

Department of Criminal Justice
2021-2022 Program Performance Review
Politics, Administration and Justice
California State University, Fullerton
Department Self Study



Faculty PPR Committee:
Alissa Ackerman, Department Coordinator
Lidia Nuño, Associate Professor
Veronica Herrera, Associate Professor
Dixie Koo, Professor

Acknowledgements: The writing of this PPR document would not have been possible without input from the entire criminal justice department. However, special thanks and appreciation goes to the members of the PPR Committee: Lidia Nuño, Veronica Herrera, and Dixie Koo and Alissa Ackerman for their tireless work to write this document. A PPR is a heavy lift and their service to this endeavor must be acknowledged. Also, Program Vice-Coordinator, Georgia Spiropoulos wrote significant portions of this document in consultation with Phillip Kopp, Amy Cass, Dixie Koo, Sandeepa Bevl, and Sigrid Williams. The Ad-hoc Curriculum Committee referenced in the PPR was chaired by Stacy Mallicoat and included committee members Dixie Koo, Georgia Spiropoulos, and Phillip Kopp. A special thanks also goes to our Chair, Matt Jarvis, who provided the language for items related to budget and facilities.

I. Department/Program Mission, Goals, and Environment

a. Briefly describe the mission and goals of the unit and identify any changes since the last program review. Review the goals in relation to the university mission, goals and strategies

The Criminal Justice Department is the largest major program in the Division of Politics, Administration, and Justice, serving over 1300 majors. The Division houses three undergraduate and two masters level programs across three departments: criminal justice, public administration and political science. The Criminal Justice Department serves only undergraduate students. Although there have been past conversations about building a Master's program in Criminal Justice, it has not happened partly because we do not have the capacity or resources to build such a program.

The Division is overseen by a chairperson and each department is managed by a coordinator, all elected by their respective faculty. Coordinators serve three-year terms and are given a course release per semester for their service to the program. The coordinators in the other departments receive two course releases per semester because they oversee the undergraduate and graduate programs. The criminal justice coordinator does not receive this additional course release, despite the criminal justice undergraduate program dwarfs all other programs in the division for over two decades at least. For example, enrollment in the undergraduate criminal justice program in 2021-22 was 1,348. Enrollment in the undergraduate political science program was 424 and public administration program was 176.

Since the 2013 PPR, the department has hired four new full-time, tenure-track faculty. All four have been granted tenure and promotion. Currently, the department consists of all tenured professors.

With new faculty come new ideas about our mission, goals and strategies in the program. Since last review we updated all the learning objectives for the required courses in the major. We renamed our CRJU 385 course from the archaic and problematic name, "Minorities & Crime" to "Race, Inequality and the CJS". The Department is discussing a mission statement but has not adopted one. As the reader knows, a mission statement is a public expression of what is a department or what they want to be. We are having difficulty articulating this because faculty are still working on exactly

what is that image. Some faculty advocate moving toward a social justice oriented criminal justice program and while most full-time faculty also want to move in that direction in theory, we are currently discussing what that means in practice. These talks are on-going and will resolve in time. In response to the current PPR, we recognize that the information provided on our website is outdated and incorrect and needs to be updated.

As part of the external review process, we would like to continue discussing our mission and goals and what this means for us as a department.

b. Briefly describe changes and trends in the discipline and the response of the unit to such changes. Identify if there have been external factors that impact the program (e.g. community/regional needs, placement, and graduate/professional school).

Over the last decade, the discipline as a whole has undergone a shift in terms of how we approach our understanding of criminal justice systems and the disparate impacts these systems have on non-white people. In other words, the field has shifted toward a more critical and nuanced approach to teaching and scholarship on criminal justice related topics. This shift has been in the making for more than two decades, but events over the last five years have required faculty to seriously confront the way we teach, the materials we use, and our overall student learning goals.

In response to a changing discipline and an overall change in how we individually and collectively view criminal justice issues, we created an ad-hoc committee during the 2020-2021 AY to review our core curriculum and our CRJU 385 course. We updated the learning objectives for all but one (CRJU 310) of our required courses. We discuss these changes in detail below.

c. Identify the unit's priorities for the future.

