review of performance and reviews the certifications and ranking of part-time applicants. The Personnel Committee also recommends minimum qualifications for full-time recruitment announcements and acts as the search committee, unless the Division votes to empanel a separate search committee for a given search.

The Curriculum Committee reviews all undergraduate course and program proposals and makes recommendations on all program changes to the Committee of the Whole. Course proposals recommendations are made to the Chair. In addition, this committee coordinates with Assessment and Academic Standards in an ongoing review of course delivery and program content.

Assessment and Academic Standards conduct yearly review of the reports of the course cohorts and oversees all assessment of learning outcomes, student performance, teaching and program performance.

The Graduate Committee, with the Graduate Coordinator as chair, performs curriculum and assessment tasks for all graduate courses and the overall program.

Since the last review, the Division has collectively revised the core requirements for the major and minor, revised the graduate admissions and graduate program,

instituted a pre-major, revised the student survey form, hired multiple faculty members, and revised our policies and procedures. The Division has also re-elected a Chair for a succeeding term for the first time in 15 years. We view these events as evidence of increased commitment, cooperation and stability among the faculty.

Students are not directly involved in Division governance.

The Division is involved in all phases of College governance, with membership on all College committees, though no dean or associate dean has ever come from the Division of Criminal Justice.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT/RESOURCES

Library

Historically, the library support for the Division in terms of holdings was very weak until 1996. At this time, the library changed its formula for allocation resources to an FTE-based formula. Since that time, the Division has routinely received support in the form of acquisitions whenever requests have been made. Our library liaison, Ben Amata, has maintained open communication with the Division and has been routinely responsive to our requests. In addition to the library holdings, the library faculty have proven very supportive in providing instruction on research and library usage to a variety of classes, from the freshman seminar to graduate research classes. The most notable hole in library support is the lack of a data base search system for plagiarism.

Computer/Technology

The College provides substantial support for the Division in the form of two computer specialists. All faculty have computers, and the College has regularly upgraded faculty computers. Five of our six assigned classrooms are designated "smart classrooms"; however, these rooms are poorly equipped and arranged to take advantage of the resource.

Although we have not conducted research on the satisfaction level of students or faculty with media and computer training support at the University level, individual faculty report satisfaction with these support services, though not the smart class rooms.

Student Support Services

We have no survey data on satisfaction with student support services, and much of this activity is not observable by us. We do have extensive contact with the

degree evaluators in the Evaluations Office and the orientation coordinator in the Academic Advising Center. In both cases, support has been excellent.

Physical Facilities and Equipment

As stated above, the faculty computers are good to excellent. We have a good quality copier, Risograph and shredder. Some offices still have only one telephone line for two occupants and almost all faculty share offices. Only the Chair, Internship Coordinator, SacMentoring Coordinator, and Director of CAPCR have individual offices. The Division is housed in the oldest and poorest space on campus. We do have the advantage of all our faculty offices being in Alpine Hall, along with four of our six designated classrooms. Unfortunately, we have not been able to consolidate all offices on the first floor, proximate to the Division office and the student service center. Although numerous offices exist in this area, and were vacated four years ago with the move of the Government Department, the space was assigned to the College of Education. Efforts to exchange second floor space with College of Education for comparable first floor space have met with no success.

A shortage of available classroom space has forced the Division to schedule more classes in the late afternoon and evening than would be ideal to meet student demand.

Financial Resources

The Division has historically provided the most FTEs for the fewest dollars of any unit in the College of Health & Human Services, and appears to have the highest student to faculty ratio in the entire University. As previously addressed, the College has pursued a policy of more equitable treatment of this Division for the past several years; however, disparate division of financial resources is built into the structure through long years of past practice. Much of the disparity, though not all, results from the clinical nature of other disciplines in HHS combined with the pressures exerted on the College through external accreditation requirements for clinical programs. This disparity manifests itself primarily in class size and assigned time. The support staff, equipment funds and operating funds are far more balanced. We have experienced a shortage of funds for mailing that has restricted the ability of our Student Assistance Center to communicate with various groups of students needing contacts and notification.

The greatest disparity can be seen in historical practices of granting assigned time. The Division has no undergraduate coordinator; this role is assumed by the Chair. The Graduate Coordinator receives six units of assigned time every year, but for the past three years the Chair has taught six units. Thus, the net assigned time for coordination has been zero. The Division has received the enthusiastic support of the Dean for its cohort advising in the form of 12 units of assigned time per year. This will be doubled in the 2005-2006 Academic year.

The SacMentoring and Internship Coordinators get no direct assigned time, as the students in these programs generate FTEs approximately equivalent to what would come from their teaching a classroom section. Although the Division continues to operate in a far leaner manner than other units in HHS, the disparity has declined significantly in the past two years as a result of budget cuts and changing policy on assigned time at the College level. It is our expectation that with improving budgets, the College will assure that the past patterns of resource distribution are modified to allow a reduction in section size and the student to faculty ratio in the Division.

We expect that some additional funding will be required for the Student Assistance Center, if the current demand patterns continue. The effective use of budget by this Division should require little discussion. Our faculty to student ratio reflects our efficiency. We have responded to multiple budget cuts without reductions in FTE and while expanding student services. We have done so primarily through more efficient scheduling and faculty willingness to accept very large classes. However, we have stretched our budget to its limits. There is nowhere left to cut in our meager discretionary line items.