TO: The Academic Senate

FROM: Committee of Academic Planning and Resources (CAPR)

SUBJECT: Criminal Justice Administration Five-Year Review

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of the Five-Year Program Review of the Department of Criminal Justice Administration and continuation of the program without modification

I. Background

Overview description of the program

Established in 1976, the Department of Criminal Justice Administration (CRJA) offers an undergraduate program leading to a B.S. and a minor in Criminal Justice Administration (CRJA). Instruction evaluates and analyzes the history, policies, practices and objectives of justice administration in society. Both the regular and adjunct faculty members have advanced educational credentials and possess practical career experiences in the field. An active Student Club brings speakers on campus, organizes visits to courts, crime labs, jails, and supervises tours of police target ranges and offices. Employment in the field remained high in the study period, ranging from federal and state agencies to virtually all of the local, county and regional criminal justice offices in the Bay Area. Graduates function as police chiefs and officers, secret service agents, FBI agents, marshals, rangers, deputy sheriffs, probation, parole and immigration officers, and so on.

In 2001, CRJA had 4.00 Tenure Track FTEF and 1.60 Lecturer FTEF, offering 15 courses (totaling 16 sections, with 32.3 students in each section on average). CRJA is currently searching for a full-time Tenure Track faculty member. CRJA majors decreased significantly from 413 in 1997 to 277 in 2001, with an average of 338. CRJA minors averaged 30 during the same period of time. As an interdisciplinary program, CRJA majors also take required or elective courses from among 12 other departments, 8 of which are in ALSS (ANTH, COMM, ES, MLL, PHIL, POSC, PUAD and SOC). Despite the decline in majors, CRJA still ranked 4th in number of majors in ALSS and 9th campus-wide in 2001. The large number of major students demanding advising presents a heavy burden on a small faculty, reducing opportunities for innovative and sustained research and retraining. In addition, two tenured faculty members are close to retirement, and one tenured faculty member is assigned two thirds of time for the Directorship of Liberal Studies. Therefore, successful recruitment of new faculty is a priority and vital goal for the Department.

Overview of the documents submitted to CAPR

-1-
To comply with CAPR’s Policies and Procedures for Five Year Reviews and Plans (00-01 CAPR 7), CRJA submitted to CAPR a collection of the four required documents: 1) a comprehensive Self-Study, 2) a plan for the development of the program for the next five years, 3) the Outside Reviewer’s Report, and 4) the program’s response to the Outside Reviewer’s Report. The Self-Study presented a) a summary of the last Five-Year Review and Plan, its implementation, and the remaining issues, and included b) copies of four tenure track applications between 1998 and 2004, c) a plan for learning outcomes assessment and its implementation, d) academic performance review statistics with tables, e) a comparison between CRJA at CSUH and comparable programs in the CSU system, and f) a summary of achievements of the Program since the last review. The Self-Study did not include comparison information with comparable programs in the U.C. system and other institutions nation-wide. The Self-Study did not include information concerning requirements over 180 units, because the Department is in the process of discussing and deciding on the issue. The Plan for the next five years discussed curriculum, student, faculty, and resource issues. The Plan specified actions/changes to be taken, some with time lines, but did not specify persons in charge of the actions and did not discuss the anticipated cost.

II. Five-Year Program Review/Self-Study (1997-2002)

Summary of specific areas of the Self-Study

Last Five-Year Plan To implement the five-year plan developed for the last five-year review, the Department focused on addressing the concerns raised by the last external reviewer in 1997. The Department has revised its curriculum by increasing the number of Core courses taught by the home department, creating new courses for the Core, adding three courses to the Corrections Option, and grouping the elective courses into four specialized clusters to facilitate academic interest and career planning.

Remaining Issues The Department reports the remaining issues from the last review: 1) The student to faculty ratio (SFR) is “extremely high in comparison to other disciplines, both in the classroom and student advisement.” 2) The office space is limited, with two offices housing four regular faculty members and all the lecturers. 3) The secretarial service for major student service is limited due to lack of adequate staff. And 4) the starting salary offer for new tenure track recruits is not adequate for attracting and retaining quality hires. Dr. Vogel, the outside reviewer of the last five-year review, reported that the Department was unjustifiably viewed as a “cop shop” providing a service rather than academic program, and the University and School policies seemed to be biased against the Department’s development in favor of the traditional programs. The Department feels that the University administration should recognize the academic integrity of the Program and its role to attract significant amount of majors feeding the enrollment of the courses in this Program and other departments.

