

Appendix F

Criminal Justice Assessment Plan

Appendix F

CJ Assessment Plan

COLORADO MESA UNIVERSITY Program Outcome and Assessment Plan Template

Program Name: Criminal Justice (BA and BAS/POST Academy)

Date: Last updated December 2016

Program Outcome	Courses/Educational Strategies Indicate if outcome is Beginning(B), Developing(D) or Advanced(A)	Assessment Method(s)	Time of Data Collection/ Person Responsible	Desired Level of Accomplishment/ Benchmark	Results of Assessment	Actions Taken
Outcome #1: Students will discuss the history and practice of each segment of the Criminal Justice System: police, courts, and corrections. (Specialized Knowledge)	CRMJ 201 (B, D) Introduction to CJ	What: Final Grades How: Average of final grades	Who: Delaney When: Fall 2014	80% or better	Results: Key Findings: Conclusions: CRMJ 201: Out of 41 students, 56% earned above 80% and 83% above 70%	Action: Re-evaluation Date: Faculty will collaborate on pedagogical approaches to improve, especially in the area of courts. Will reassess again in 2018/2019.
	CRMJ 310 (D) Police Process	What: Quizzes How: Random sample of MC questions from each exam	Who: Reece When: Fall 2014	80% or better	CRMJ 310: Both on-ground and online sections. Out of 66 students, average was 80.37% Online section was lower.	Focus on honing student's knowledge base in the online format in preparation for the quizzes. Reassess in 2018/2019.
	CRMJ 320 (B, D, A) Corrections	What: Quizzes How: Random sample of student quizzes	Who: Drelling When: Fall 2014	80% or better	CRMJ 320: Out of 40 students, their overall average was determined to be 85%.	No action needed; Re-assess Fall 2018.
	CRMJ 328 (A) American Court System	What: Courtroom Observation Assign How: Specified by Instructor	Who: Delaney When: Spring 2016	80% or better	Out of 41 students in their Final Paper observing court in action, four of six observations were covered by over 80% of the students, and a fifth was observed in 78% of the papers.	
Outcome #2: Students will analyze ethical issues surrounding the practice	CRMJ 302 (B, D, A) Ethics in CJ	What: Ethical Dilemmas How: Rubric specified by Instructor	Who: Reece When: Fall 2014	80% or better	Results: Key Findings: Conclusions: CRMJ 302: Out of 33 students, average score was 80.5%	Action: Re-evaluation Date: No action needed; Re-assess Fall 2018

Outcome #5: Students will demonstrate proficient oral communication and writing skills that are formal and professional in nature. (Communication Fluency)	CRMJ 310 (D, A) Police Process	What: POP/SARA, Case Study Oral Presentations How: Presentation Rubric	Who: Reece When: Spring 2016	Proficient and professional presentation skills. Above 90%.	Results: Key Findings: Conclusions: CRMJ 310: 34 of 36 students participated and were assessed; average score was 95.5%.	Action: Re-evaluation Date: No action needed; Re-assess Spring 2019.
	CRMJ 490 (A) Comparative CJ	What: Written News Summaries and reactions. How: Writing Skills	Who: Reece When: Fall 2017	Proficient and professional writing skills. Above 90%.	CRMJ 490: 35 of 36 students were assessed; average score was 93.79%.	No action needed; Re-assess Fall 2020. Reassess using different, more technical writing assignments in 2018/2019
BAS/POST Only						
Outcome #6: Students will demonstrate proficiency in basic skills (driving, firearms, and arrest control) required for entry level policing. (Applied Learning)	CRJW 106 (B, D, A) Arrest Control	What: Practical exam that meets Colorado Post standard How: Students must demonstrate proficiency in requisite skills area; standard for competency is developed and approved by State POST board	Who: Piatanesi When: Spring 2014	Arrest Control: 80% or better on written exam and score "proficient" on practical exam	Results: Key Findings: Conclusions: Results: 15 students: Class avg. on written Arrest Control exam was 94.3%; the high grade was 98% the low was 88% 15 of 15 scored "proficient" on State POST practical exam Key Findings: All students exceeded benchmark Conclusions: Instructional program is highly successful	Action: No action needed; Consider raising benchmark Re-evaluation Date: Re-assess Fall 2018 or Spring 2019
	CRJW 107 (B, D, A) Driving		Who: Piatanesi When: Fall 2016	Driving: 80% or better on written exam, practical is a specified time limit on a set tactical course.		
	CRJW 108 (B, D, A) Firearms		Who: Piatanesi When: Fall 2019	POST Board requires 100% score for firearms		

Adapted from Long Beach City College and Indiana State University Assessment Plans

Appendix G

Criminal Justice Program Curriculum Map

Appendix G

Criminal Justice Program Curriculum Map

Curriculum Map for Criminal Justice (Including core/required courses only)