As part of the Program Performance Review, the faculty met to identify and discuss priorities for the future. Three key priorities were identified related to faculty and representation, curriculum issues, and student writing problems.

Faculty note the importance of having a faculty that is more representative of the students we serve. This means that area of specialization among potential hires is less important than the ability of new hires to connect with and understand our students. Conversely, our students need to see a reflection of themselves in their faculty.

Some faculty are interested in developing courses and creating future faculty lines to cover emerging and critical frameworks, including, but not limited to: rural, queer, indigenous, abolitionist, and green criminology. However, we recognize that until we can fully serve the students we currently have, building out our elective curriculum is not feasible.

One way to better serve students is to revamp our current curriculum to change the number of required courses students must take. We talk about this elsewhere in this report. However, it is noteworthy here, as one of the priorities we discussed as a faculty was to take a comprehensive look at our overall curriculum. Is what we are doing actually working? Should we include more units? Should we bring back our correlated curriculum? Should we restructure the major?

As part of this review process, we elected to form an ad-hoc committee to look specifically at curricular issues. Their findings and questions related to their proposed solutions are also included within this document.

Finally, we remain concerned about the significant writing issues and a lack of preparation we see with our students. In particular, we discussed coming up with a different, perhaps in-house, writing course.

- d. If there are programs offered in a Special Session self-support mode, describe how these programs are included in the mission, goals, and priorities of the department/program (e.g. new student groups regionally, nationally, internationally, new delivery modes, etc.)**

Historically, criminal justice offers 4-5 courses during the January intersession and approximately 10 courses during the summer session, depending on student demand. Sometimes these courses bring students seeking to complete a GE requirement. Each course offered during intersession or summer session is also offered during the regular academic year. Providing these course offerings helps students complete their degrees more quickly. Bottlenecks during the regular academic year remain an ever-present and frustrating problem. These courses help to reduce this frustration and aid students in fulfilling their degree requirements. Students can also participate in Study Abroad or the DC Scholars Program during Special Sessions.

II. Department/Program Description and Analysis

- a. Identify substantial curricular changes in existing programs, new programs (degrees, majors, minors) developed since the last program review. Have any programs been discontinued?**

We have significantly improved on our curriculum since the 2013 program review. We have added a number of exciting and popular new elective courses including CRJU 304 – Criminal Courts, CRJU 327 – Victims of Crime, CRJU 360 – Comparative and International CJ Systems, CRJU 362 – Immigration and Crime, CRJU 393 – Peer Mentors in Criminal Justice, CRJU 410 – Restorative Justice, CRJU 417 – Mass Murder, CRJU 459 – Crime and Justice at the U.S.- Mexico Border, CRJU 474 – Animals, Law and Society, CRJU 487 – Technology and Criminal Justice Rights, and CRJU 491 – Applied Policy Research.

These elective courses have been a welcome addition to our major. Unfortunately, it has resulted in two problems. First, faculty have expressed frustration around course ownership and the inability for other faculty to step in and teach a specialized course where the faculty who created the course is the only expert on the given topic. Second, in order to have full-time faculty teaching our required courses we often must forgo teaching electives in order to teach core courses. A third and equally important problem is that the current service burdens placed upon us make it difficult for some faculty to propose new courses.

We changed two of our 400 level upper-division electives to 300 level electives in 2015 because the style in which they were being taught were more consistent with 300 level courses. The PAJ Division policy requires that 400 level electives to be taught by someone with a Ph.D.

In 2017 we elevated transfer requirements to deal with impaction, but it unfortunately does not appear to have lessened our overall enrollments. Our new standards were a 2.8 GPA or a 2.7 with AST and CRJU 100 equivalent. Most students have CRJU 100 as an AST, so this transfer requirement has not necessary had the effect we envisioned. A different way to address this might be to have admissions standards for all and a pre-major for freshmen.

In the Fall 2018 catalogue we created a program change requiring that 9 of the 15 elective units required to be at the 400 level. In the Fall 2019 catalogue we began allowing a C- course grade to count toward our major.