Tenure Track Position Applications The Department has submitted four applications for new tenure track positions, following the outside reviewer’s recommendation (for 1998-1999, 2000-2001, 2002-2003, and 2003-2004). One resulted in a new hire who left two years later for a higher position in another university, one was denied, the other resulted in a latest new hire, and the last application was approved and the search is in progress.

Outcomes Assessment Plan The Department reports that little novel development has taken place
in this area, due to limited faculty resources. However, the Department has developed an assessment plan including the mission statement, program goals, learning outcomes, and assessment tools. The assessment is primarily based on three subjective methods: the standard student course evaluations for each course every quarter, alumni and agency surveys, and student survey questionnaires administered at three different points of time: initial entry, midway, and filing for graduation.

**Comparable Programs in Other Universities**  The Report compared the CRJA Program at CSUH with similar programs on other campuses of the CSU system. Currently, 12 other CSU campuses offer undergraduate degrees in CRJA, six as a B.A and six as a B.S. Major enrollments range from 150 to 1281, with the median of 518. CSUH ranks the 12th with 277 majors. Numbers of full time faculty range from three to 29, with the median of 9. CSUH ranks the 11/12th. Units required for completing the major range from 41 to 124, with the median of 76. CSUH requires 78 units, ranking it 6th. The only correlation that seems to emerge is that between faculty size and the number of courses offered in the program. Therefore, the Department argues that the increase of the faculty of the Program is crucial for the increase of the course offering. The Report does not include any information about similar programs in the U.C system or other universities nation-wide.

**Achievements Since the Last Review**  The Department has revised the curriculum of CRJA by having four CRJA courses approved for satisfying the G.E. requirement, creating the internship course CRJA 4128 (Internship in Criminal Justice) and the seminar course CRJA 4126 (Seminar in Criminal Justice Administration). The faculty has also sustained a high level of professional productivity, has been engaged in campus and community services, and has used their own resources for training, conferences and augmenting the Department’s video and computer reference library. The Report states that “the Department has a high per capita presentation/publication record compared with other departments,” though, except for Dr. Cadwallader, no specific quantitative information was provided for such comparison. All the regular faculty members belong to numerous professional associations and are active in their professional fields by attending conferences and publishing professional works.

**Justification for Over 180 Units**  The Report does not include information concerning this issue. At the oral presentation to the CAPR meeting on 4/3/2003, Dr. Carmichael explained that the Department is in the process of deciding on this issue, hence the absence of information.

**Summary of Supporting Data**

The CRJA maintains a retention rate of 60% of its majors, with 224 graduates by 2001 out of the 373 enrolled majors in 1998. The number of enrolled majors declined steadily during the 1997-2001 period, from 413 in 1997 to 277 in 2001, though it still ranked the 3rd in ALSS and 9th campus-wide in majors. Course offering has been relatively steady, from 14 in 1997 to 15 in 2001, totaling 18 sections in 1997 and 16 sections in 2001. Average section size was very high, with 45.9 students per section, and then remained relatively stable around 32 per section, above the capacity limit. Total course enrollments were also high in 1997, with 827 students, and then fluctuated between 445 and 555, with 517 in 2001.

Tenure track FTEF varied between 4.0 and 5.0, with 4.0 in 2001, and lecturer FTEF increased to 1.6 in 2001 from 1.33 in 1997. Lecturer FTEF constitute 29% of the total, and 34% of the FTES is taught by lecturers. CRJA FTES varied between 114.6 and 138.3, with 137.8 in 2001. The SFR was
the highest in 1997, reaching 35.4, which then fluctuated between 23.4 and 29.7 afterwards, with 26.2 in 2001.