Student Learning Outcome	BASIC Retention and comprehension	DEVELOPING Analysis and application	ADVANCED Evaluation and creation
Students will discuss the history and practice of each segment of the Criminal Justice System: police, courts, and corrections. <i>(Specialized Knowledge)</i>	CRMJ 201	CRMJ 201 CRMJ 310 CRMJ 320 CRMJ 328	CRMJ 310 CRMJ 320 CRMJ 328
Students will analyze ethical issues surrounding the practice of criminal justice in a diverse society. <i>(Personal and Social Responsibility)</i>	CRMJ 302 CRMJ 310 CRMJ 320 CRMJ 328	CRMJ 302 CRMJ 310 CRMJ 320 CRMJ 328	CRMJ 302 CRMJ 465 CRMJ 490 CRMJ 499
Students will practice quantitative and qualitative research methods including interpretation of statistical analyses. <i>(Quantitative Fluency and Information Literacy)</i>	CRMJ 315	CRMJ 315	CRMJ 315
Students will apply major criminological theories to criminal behavior. <i>(Critical Thinking)</i>	CRMJ 370	CRMJ 370	CRMJ 370
Students will demonstrate proficient oral communication and writing skills that are formal and professional in nature. <i>(Communication Fluency)</i>	CRMJ 201	CRMJ 310 CRMJ 320 CRMJ 328	CRMJ 315 CRMJ 465 CRMJ 490 CRMJ 499
Students will demonstrate proficiency in basic skills (driving, firearms, and arrest control) required for entry level policing. <i>(Applied Learning)</i>	CRJW 106 CRJW 107 CRJW 108	CRJW 106 CRJW 107 CRJW 108	CRJW 106 CRJW 107 CRJW 108

Appendix H

Three-year Summary Report

Appendix H Three-Year Summary Report

COLORADO MESA UNIVERSITY Three-Year Summary Report

The Colorado Mesa University assessment progress report will consist of areas regarding program student learning outcomes, results, and actions taken over a 3-year period. Please attach the last three years of annual assessment reports, and any department/program minutes that recorded discussion of learning outcomes. Summarize each student learning outcome that has been assessed over the past three years. Attach rubrics used in assessment.

Assessment Summary

Program Outcome 1	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection
Discuss the history and practice of each segment of the CJ System: police, courts, corrections. (Specialized Knowledge)	Intro to CJ – 201	Final grades	Fall, 2014
	Police Process – 310	Random sample of quiz questions	Fall, 2014
	Corrections – 320	Random sample of quiz questions	Fall, 2014
	Am. Courts – 328	Courtroom observation assignment (rubric specified by instructor)	Spring, 2016

Results Summary

Year	Results (include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (if Applicable)
2014	CRMJ 201 – out of 51 students, 56% performed above 80%, while 83% performed above 70%	80% or better
	CRMJ 310 – out of 66 students (including online & on-ground), students performed at an average of 80% (however, online students had lower performances on average)	80% or better
	CRMJ 320 – out of 31 students, 15 performed at 80% or better, while 8 performed between 70-79%	80% or better
2016	CRMJ 328 – out of 41 students, just over 80% of the students met four out of six expected observations, while 78% of the students met five out of six expected observations.	80% or better

Actions Taken (Briefly describe the analysis of the results and actions taken for future assessment. Indicate any budget implications based on the analysis. Limit 160 words.)

CRMJ 201 – Upon faculty observation/discussion on assessment, students consistently showed lower performances on the "courts" unit in this class. We collaborated and shared our various pedagogical approaches on this unit in order to improve teaching methods and clarification of concepts/info in this unit, as well as build in more review time prior to exams. We will collect data from this course in again in 2017 or 2018.

CRMJ 310 & 320 – Faculty acknowledged that we need to adjust our assessment methods in order to get away from using exam grades/averages as data. We intend to focus on selecting specific exam questions linked directly to the SLO, and/or using specified assignments for future assessment data. Additionally, in CRMJ 310, efforts will be put into place to enhance online students' knowledge base for better preparation for quizzes (e.g. provide additional/alternative resources on subject matter).

CRMJ 328 – Overall, students performed well on this assignment. No patterns were observed to indicate any specific areas where students were struggling as a group. Will collect data and reassess again in the future.

Program Outcome 2	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection
Analyze ethical issues surrounding the practice of criminal justice in a diverse society. (Specialized Knowledge)	Ethics in CJ – 302	Ethical dilemmas assignment (rubric specified by instructor)	Fall, 2014

Results Summary

Year	Results (include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)
2014	CRMJ 302 – out of 33 students, average performance on this assignment was 80.5%. Overall, students were able to analyze ethical scenarios concerning various segments of the CJ system (police, courts, corrections) using the rules within the "ethical pyramid," moral judgment/moral rules, and ethical systems discussed throughout the course.	80% or better

Actions Taken

CRMJ 302 – Overall, students generally performed well on all parts of this assignment. No patterns were observed to indicate that students (as a group) struggled in any specific area. Will collect data and reassess again in the future.

Program Outcome 3	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection
Use knowledge of the nature and causes of crimes, typologies, and theories of offenders and victims in critiquing current crime prevention policies. (Critical Thinking)	Criminology – 370 Juvenile Justice & Delinquency – 325	Policy critique assignment (rubric specified by instructor) Exam essay question(s) aimed at critiquing CJ policy/practice (rubric specified by instructor)	Fall, 2015 Fall, 2016

Results Summary

Year	Results (include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)
2015	CRMJ 370 – out of 18 students, the average performance on the assignment was 83%. Students were able to identify flaws in a specified CJ policy or practice, and use criminological theories to help illuminate those flaws (as well as offer solutions). However, students generally struggled to provide substantial evidence (beyond the course material) to demonstrate the magnitude of the policy flaws outlined in their papers.	80% or better

2016	CRMJ 325 – data will be collected on this class once the fall semester (2016) is completed.	80% or better
------	---	---------------

Actions Taken:

CRMJ 370 - Better clarification of assignment expectations, as well as examples of scholarly, concrete evidence applicable to this assignment will be discussed/provided in the future.