Most importantly, in the 20-21 AY we updated the title and learning goals for CRJU 385 from “Minorities and Crime” to “Race, Inequality and the CJS”. We also updated learning goals for all of our required courses in an effort to bring a more critical perspective to our major. These courses include: Myths and Realities of Crime and Justice (CRJU 100), a course formerly known as “Introduction to Crime, Law & Justice; Foundations of Criminal Justice (CRJU 300), Criminal Law (CRJU 310); Policing (CRJU 315); Theories of Crime and Delinquency (CRJU 330); Research Methodology (CRJU 34); and Corrections (CRJU 345).

b. Describe the structure of the degree program (e.g. identify required courses, how many unites of electives) and identify the logic underlying the organization of the requirements.

Students majoring in Criminal Justice must take seven (7) required courses, five (5) criminal justice electives (three of which must be at the 400 level), and the writing requirement, ENG 301 or 365.

Core Curriculum (21 Required Units)

CRJU 100 - Myths and Realities of Crime and Justice
CRJU 300 - Foundations of Criminal Justice
CRJU 310 - Criminal Law: Substantive
CRJU 315 - Policing

CRJU 330 - Theories of Crime and Delinquency
CRJU 340 - Research Methodology
CRJU 345 – Corrections

A list of electives can be found at
http://hss.fullerton.edu/paj/_resources/pdfs/Handbooks/crju_ug_handbook_F20.pdf

- c. Using data provided by the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness to discuss student demand for the unit’s offerings; discuss topics such as over enrollment, under enrollment, (applications, admissions and enrollments) retention, (native and transfer) graduation rates for majors, and time to degree (see instructions, Appendices A and B).**

During the 2013 PPR we had 1,218 majors. Numbers from the subsequent five years show similar enrollments until the 2019-2020 AY when our enrollments increased to 1,275 and then in 2020-2021 AY to 1,347

Our courses are consistently enrolled at capacity or above capacity to meet student demand. In the spring of 2020, we halted admission into our major to ensure they had seats in requires course. Halting admissions for one semester had little impact on demand across criminal justice courses.

First time freshman admits significantly increased over the last five years, despite the number of applicants remaining relatively stable. This is true for upper-division transfers. The number of applicants has remained consistent, but admissions nearly doubled in 2020. Enrollments of upper-division transfers decreased between 2016 and 2018, but began to increase in 2019. We had just shy of 200 upper-division enrollments in 2020 compared with a low of 114 in 2018.

Yet our four-year graduation rate for first time freshman has increased from 22.2% in 2013 to 39.9% in 2017.

Our courses remain in high demand for students. This includes CRJU 100 offered as a lower division GE and the courses within our major that are consistently full. One reason students may not fulfill the requirements of their degree in a timely manner is simply because we do not have enough seats available to accommodate our growing demand. The faculty to student ratio also affects the ability to offer a variety of electives. While we have over a dozen unique elective course topics, many of these topics are not regularly being taught as the demand for required courses are high and faculty are forced to teach classes that are required.

- d. Discuss the unit’s enrollment trends since the last program review, based on enrollment targets (FTES), faculty allocation, and student faculty ratios. For**

graduate programs, comment on whether there is sufficient enrollment to constitute a community of scholars to conduct the program (see instructions, Appendices A and B).

Enrollment targets were consistent for a number of years, until trending upward during the 2019 and 2020 academic years.

During academic years 2019 and 2020 we had a decrease in number of first-time freshmen students who applied. Yet the number of students who were admitted and enrolled increased substantially. While the number of upper-division transfer student applications has increased, the number of transfer students admitted and the number of transfer students enrolled has increased at a much higher rate, particularly as it relates to admissions, which increased to 389 in 2019, and 607 in 2020, from 285 who were admitted in 2018.