III. Outside Reviewer’s Comments & The Department’s Response

Dr. Robert Fong, Chair and Professor of the Department of Criminal Justice at California State University, Bakersfield served as the external reviewer of the CRJA Program. As part of the review process, he visited the CSUH campus on February 20, 2003 and submitted a report on March 10, 2003. The report stated clear goals and review criteria. Dr. Fong reviewed the numerous review documents, interviewed the whole regular faculty, the Interim Dean of ALSS, the Provost of CSUH, a librarian, two classes of students, and the library holdings in CRJA

Curriculum Dr. Fong praised the CRJA Program’s curriculum as “rich in quality and reflective of the Department’s commitment to provide students and graduates with an excellent liberal arts education to meet the challenges of justice administration in a complex society” and as having “a strong programmatic focus on the development of critical thinking, communication skills, and the ability to conceptualize ideas.” However, Dr. Fong was troubled by the fact that some Core courses continued to be taught by faculty from outside the Department, despite the strong recommendation for a change in the previous five-year review. With the 3rd largest enrollment of majors in ALSS, the Department should have the right to determine its own core courses in order for students to “receive a truly quality and discipline-based education” and to “bring full credibility to the criminal justice program,” as already granted to other respected CRJA programs in the CSU system and elsewhere.

Faculty Dr. Fong observed that the proportion between the faculty size and the number of majors and FTES deteriorated since the previous Five-Year Review, despite the last reviewer’s strong recommendation for a change. He noted that the 297 majors and 147.2 FTES (Fall 2002 figure) across both the Hayward and CCC campuses were supported effectively by 2.89 regular faculty members and a few adjunct lecturers. This made CRJA have “one of the highest SFRs (26.2) on CSUH and in the CSU system,” with the faculty-student advising ratio up at 1:169, way beyond the 1:30 advising ratio specified in the ACJS Standards (1995). Dr. Fong argued that this undesirable SFR resulted in several unintended negative consequences. First, it demoralized the faculty, “after years of neglect and inequitable treatment.” Second, it made the program’s major enrollment decline (413 in 1997 to 277 in 2001), while the national trend pointed in the opposite direction. The decrease was viewed as caused by the lack of an adequate number of CRJA courses offered each quarter that delayed the majors’ timely graduation plans, who consequently switch to other majors or other campuses. Third, it made the program an undesirable working environment for retaining junior faculty members, since two tenure-track hires have left the Department since 1997 with this as one of the major reasons. Fourth, it compromised its service to the students. And lastly and most seriously, when the two senior faculty members retire at the end of the current academic year, the Department will be at the edge of collapsing, due to lack of regular faculty. This will inevitably negatively affect the FTES in the G.E. courses and other CRJA required courses offered by other departments within and outside ALSS. Dr. Fong also concurred with the previous reviewer in that the starting salary offers for tenure track hires are below the standard amount for the discipline. Considering the high cost of living, the typical CSUH offer “is hardly a salary that will raise the eyebrows of even the most eager but inexperienced new Ph.D.s.”

Students Dr. Fong agreed with the previous reviewer in stating that “students are flocking to the criminal justice program ... because it is a discipline that touches their lives in profound ways
and offers a myriad number of employment opportunities.” The interviews showed that the students were proud of having chosen the major, regarded the program as challenging with high standards and professors as caring. However, students were unanimous in complaining for the low number of CRJA courses offered each quarter, and were “confused about and frustrated by the lack of support the Administration has shown for what they perceived to be one of the most important academic programs on campus.” Graduates of CRJA ended up in many leadership positions in their careers, such as the Police Chief of the City of Hayward, Director of Public Safety at CSUH, and various positions in FBI, DEA, ATF, CHP, CDC, and so on.

**Other issues** Dr. Fong appreciated the high work load of the CRJA Administrative Coordinator, and recommended reclassification of the position to match the work. Dr. Fong regarded the information technology and other facility resources to be inadequate, in dire need of improvement. Dr. Fong observed that little has changed since the previous review concerning library resources. Only four new journal titles had been added to the collection of 18 CRJA subscriptions, which only represented 25% of the titles that could be purchased.

**Conclusion** Dr. Fong concluded that although the Department of CRJA has made an undeniable contribution to the College and University, “decades of neglect, inequitable treatment, and exploitation has taken a heavy toll on the Department.” “If the current practices continue, the program will soon cease to exist and the devastating effects will surely be felt throughout the campus for years to come.” “On the other hand, if the University chooses to nurture its growth, it must break free from a culture of self-interests and secretive decision-making.” “Top decision-makers should no longer turn a deaf ear to the urgent calls for help ... Time is of the essence!”