CRMJ 325 - TBD

Program Outcome 4	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection
Practice quantitative and qualitative research methods, including interpretation of statistical analysis. (Quantitative Fluency)	Research Methods in CJ – 315	Qualitative observation assignment (rubric specified by instructor)	Spring, 2015

Results Summary

Year	Results (include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (if Applicable)
2015	CRMJ 315 – out of 23 students, the average performance was 82% (section 001); and out of 17 students, the average performance was 85% (section 002).	80% or better

Actions Taken:

CRMJ 315 – the faculty member who taught this class is no longer at CMU, and we were unable to discuss the results of these data in-depth with her. We will regroup and reassess this SLO once we obtain a new faculty member to fill this role (2017/2018).

Program Outcome 5	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection
Demonstrate proficient oral communication and writing skills that are formal and professional in nature. (Communication Fluency)	Police Process – 310	POP/SARA oral presentations (rubric specified by instructor)	Spring, 2016

Results Summary

Year	Results (include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)
2016	CRMJ 310 – 34 out of 36 students participated in this assignment and the average performance was 95%. Overall, students were able to demonstrate the depth of knowledge and problem solving abilities required on the assignment. Presentation skills and delivery of information were coherent and professional. Additionally, <i>visual presentation</i> of concepts and information (i.e. Power Point or Prezi) was required as well, and students excelled in this aspect.	80% or better

Actions Taken:

CRMJ 310 – Overall, students performed well on the oral presentations. No patterns were observed to indicate that students (as a group) struggled in any particular area. Will collect data and reassess again in the future.

In 2017/2018, case study oral presentations will be assessed in CRMJ 370 (Criminology), and a specified writing assignment will be assessed in CRMJ 490 (Comparative C.J.).

Program Outcome 6	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection
BAS/POST Only Demonstrate proficiency in basic skills (driving, firearms, and arrest control) required for entry level policing. (Applied Learning)	Arrest Control – 106	Practical exam that meets CO POST standards (as approved by the State POST Board)	Spring, 2014

Results Summary

Year	Results (include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)
2014	CRJW 106 – out of 15 students, the average score was 94.3% on the <i>written</i> exam. Highest score was 98%, and lowest score was 88%. All (15/15) students performed at the "proficient" standard or above on the <i>practical</i> exam.	"Proficient" (as determined by State POST Board)

Actions Taken:

CRJW 106 – All of the students exceeded the required benchmark – overall this portion of the program is highly successful.

Other parts of the program (firearms and driving) will be assessed in the near future.

Appendix I

Criminal Justice Program Revised Assessment Plan

Appendix I

Criminal Justice Program Revised Assessment Plan

COLORADO MESA UNIVERSITY Program Outcome and Assessment Plan Template

Program Name: Criminal Justice (BA and BAS/POST Academy)

Date: Last updated September 2018

Program Outcomes	Courses/Ed. Strategies Indicate if outcome is Beginning(B), Developing(D) or Advanced(A)	Assessment Methods	Time of Data Collection/ Person Responsible	Desired Level of Accomplishment/ Benchmark	Results of Assessment	Actions Taken
Outcome #1: Students will discuss the history and practice of each segment of the Criminal Justice System: police, courts, and corrections. (Specialized Knowledge)	CRMJ 201 (B) Introduction to CJ	What: Exams How: Random sample of test questions from each unit	Who: Delaney, Reece, & Drelling When: Fall, 2018	80% or better	Results: Key Findings: Conclusions:	Actions: Re-evaluation Date:
	CRMJ 310 (D, A) Police Process	What: Exams/Quizzes How: Questions focused on history/practice of policing	Who: Reece or Watters When: Spring, 2019	80% or better		
	CRMJ 320 (D, A) Corrections	What: Exams/Quizzes How: Questions focused on history/practice of corrections	Who: Drelling or Santos When: Spring, 2019	80% or better		
	CRMJ 328 (D, A) American Court System	What: Courtroom Observation assignment How: Rubric specified by instructor	Who: Delaney When: Spring, 2019	80% or better		
Outcome #2: Students will analyze ethical issues surrounding the practice of criminal justice in a diverse society. (Ethical reasoning/Personal and Social Responsibility)	CRMJ 302 (B, D, A) Ethics in CJ	What: Ethical Dilemmas assignment How: Rubric specified by instructor	Who: Reece or Watters When: Fall, 2019	80% or better	Results: Key Findings: Conclusions:	Actions: Re-evaluation Date:

Outcome #3: Students will apply major criminological theories to criminal behavior. (Critical Thinking)	CRMJ 370 (B, D, A) Criminology	What: Book Review / Final Paper assignment How: Rubric specified by instructor	Who: Dreiling When: Fall, 2019	80% or better	Results: Key Findings: Conclusions:	Action: Re-evaluation Date:
Outcome #4: Students will practice quantitative and qualitative research methods including interpretation of statistical analyses. (Quantitative Fluency)	CRMJ 315 (B, D, A) Research Methods in CJ	What: Research Proposal assignment How: Rubric specified by instructor	Who: Santos & Watters When: Fall, 2018	80% or better	Results: Key Findings: Conclusions:	Action: Re-evaluation Date:
Outcome #5: Students will demonstrate proficient oral communication and writing skills that are formal and professional in nature. (Communication Fluency)	CRMJ 310 (D, A) Police Process	What: POP/SARA Presentation How: Presentation rubric	Who: Reece or Watters When: Spring, 2020	80% or better	Results: Key Findings: Conclusions:	Action: Re-evaluation Date:
	CRMJ 340 (D, A) Community Corrections	What: PSI assignment How: Writing skills rubric	Who: Dreiling When: Fall, 2020	80% or better		
	CRMJ 490/465 (A) Comparative CJ - or - Contemporary Issues	What: ??? How: Writing skills rubric	Who: ??? When: Fall, 2020	80% or better		
BAS/POST Only						
Outcome #6: Students will demonstrate proficiency in basic skills (driving, firearms, and arrest control) required for entry level policing. (Applied Learning)	CRJW 106 (B, D, A) Arrest Control CRJW 107 (B, D, A) Driving CRJW 108 (B, D, A)	What: Practical exam that meets Colorado Post standard How: Students must demonstrate proficiency in requisite skills area; standard for competency is developed and approved by State POST board	Who: Piatanesi When: CRJW 106 – Fall, 2018 CRJW 107 – Spring, 2019 CRJW 108 – Fall, 2019	Arrest Control: 80% or better on written exam and score "proficient" on practical exam Driving: 80% or better on written exam, practical is as specified time limit on a set tactical course. POST Board requires 100% score for firearms	Results: Key Findings: Conclusions:	Action: Re-evaluation Date:

Adapted from Long Beach City College and Indiana State University Assessment Plans

**Program Review
Bachelor of Arts (BA) and Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) in
Criminal Justice**

**Criminal Justice Program
Colorado Mesa University**

Prepared by

Michael D. White, Ph.D.

**Professor, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Director, Ph.D. Program in Criminology and Criminal Justice
Associate Director, Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety
Arizona State University**

April 2019

INTRODUCTION

This report reviews the Bachelor of Arts (BA) and Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) in the Criminal Justice Program at Colorado Mesa University (CMU). The report draws on information from several sources, including a comprehensive self-study completed by the faculty in the Criminal Justice Program, official university, department and program documents, curricula, enrollment figures, and faculty curriculum vitae (much of which was included in the self-study). The report is also based on a one-day site visit completed by the external program reviewer on March 29, 2019. During the site visit, I met with university administrators from Academic Affairs, Information Technology, and Distance Learning, criminal justice faculty, library staff, students, and staff. I also attended a class taught by Dr. Michael Delaney. Based on the aforementioned information, I believe I am able to offer an independent, thorough assessment of the BA and BAS degrees in the Criminal Justice Program.

First and foremost, I would like to thank the university and Criminal Justice Program faculty and staff for organizing my visit. The day was well-organized and very informative. I also commend the Criminal Justice Program faculty for completing a thoughtful and candid self-study. My primary conclusion is that Colorado Mesa University has a quality Criminal Justice Program that reflects the true spirit and mission of the University. The dedication of the faculty to their students is among the most impressive I have seen anywhere. The curriculum at the core of both the BA and BAS degrees is comprehensive and up-to-date based on the current issues of today. The BAS degree is quite unique, as it offers students the opportunity to earn both a Bachelor's degree and Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certification. The Criminal Justice Program is adequately supported by administrative staff, and especially the library staff. The program also has the support of department and university leadership. In short, I conclude

that students majoring and minoring in Criminal Justice receive a quality education at Colorado Mesa University (See Appendix A for the Colorado Mesa University Program Review Executive Summary Template). This conclusion is all the more impressive given the small faculty size and the number of students served by those dedicated faculty. The remainder of this report describes various aspects of the Criminal Justice Program, including the faculty, infrastructure, curriculum, enrollment, a potential online Master's Degree, and the prospects for continued growth. The report also includes 15 recommendations across those program areas.

The Program and the Faculty

According to the program self-study, the criminal justice “discipline” has been offered at Colorado Mesa University (formerly Mesa State College) since 2006. At the time, there were two faculty—one full-time tenured professor and one part-time professor. In 2010, the program created the BA degree with a concentration in law enforcement (POST Academy –this became the BAS degree in 2017), and the original part-time professor moved into a full-time position. The number of full-time tenured faculty has varied over the years based on retirements and hires in 2011, 2013, and 2017. At the time of this review, the Criminal Justice Program is staffed by five full-time tenured/tenure track faculty: one full professor, two associate professors, and two assistant professors. The Criminal Justice Program also currently has an open search for a new tenure-track faculty position (with a fall 2019 appointment date). Classes are also taught by part-time/adjunct faculty.

The mission of the CMU Criminal Justice Program is to “prepare future criminal justice professionals and academics through exceptional academic rigor, experiential learning, and by requiring the highest ethical standards. The guiding principles of CMU’s Criminal Justice program are integrity, service, and justice (self-study, p. 5).” The Criminal Justice Program’s

mission reflects the larger mission of CMU, and this mission is achieved through two Bachelor degree tracks. “The BA degree track provides students with the knowledge, communication, and critical thinking skills necessary for success in a criminal justice profession. The BAS degree track gives students the option to simultaneously obtain a bachelor’s degree and the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certification (Self-study, p. 5).” BAS graduates are job-ready and are able to secure positions in various policing/law enforcement positions. The Program also offers minors in Criminal Justice and Forensic Investigation.