At the 2013 PPR we had a total of 1,218 majors. Numbers from the last five years show that enrollments have hovered at around that same place, until the 2019-2020 AY when our enrollments increased to 1,275 and then 1,347 in the 2020-2021 AY. Our *Full Time Equivalent Student* (FTES) continues to increase. In order to serve our students, we must be given additional faculty lines and faculty lines must continue to grow at the same rate as the number of students being admitted. This is critical, as we often cannot find academically qualified part-time faculty. Currently 59% of our FTES is being taught by adjunct faculty. The increasing number of students also increased our already demanding service burdens, which can only be addressed with full-time lines.

e. Describe any plans for curricular changes in the short (three-year) and long (seven-year) term, such as expansions, contractions, or discontinuances. Relate these plans to the priorities describes above in section I.C (unit's future priorities).

In the 2020/2021 AY the criminal justice faculty created an ad-hoc committee to review our core curriculum and our Minorities and Crime course (CRJU 385). The committee and the larger department voted to approve a change in course objectives and goals across the greater core curriculum that takes a more critical approach to 21st century criminal justice issues. Additionally, the committee revamped the Minorities and Crime course by changing the name of the course to Race, Inequality, and the CJS and updated the learning objectives for the course.

We are pleased with the changes we have made to the core curriculum. In the next three years we would like to make CRJU 385 a required course for all CJ majors. However, it is crucial that 385 be taught by individuals who have the knowledge and expertise to teach this course in a manner

consistent with the goals and objectives of the course. The harm to students that can occur if someone teaches this course inappropriately cannot be understated.

We have also discussed adding a Courts class to our core curriculum, as not having such a course is inconsistent with most criminal justice programs. We currently offer a substantive law course in the core curriculum and a courts class as an elective.

We have also discussed a proposed sequencing of our required courses. For example, one idea is to require our Theories course (CRJU 330) to be taken prior to Research Methodology (CRJU 340). We've also discussed requiring Theories (CRJU 330) as a pre-requisite to our 400 level elective courses.

Adding two courses to our core curriculum is currently not possible, as our full-time faculty are already stretched too thin.

In the longer term, we have discussed taking a more comprehensive look at our overall curriculum. Is what we are doing working? Should we include more units? Should we bring back our correlated curriculum to allow students to take a more diverse array of courses without taking up seats in our already impacted courses?

Given these questions, an ad-hoc committee was formed to look at potential curriculum models.

They framed their conversations and conclusions around several important factors, including:

- The current structure of our major is 39 units, one of the lower unit majors in H&SS.
- As a low unit major, our students have an excess number of units remaining to meet the 120-requirement following the completion of GE. This can lead some students to take excess units in criminal justice. This pairs with the timeline when we last revised the major and reduced the number of units required. This makes it difficult for many of our students to secure the seats that they need in elective courses in order to move towards a timely graduation. It also narrows their educational experience, which may not serve them best when seeking opportunities for employment or graduate studies.
- Tenured faculty are often needed to meet the core requirements of the major, which limits their ability to offer courses at the 400 level. Our Division standards require faculty to have a Ph.D. or a terminal degree in the field in order to teach 400 level courses. Due to the lack of Ph.D. programs in the area, it is often difficult to find adjunct faculty that can teach courses at this level. While we have a good pool of lecturers, their practitioner experience in the field can limit them to specific topics (i.e. law, policing, corrections, etc.) in the curriculum.
- Given the state of recent events, we feel that students who are seeking career opportunities in criminal justice should be required to take courses in race and ethnic relations. While the introduction of GE Area F will help achieve this goal, we believe that a major specific course is also warranted.

- As a major component of the criminal justice system, we have not been able to offer a core course on criminal courts. This is a significant component of our criminal justice system that is missing from our curriculum for the majority of our students. Our current course is offered 1x a year as a service-learning elective course to a small population (<20 students) and could be more appropriate as a 400-level elective course.
- Recent changes to the GE package have made our major less diverse, as students can now count areas D1, D3 and Z within the major requirements. We believe that students should have a broader educational experience to best prepare them for their future careers as well as for their personal growth and development.
- Over the past 8 years, we have stressed the question of reducing our major population. Previous attempts to reduce students (including requiring prereqs or freezing admissions for transfer students) have had little to no effect. While there has been recent news about college-based admissions, it is unclear how this might work. Any reduction in the size of our major population without increasing our GE will likely mean a reduction in PTF positions based on our current SFR (which is one of the lowest in the college). There may be a small reduction in the demand for advising and grad checks.