**CRJA’s response** The Department of CRJA generally appreciates the review and its recommendations and comments. It pointed out that the Department had made some significant changes in improving the curriculum following the previous reviewer’s recommendations, though still far from ideal due to resource limitations. The Department states that Dr. Fong’s recommendations will be considered seriously and implemented, when appropriate and if resources are made available.

**IV. Program’s Five-Year Strategic Plan (March 2003)**

**Curriculum**
- Little curriculum change for the undergraduate program is feasible without significant increase of resource support.
- The only possible change being considered involves the substitution of a CRJA course as one of the required major course for a course infrequently offered by another department.
- The Department feels there is a high need and desire for developing an M.A. program in CRJA, which was proposed to and rejected by CAPR in 2000.

**Students**
- The demand for CRJA graduates is projected to be steadily increasing for both the legal and educational systems in the next five years. The enrollment will be promoted even more by the establishment of a graduate program in CRJA at CSUH. However, the expansion will require comparable resource increases, including faculty, supporting staff, and facilities.
- In the next year, the Department will implement a Department student assessment matrix to assess the learning outcomes.
The Department aims to provide better faculty-student advising ratios for better personal guidance and more opportunities for field experiences.

Faculty

- The Department plans to request three or four tenure-track allocations in the 2004-2005 academic year, while building its part-time teaching support.
- The Department would like to see more assigned time for the Department Chair than the current 0.44 administrative time.
- For a desired faculty-student ratio for advising, the Department needs to aim for 7.5 regular faculty members for the current major enrollment, 3.5 higher than the current 4.0.

Others  No other areas of changes are proposed.

Cost considerations  No specific costs for the proposed actions summarized above are presented in the Plan.

V. CAPR’s Analysis of the Program’s Five-Year Review

Drs. Benjamin Carmichael (Chair), Marc Neithercutt, and Thomas Cadwallader from the Department of CRJA met with CAPR to discuss the CRJA’s Five-Year Review at the April 2 CAPR meeting. Chair Carmichael presented a brief survey of the Department and the Review. Several CAPR members asked questions, followed by responses and clarifications by the three CRJA faculty members present at the meeting. Approximately 35 minutes were allocated to the entire process.

The Document Format

CAPR commends the Department of CRJA for its conscientious efforts in providing materials by closely following the specified format. The contents and data are clearly presented and special efforts have been made to present appropriately adapted table formats with highlights and explanations, in addition to the attached Institutional Statistics tables, to support arguments. CAPR also appreciates the Department’s effort in the clear organization and marking of the various documents. However, there is still room for some technical improvement. For example, the item numbers in Document 1 (Self-Study) are out of step, and the relevant part in the Table of Contents does not match the numbering in the text. The summary that should have addressed what has been learned from the Learning Outcomes Assessment (Document 1, #3 as specified in 00-01 CAPR 7; Document 1, #4 in the CRJA Review documents) focused primarily on the Department’s problem of resources shortage, instead of the intended assessment of the education practice and strategies for improvement. Some numbers need to be more consistent (e.g., majors were 373 for 1998 in Table 1, but 376 in Table 2; CRJA majors ranked as the 2nd in CLASS in the Reviewer's Report, but as 3rd and 4th in various places in other documents, etc.)

The Five-Year Review

CAPR strongly shares the external reviewer’s and the Department’s serious concern and the alarm that the very existence of the Program will be at the stake when the two senior regular faculty, one of whom is the current Department Chair, are scheduled to retire by the end of the current academic year. CAPR also appreciates the conscientious contribution made by the small CRJA faculty in advising the 3rd largest major enrollment in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences
(CLASS), in addition to offering the CRJA courses at the normal work load for both the majors/minors and the students satisfying their G.E. requirements. CAPR notes that the Department of CRJA is housing its 4 regular faculty members plus the part-time lecturers in only two offices. This is below the standard of typical practices among CLASS departments at CSUH, where two regular faculty members share one office, with additional rooms providing office space for part-time lecturers.