The faculty are, by far, the most valuable resource in the Criminal Justice Program. As I stated earlier, the dedication of the Criminal Justice faculty to their students, their program, and each other is remarkable. They are the foundation of the program’s success. I commend them for the level of commitment to their work. Faculty time is devoted to four pillars: teaching, service, student advising, and research/scholarship. Faculty performance is also assessed across the four pillars. The standard teaching load is 24 credits per academic year, or four classes per semester. Classes are offered in both traditional “brick and mortar” and online formats. Though the entire degree is not offered online, the program self-study indicates that most core courses are offered online at least once per year. The program self-study indicates that approximately 70-80% of classes over the last five years have been taught by the tenured/tenure track faculty. This is an impressive accomplishment, but both the self-study and my interviews with faculty indicate that Criminal Justice professors are routinely teaching significant overloads. Page 29 of the self-study states:

The Criminal Justice faculty are averaging between 35 and 40 credit hours per year and that does not include internship or independent study hours, nor any non-Criminal Justice classes, such as the Freshman Orientation class (which two faculty members regularly teach). This is well over CMU’s expected 24-credit hour workload.

The potential for burnout given the high teaching loads is significant. By all indications, the faculty take on the teaching overloads voluntarily, or perhaps more accurately, out of a sense of obligation to their students and the program. This is again a testament to their supreme professional dedication. In fact, when I asked the faculty their preferences regarding teaching overloads, they expressed greater concern regarding the number of students in classes than the number of classes taught, particularly at the upper division level. More specifically, upper division courses are designed to be taught in a seminar style with an intensive writing component. But class sizes of 30 or more students in the typical upper division Criminal Justice section inhibits the way those classes can be taught—especially with the course overloads. According to the faculty, upper division classes end up getting taught like lower division classes. Faculty also noted the sense that upper division classes in other disciplines in the Department of Social and Behavior Sciences do not have as many students.

Interestingly, students also mentioned class size but identified a different problem. They noted that the class caps sometimes prevented them from enrolling in the desired or required classes. On occasion, this resulted in a student having to take a class online instead of in-person. But several students indicated that their progress toward graduation had been inhibited by their inability to enroll in Criminal Justice classes that had already filled. Students also lamented that some courses seemed to be only offered online, such as the counter-terrorism and ethics classes.

Faculty also devote a significant amount of time to student advising. With only five full-time tenured/tenure track faculty and nearly 500 majors, some faculty advise well over 100 students. Though this is clearly a labor-intensive part of their job, it is my sense that faculty truly enjoy the opportunity to connect with students via this advising role. When I asked the faculty what they (both the faculty and the program) do well, they unanimously agreed on several things,

but “connections with students” was at the very top of the list. These connections occur in the classroom of course, but the one-on-one advising is certainly at the core of student-faculty engagement. I also met with a group of students, and I asked them the same question: what does the faculty do really well? Students overwhelmingly pointed to the professors’ “personal touch” and “their sincere desire that students succeed.” I also asked that question of university administrators and the Department Head, Dr. Jessica Herrick, and responses again focused on student engagement.

The faculty are also actively engaged in on-going program assessment efforts. As mentioned previously, the program self-study is comprehensive, candid, and thoughtful. The self-study clearly identifies the program and faculty strengths – strengths I also identify in this external review. But the self-study also accurately identifies challenges facing the program, and offers a straightforward, honest appraisal of the future direction of the program. As part of this review, the faculty have conducted an assessment of both program and institutional student learning objectives (outlined on p. 22 of the self-study). The self-study also notes (p. 22):

Discussions among the Criminal Justice faculty regarding assessment is ongoing and take place at least once per semester to evaluate progress, findings, and recommendations regarding the current program SLOs. It is important to note the process of assessment is continuous and program faculty have made numerous improvements and updates to the SLOs, curriculum map, and assessment plan since 2012.

The commitment to ongoing program assessment and student learning objectives is quite impressive.

Other strengths of the program mentioned by the faculty include: delivery of the curriculum, student retention, student placement after graduation, service learning (e.g., guest speakers, crime house, “body farm,” the Inside-Out Program), and the collegiality among the faculty. Students similarly highlighted the faculty connections to the field, as well as the

opportunity to enroll in the BAS program (and essentially be “job-ready” for a position in law enforcement upon graduation).

I also asked faculty, students, administrators, and the Department Head to identify challenges for the program. From the faculty’s perspective, the majority of the challenges they face are tied to the need to hire additional faculty. The current search will result in one new hire, but they believe they need at least one additional faculty line to properly staff current needs. The shortage leads to large student advising assignments, the teaching overloads, and the large class sizes in upper division courses. Faculty noted the advising and teaching obligations result in their research and scholarship getting short-shrift. They also suggested their salary structure makes it difficult to attract new faculty when the program does have open searches. Last, they noted they receive \$600 a year for travel/faculty development. Faculty stated this amount has not changed in several years, and they are overdue for an increase. The current amount could cover travel to a local conference, but is not sufficient to fully fund travel to the larger national conferences in criminology and criminal justice (American Society of Criminology [ASC], Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences [ACJS], or their regional associations, such as the Western Society of Criminology [WSC]). The Department Head also echoed the need for more faculty, and administrators noted awareness about faculty concerns related to course overloads and salary.

Based on the discussions during my site visit and review of the self-study, I offer a number of recommendations.

1. It is critical the current search is successful in hiring a tenure track faculty member. The Criminal Justice Program and administration should do their best to insure the search does not fail.
2. The Criminal Justice Program should be allocated an additional full-time tenure track position for fall 2020.

3. The Criminal Justice Program and administration should reduce class size on upper division courses to facilitate the appropriate seminar-style teaching and address student concerns about enrollment, most likely through offering additional sections of the classes.
4. The Criminal Justice Program should hire additional part-time faculty as needed to accommodate these recommendations.
5. Criminal justice faculty should receive an increase in faculty travel/professional development funds.