The ad-hoc committee created three potential curriculum outcomes. The first options would add a required courts class, keep our law class CRJU 310 as a required course, and would add CRJU 385 as a required course. Students would have less options for electives and core faculty would be teaching more required courses than electives.

The second option would take law, policing, and corrections out of the core and they would be offered only as electives. CRJU 385 would be added as a required course as follows:

Core 15 units

CRJU 100, CRJU 300, CRJU 330, CRJU 340, CRJU 385

Writing Requirement 3 units

ENGL 301 or 365

Electives 21 units

Students can take any of them in whatever order

Former core courses (310, 315 and 345) would now be considered electives

Students would be required to take 9 units at the 400-level

Correlated 9/12 units

Waived for double majors or those with a minor

Select departments where students can take classes from (see proposal #1 for details)

9 units must be at the upper division level

Cross-listed units must either be electives or correlated - they cannot count for both

The third option would create a core curriculum of 15 units and a breadth requirement of 6 units. The breadth units would be comprised of policing, correction, law, and courts. CRJU 385 would be added as a required course as follows:

Core 15 units

CRJU 100, CRJU 300, CRJU 330, CRJU 340, CRJU 385

Breadth 6 units from

CRJU 304, CRJU 310, CRJU 315, CRJU 345

Electives 15 units

Students would be required to take 9 units at the 400-level
Students could take additional courses from the breadth requirement as electives

Writing 3 units

ENGL 301 or 365

Correlated 9/12 units

Waived for double majors or those with a minor
Select departments where students can take classes from.
9 units must be at the upper division level

Options two and three were detailed above as they were seen by the faculty as more viable than option one. In all three options, CRJU 385 becomes a required course and would necessitate a new, perhaps joint, hire with h AFAM/ASAM/CHIC to help meet the demand.

The faculty met in November of 2021 to discuss these three options and there was considerable debate. Several faculty members believe that the core curriculum should include police, courts, and corrections, with law becoming an elective. Others believe that the law course is an integral part of the core curriculum.

We put this to a non-binding vote simply to move the conversation along for the purposes of our program review, in hopes that our external reviews can provide input and offer clarity. Only a few faculty members responded via email. The general comments were mostly “some version of option 3”. However, a few people said “whatever version keeps 310 in the core”. One thing worth noting is that if we proceed with making courts a required course, or a breadth requirement, we would likely need to hire a tenure-track faculty member to help carry the load for the course.

- f. Include information on any Special Sessions self-support programs offered by the department/program.**

Historically, criminal justice offers 4-5 courses during the January intersession and approximately 10 courses during the summer session, depending on student demand. Sometimes these courses bring students seeking to complete a GE requirement. Each course offered during intersession or summer session is also offered during the regular academic year. Providing these course offerings helps students to complete their degrees more quickly. Bottlenecks during the regular academic year remain an ever-present and frustrating problem. These courses help to reduce this frustration and aid students in fulfilling their degree requirements. Students can also participate in Study Abroad or the DC Scholars Program during Special Sessions.

III. *Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes*

- a. Describe the department/program assessment plan (e.g., general approach, time table, etc.) and structure (e.g. committee, coordinator, etc.), and if applicable, how the plan and/or structure have changed since the last PPR.**

Educational effectiveness is of paramount importance to the department of Criminal Justice. We believe that our graduates can make a difference in their community so it is important that they know what we teach them in the classroom. Formal assessment of the program began in 2014. What we learned in these last seven years is that we must (1) continue to foster a departmental culture that values assessment and (2) update our assessment plan.

Assessment is currently done by one criminal justice faculty member who receives assigned time for one semester per academic year to complete the assessment of one SLO per academic year. The assessment work is mostly done at the beginning and/or end of the semester. The time commitment depends on the work that needs to be done for that calendar year. An annual update of the department's progress is posted in the AMS system in November.