CAPR notes the steady decline of the CRJA major enrollment from 413 in 1997 to 277 in 2001. This is in the opposite direction shown in the enrollments in this field in other universities nationwide and in the demand for employment in this field. The smaller enrollment also places CSUH in second to last place among the 13 programs offered in the CSU system. Although the Department claims that the decline was due to the decrease of the faculty size, this argument is not convincingly supported by the data, since CRJA had 4.00 regular faculty plus 1.33 lecturers in 1997, and 4.00 regular faculty plus 1.60 lecturers in 2001, but the enrollment was 413 in 1997 and 277 in 2001. The faculty size remained the same, but majors declined by about 30%. However, CRJA’s explanation is quite reasonable that the decline might have been caused by the lack of adequate offering of major required courses each quarter, which delays the students’ graduation plan and forces them to change to other majors or campuses. Therefore, increased faculty size that secures more CRJA controlled courses offered more regularly may provide a more student friendly environment. This will also correct the mismatch between being the 6th in enrollment but 12th in faculty size among the 13 similar programs in the CSU system. CAPR also noted the concerns raised by the external reviewer and the Department that the starting salary is not adequate to the field’s standard. Although it was not convincingly presented as an important contributing cause, CAPR is concerned by the attrition of two new hires in the Program during the last Five-Year Review period.

CAPR recognizes the conscientious efforts made by the CRJA Department in revising its curriculum, following the recommendations of the external reviewer and securing more library resources. CAPR commends the active participation in teaching, professional, and service activities by the regular faculty members, and the hard administrative work to serve a large body of major students by the Department Administrative Coordinator. CAPR praises the efforts made by the regular faculty in training, attending conferences, and augmenting the Department’s information technology resources at their own expenses.

CAPR commends and supports CRJA’s plan to place faculty recruitment as its priority in the Five-Year Plan and would like to actively promote its future efforts for this purpose where appropriate. However, the Plan did not specify the particular fields of the three-to-four proposed applications for the tenure track position for 2003-2004. CAPR recommends clear specification and prioritization of each position to enhance possibilities of approval. CRJA should also plan for the following years during the Five-Year Plan period for such applications, since it is not very likely that three or four applications will be approved for one year. The Review document was not clear about the evidence for what CRJA considers as the “unfair treatment in resource allocations.” At one place, it is attributed to the adoption of the “EFTS-based principle”, biased against departments with large majors, but at another place, it is attributed to the unfair application of the principle. Unless the evidence is clearly and convincingly identified and presented, CAPR is not able to provide effective support to correct the perceived “wrong” practices. In addition, CRJA did not seem to have developed effective strategies to change the bleak situation of the Department. If the same strategies are to adopted, wouldn’t it be the case in the next Five-Year Review that the external reviewer will again report that “too little has changed?”  To respond to this concern, Dr. Carmichael commented at
the meeting that the changes had to be initiated from the Administration, not from the Department.

Since the Plan does not present specific cost issues for the increase of the faculty size, CAPR cannot make informed judgment about the financial feasibility of the planned action concerning new hires. Despite the above concerns, CAPR notes that the 29% of the lecturer proportion in CRJA is quite positive compared to the CSUH average, almost comparable to the 75% regular faculty goal aimed by the University. CAPR notes the justifications presented for the proposed M.A. program for the next Five-Year Plan. However, the Plan did not analyze the reasons why CAPR rejected its previous proposal in 2000, nor presented new grounds or strategies to convince CAPR for its future decisions.

CAPR requests that CRJA decide on whether or not to maintain the 186-units requirement at its soonest opportunity, and report to CAPR of the decision. In the case that 186 units are to be maintained, an explanation should be made and reported to CAPR.

In conclusion, CAPR is satisfied with the performance of the CRJA Program in the past Five-Year Review period for its curriculum development, educational service, and faculty professional activities. CAPR recognizes and is concerned for the urgency in replacing the about-to-retire faculty with new hires in the immediate future. CAPR is generally supportive of CRJA’s plan to steadily increase the faculty size to sustain and expand the current CRJA major enrollment. CAPR feels that CRJA’s claim that it has been unfairly treated by the College and University Administrations needs to be substantiated by data specifically comparing the Program and other programs in the College and University. Regardless, it concurs with the Outside Reviewer that CRJA is a rigorous and academically worthy program that makes an important contribution to CLASS and the university as a whole.

VI. **CAPR Recommendation for Continuation of the Program**

CAPR voted unanimously to continue the program without modification.

VII. **Date of the Program’s Next Five-Year Review**

2007-2008

Note: CRJA has submitted a response letter to CAPR, addressing many of the questions and concerns raised in the report, after the draft of the report was forwarded to the Department. The response letter from CRJA is attached for reference and record.