Infrastructure

The Criminal Justice Program is housed within the Social and Behavioral Sciences Department, along with more than a dozen other programs such as Psychology, History, Sociology, and Political Science. According to the Department Head, there are a total of 33 full-time tenured/tenure track faculty in the Department. CMU does not have Deans; in effect, the Department Head functions as a Dean and reports directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. There is a Criminal Justice Program Coordinator who serves as the point of contact for the Department Head. This appears to be a voluntary position. I did not get a good sense of the scope of work for this Coordinator position, but such roles typically receive some form of compensation. The CMU organizational structure is fairly unique, and at the Department level, it creates the potential for interdisciplinary, collaborative work among faculty. The faculty in the Department are spread across two buildings, which reduces some of the aforementioned potential collaboration, but the Department Head noted she makes a concerted effort to provide ample opportunities from cross-disciplinary faculty engagement. The Criminal Justice faculty are all co-located on one floor in the same building, which facilitates communication among the CJ faculty. The close proximity of Criminal Justice faculty is also a convenience for students, whether they are seeking out professors for advising, office hours, or other issues. The area in which the Criminal Justice faculty is located is certainly adequate to meet with students,

professors, administrators, and other visitors. The IT support, computer services (both in the classroom and in faculty offices), and administrative support all appear more than sufficient to meet the needs of faculty and students. During my site visit, I did not hear a single complaint or negative comment about program space, support services, classrooms, or infrastructure. In fact, I was quite impressed with the “new feel” of nearly all of the university buildings and infrastructure, based on my observations from walking around campus and visiting several buildings (and classrooms).

The library and staff are especially impressive. The library is newly renovated, with a coffee shop and eatery, more than 300 computers, and ample space for students to meet and study. The criminal justice collection is also impressive. The Criminal Justice Program has their own library liaison, who serves as a point of contact for both faculty and students. The liaison recently completed a review of the criminal justice collection, including books, monographs, journals, electronic resources, and periodicals (and other media). Based on the assessment, the library liaison identified strengths and weaknesses of the collection, and she made recommendations for acquisitions to address those weaknesses. The library also has a very robust inter-library loan system with other universities in Colorado. Any resource not found at the CMU library can be retrieved through inter-library loan, typically within five business days. The library staff were aware of discussions regarding a potential new online Master’s program in Criminal Justice, and though they felt their current resources are adequate, they noted the importance of assessing the need for expanding the collection –and costs of that expansion –to meet the requirements of a new Master’s program. I have two recommendations related to program infrastructure.

6. The Department should explore the potential to provide some form of compensation for the Criminal Justice Program Coordinator position. The additional work, on top of teaching, advising, service, and scholarship, may warrant a stipend.
7. The Criminal Justice Program should work closely with their library liaison as discussions about the Master's program progress.

Curriculum

The Criminal Justice curriculum in both the BA and BAS degrees is comprehensive, and by all accounts, provides students with a thorough program of study in criminal justice. The breadth, depth, and level of the curriculum is appropriate and is consistent with curricula in other leading criminal justice programs across the country (including Arizona State University). The faculty also continually evaluate the curriculum to insure it is current and follows best practices in the field. The self-study provides a description of how the curriculum has been changed/updated since the last self-study to “maintain currency in the field” (nearly a dozen changes; pp. 10-11). Students begin with a one-credit *Orientation to Criminal Justice Inquiry*, followed by *Introduction to Criminal Justice*. All of the standard courses are found in the curriculum, including core systems classes (police, courts, corrections), criminology, statistics and methods, and ethics. Students can also choose from a range of elective courses in the categories of policing (e.g., community policing, criminal investigation), courts (e.g., criminal procedures, criminal law), corrections (e.g., community corrections, capital punishment), and criminal justice theory (e.g., victimology, crime and deviance). There are a host of other electives available in psychology, sociology, and related disciplines. The degree culminates with a capstone experience, which can include a senior-level seminar, internship, or structured research. Courses are offered in brick and mortar, online, and hybrid formats. Courses are also offered in the traditional 15-week semester, as well as condensed semesters (e.g., summer and “J-term,” or during the winter holiday break). Though I did not examine any syllabi for course

content, the curriculum is wide-ranging and diverse, and my review of professors' curriculum vitae suggests the faculty have both the academic and professional expertise to deliver a first rate Criminal Justice curriculum. The students I spoke with were highly complementary of the curriculum.

There are several unique and valuable components to the curriculum. This includes the Inside-Out Prison Exchange, the forensic mock crime scene house, and "body farm." These components of the curriculum give students the opportunity to see and experience first-hand the issues described in their classroom. Perhaps the most unique feature of the curriculum is the BAS degree itself. Students who pursue the BAS major receive the comprehensive curriculum described above, and in addition, they receive 30 credit hours for the completion of the Peace Officer Standard and Training (POST). In effect, students who graduate with the BAS are immediately eligible for a position in law enforcement. According to the self-study, the BAS has a job placement rate in law enforcement of 90%. This is a tremendous opportunity for students who want to enter the law enforcement profession. The BAS degree sets the Criminal Justice Program apart from most other CJ undergraduate programs across the country.

My discussions with students identified a few issues with how the curriculum is offered. For example, students stated that some classes are only offered in online format (or are rarely offered in-person). The Ethics and Counter-terrorism courses were mentioned specifically as classes the student would rather take in-person. As mentioned previously, students indicated they sometimes cannot get into classes they need because the sections close quickly, or because criminal justice classes are offered at the same day and time. This is especially a problem among the lower-level classes (e.g., Police Process, Corrections) that serve as pre-requisites for upper-division courses. According to students, this can occasionally inhibit their progress toward

graduation. The students also identified a need for a “professional development class” offered preferably in their junior year. This could be a one-credit class, which serves as a book-end to the *Orientation to Criminal Justice Inquiry*. Students discussed some of their needs as they approach their senior year which they felt could be addressed by such a class, including mock interviews, resume building, and introduction to internships.

The faculty also identified a handful of issues associated with delivery of the curriculum. As mentioned previously, they are concerned about class size, especially in upper division classes. Smaller class sizes would allow professors to maintain a more appropriate seminar-style teaching modality in those classes. Second, the faculty are interested in designating the *Introduction to Criminal Justice* course as an “essential learning class.” This designation would make the class available to the larger student population at CMU, and could significantly boost both class enrollments generally, and criminal justice majors and minors specifically. Administrators are also aware of the faculty’s interest in this course designation, and I get the impression there are some obstacles to overcome (e.g., changes to the class) that must take place before the “essential learning class” designation can be applied.

I received mixed opinions regarding the extent to which non-criminal justice majors can enroll in criminal justice classes. On the one hand, I heard that criminal justice classes are reserved for criminal justice majors only, and the process through the degree is quite structured. A student must first take the one-credit orientation class, followed by *Introduction to Criminal Justice*. Upon completion of those two classes, a student must take and pass the core systems classes in police, courts, and corrections. Once those courses are complete, the student is then eligible to take upper division electives. Alternatively, I also was told that non-criminal justice majors can enroll in criminal justice classes if they receive approval from the professor.

Regardless, the limited ability (or inability) of non-criminal justice majors to take criminal justice classes is likely constraining enrollments. And perhaps that is a good thing, given the size of the faculty. Nevertheless, the mixing of criminal justice and non-criminal justice majors in CJ classes could generate considerable cross-fertilization of student views and experiences.

I have several recommendations regarding the curriculum.

8. The Criminal Justice Program faculty should investigate students' concerns about some courses only being offered online, or at conflicting times.
9. The Criminal Justice Program faculty should consult with students regarding their proposed junior-year professional development course. Such a course (likely one credit) could serve as a nice complement to the one-credit *Orientation to Criminal Justice Inquiry*.
10. The Criminal Justice Program faculty and university administrators should engage in a dialogue about the potential expansion of the CJ courses to other non-criminal justice majors, both by designating *Introduction to Criminal Justice* as an "essential learning class" and by eliminating restrictions on enrollment.

Enrollment

Student enrollments have grown considerably since the last external program review in 2011. The last external review report states that there were 26 criminal justice majors in fall 2006; by fall 2010, there were 234. University administrative data in the most recent self-study indicates student enrollments in the Criminal Justice Program have been flat since 2013-2014. Over the last five academic years, the number of criminal justice majors has ranged from 476 (2015-2016) to 493 (2016-2017). In 2017-2018, there were 479. The number of minors has varied little, from 16 (2013-2014) to 31 (2016-2017). In 2017-2018, there were 24 criminal justice minors. Over the last five academic years, the program has graduated from 65-80 students with criminal justice majors (self-study, p. 14).

I asked both the faculty and university administrators why they think student enrollments have remained flat. Neither faculty nor administrators had an explanation for the enrollment

trend. There are a number of possible reasons. First, it could be that the program has “maxed out” in terms of reaching the student population. In other words, the 480 or so majors in criminal justice over the last few years represent the total population of students interested in the Criminal Justice Program. This potential explanation seems unlikely, given the growth of enrollments in criminal justice undergraduate programs nationally and the absence of competitor programs in western Colorado. Second, enrollments may be flat because the program itself has hit capacity. That is, the program is small in size (only five tenured/tenure track faculty), leading to a finite number of classes (and sections of classes). Once those sections fill up, the program does not have the resources to add new sections to accommodate any additional growth. Enrollments have flattened because the program itself has “maxed out,” and reached a natural equilibrium given its resources. A third possibility involves the manner in which the program curriculum is administered. In other words, perhaps the Criminal Justice Program has the capacity to grow, and there is a viable pool of potential new criminal justice majors and minors, but the program’s ability to attract (and enroll) those students is somehow inhibited. There may be an untapped population of students who could become future criminal justice majors and minors. There may be additional potential explanations as well.

My discussion with faculty indicates a willingness to grow both the BA and BAS degrees. They suggested more resources and additional faculty hires would be required to accommodate program growth, but they are generally supportive of the possibility. There is also particular interest in increasing the size of classes/cohorts at the POST. The POST faculty representative noted that admissions to the WCCC POST program is quite competitive, and graduates of the BAS program are highly sought after, upon graduation. Currently, the WCCC

POST has the resources to run only one POST class at a time. Additional resources could increase both enrollments in the BAS degree, and at the WCCC POST Academy.

I have several recommendations about Criminal Justice Program enrollments.

11. The Criminal Justice Program Faculty and university administrators should investigate and identify the cause(s) of recent flat trend in enrollment.
12. If there is potential for program growth, the Criminal Justice Program faculty and university administrators should engage in an open dialogue about the opportunity to expand the size and scope of the program. Do the faculty want to increase the size of the program? Does the university administration want to increase the size of the program? Will the university commit the necessary resources to accommodate program growth?

Online Master's Degree Program

Planning for an online Master's degree in Criminal Justice began several years ago. The faculty in the Criminal Justice Program designed a program curriculum (i.e., a curriculum map), determined teaching assignments, and identified the resources required to staff and manage the program. The faculty also stated there had been work completed to determine whether there is a viable student population for the program (they stated there is considerable interest). Progress toward developing the online Master's program has stalled, and there seems to be confusion about why. Faculty stated they did not know why, and they described the failure to move forward as a "missed opportunity." Faculty speculated on the causes, but they indicated there has been a lack of communication about the status of the program. The Department Head believes progress stalled because of the additional new faculty needed to support the program (e.g., the Criminal Justice Program requested two new faculty lines but only received one). University administrators pointed to a problem with a third party vendor, and noted the lack of progress had little to do with the Criminal Justice Program or its faculty. Each group I spoke with expressed a sincere interest in developing the online Master's program. The Senior Vice President for Strategic Initiatives and Distance Learning noted there are several other graduate programs at

CMU, and the university has both the resources and infrastructure to support a new online Master's degree program in criminal justice. Given how such programs have grown in other universities, it is likely the CMU program would be both successful and financially lucrative if properly marketed (e.g., advertised) and staffed. On marketing, faculty and university administration will need to devise a marketing plan if the program is created. This could include taking advantage of local media (print, radio, television), advertising on social media (Facebook, etc.), leveraging faculty professional networks, and marketing with local criminal justice agencies. The online Master's program would likely need a program director and a staff coordinator who, together, would take the lead on marketing, reviewing applications and making admission decisions, basic record keeping, monitoring enrollments, and performing student advising. If one of the current faculty takes on the program director role, an additional faculty hire would also be required to teach the new online graduate classes. It may be wise to consider the creation of an advisory board, made up of members of local criminal justice agencies. The advisory board could assist with program development, marketing, and vision. The Criminal Justice faculty and university administrators will need to continue planning for the program, including program goals, enrollment projections, admission processes (e.g., rolling admissions or a set deadline), online infrastructure, and course development. The Criminal Justice faculty should also connect with faculty in other departments at CMU with online graduate programs. There is likely a significant amount of institutional knowledge the CJ faculty could draw on as they design and implement the program.

I have several recommendations about the proposed online Master's program.

13. The faculty and university administrators should have an open discussion about the status of the online Master's program, and more specifically, why progress has stalled. They should also discuss the desire to create such a program, as well as the necessary resources and staff to successfully manage it.

14. If development of the online Master's degree proceeds, the Criminal Justice Program should get an additional faculty hire (in addition to the faculty hire in recommendation #2) and a dedicated staff person to act as a program coordinator. The program will also need a faculty director.
15. The Criminal Justice faculty should connect with faculty in other departments that offer online graduate degrees, to draw on institutional knowledge about such programs at CMU.

Prospects for the Future

The Criminal Justice Program at Colorado Mesa University offers students two comprehensive, high-quality undergraduate degree programs. The BAS degree is especially unique. The program is small with just five tenured/tenure track faculty (with an active open search underway), and the program serves approximately 480 undergraduate majors per year. In simple terms, the Criminal Justice Program is successful in achieving its mission, and the mission of the university. But the Criminal Justice Program is also at a cross-roads. Enrollments have been relatively flat for five years. Faculty are stretched thin in terms of teaching, with most taking on significant course overloads. Faculty note it is difficult to attract quality applicants for positions given the current salary structure. The online Master's program is planned, but not yet implemented. What is next? The Criminal Justice Program can maintain the status quo, especially with a new faculty hire. But my assessment is that the faculty do not want to maintain the status quo. They want to grow. They want to serve a larger pool of students. They want to begin offering a graduate online program. And the faculty recognize they need more resources, staff, professors, and support from the university to accomplish those objectives. There should be an open dialogue between the faculty, the Department Head, and university administrators about the future of the Criminal Justice Program at Colorado Mesa University. The status quo is excellent and features two high-quality undergraduate degrees in Criminal Justice. But the future

could be more, including a larger faculty, increased enrollments at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and a larger footprint in criminal justice education in Western Colorado. The prospects for the future should be determined and agreed-upon through open communication between the faculty and university administration.

Appendix A

Executive Summary Template from the Colorado Mesa University External Review Manual

Table 3. Executive Summary Template for External Reviewer's Observations

Program Review Element	Check the appropriate selection				Provide explanation if not agree with element and/or why unable to evaluate
	Agree	Not Agree	Unable to Evaluate	Not Applicabl	
The program's self-study is a realistic and accurate appraisal of the program.	x				
The program's mission and its contributions are consistent with the institution's role and mission and its strategic goals.	x				
The program's goals are being met.	x				
The curriculum is appropriate to the breadth, depth, and level of the discipline.	x				
The curriculum is current, follows best practices, and/or adheres to the professional standards of the discipline.	x				
Student demand/enrollment is at an expected level in the context of the institution and program's role and mission.	x				
The program's teaching-learning environment fosters success of the program's students.	x				
Program faculty members are appropriately credentialed.	x				
Program faculty members actively contribute to scholarship, service and advising.	x				
Campus facilities meet the program's needs.	x				
Equipment meets the program's needs.	x				
Instructional technology meets the program's needs.	x				
Current library resources meet the program's needs.	x				
Student learning outcomes are appropriate to the discipline, clearly stated, measurable, and assessed.	x				
Program faculty members are involved in on-going assessment efforts.	x				
Program faculty members analyze student learning outcome data and program effectiveness to foster continuous improvement.	x				
The program's articulation of its strengths and challenges is accurate/ appropriate and integral to its future planning.	x				

September 7, 2012

This program choose not to prepare a rejoinder.