We began program assessment in 2014, generating outcome reports on 1-2 SLOs per semester until 2017. We redesigned that assessment plan in the fall of 2017 in order to add a pretest-posttest design that was scheduled to be completed in the spring of 2023. In this second assessment plan, we sampled only certain courses that serves as markers for student populations. The CRJU-300 course is a required criminal justice fundamentals course that serves as a prerequisite or co-requisite for most other major courses and electives. These students are generally beginning their major studies and serve as our pretest population. Students in the CRJU-330 and CRJU-340 courses were chosen as our posttest population as these courses had an historically high proportion of seniors who are completing their major studies. Our sampling criteria removed seniors from the pre-test sample and sophomores and juniors from the posttest sample.

Table 1: Data collection for assessment: SLOs by time and course

SLOs	SLO Name	SEPT	MAY
------	----------	------	-----

2021/2022 Program Performance Review
Criminal Justice Department

		Course 300* (Pretest)	Courses 330 & 340+ (Posttest)
1	Concepts	2017-18	2020-21
2	Writing	2018-19	2021-22
3	Application	2019-20	2022-23

The assessment faculty member is not tasked with merely gathering completed assessment data from their colleagues. Since the department does not use embedded assessment measures to capture SLO1, the assessment person has to create and tweak an external instrument that is proctored in these relevant courses. In all assessment work, the assessment faculty member is in charge of evaluating student work. The first SLO pretest was measured through a multiple-choice test that was proctored by the professors teaching CRJU-300. The instrument was returned to the assessment faculty for processing. The test asked students 7-8 questions in each of the 7 areas of our core courses. The professors who taught the core courses selected the questions that were included on the instrument. SLOs 2 and 3 were assessed using embedded paper assignments from CRJU-300. The papers were evaluated using our assessment rubric by the assessment faculty member and a volunteer faculty member who served as a second reviewer. We use no indirect measures in our current assessment system.

We have completed three pretests to date in three academic years (AY2017-2018, AY2018-2019 and AY2019-2020). We were slated to begin the post-testing phase of assessment the following academic year, AY2020-2021. However, assessment has not been completed since the university moved to remote learning because of the pandemic in the spring of 2020.

- b. **For each degree program, provide the student learning outcomes (SLOs); describe the methods, direct or indirect, used to measure student learning; and summarize the assessment results of the SLOs.**

We have one degree program, an undergraduate degree (B.A.). Our SLOs are:

- Students are able to articulate key concepts and trends in crime, law and justice
- Students are able to write clearly, effectively and persuasively
- Students are able to apply various curricular constructs to criminal justice patterns, policies and practices

All assessment activities used direct methods and no post-test results are available because assessment was stopped when COVID began in the spring of 2020.

Commented [SG1]: This part was not completed (at least as I read it) in terms of describe methods, direct or indirect, and describe results. I added text to complete it. Please check to make sure this is good.

c. Describe whether and how assessment results have been used to improve teaching and learning practices, and/or overall departmental effectiveness. Please cite specific examples.

Since last review we sought to put in place an assessment system that gave us pretest-posttest data. Since we have not completed our posttests, we do not have any pretest-posttest data to present here. In truth, our assessment system is frustrating to those assigned to it, and despite the strides we have made in the last 6 years we still haven't figured out how to create *meaningful* assessment. And we did some things wrong in retrospect. We did not fully develop a departmental culture that valued assessment, we did not adopt fully embedded assessment measures, designed an assessment system around SLOs that may be too broad, and we failed to be reflective the assessment process.

Assessment is a difficult thing to do and it is made worse by a division-wide culture that is skeptical of it. When assessment was first proposed in 2013, faculty were concerned about the workload and how the data would be used. Specifically, they needed to be assured that it would not be used an individual-level evaluatory tool of their teaching performance. The assessment faculty member went through great lengths to eliminate identifying information on all the assessment materials. Faculty reaction may be understandable to a degree. There was some misunderstanding and rumors that spread about assessment at that time. It took time to get the point across to faculty that the purpose of assessment is to assess student learning (and not teaching effectiveness) and that it is a reflective tool (and not an evaluatory one) that gives us data to improve student learning. In truth, assessment is still marginalized in the program to an extent. But we believe that our faculty are now ready to move forward with working to improve our assessment system. So, while continuing to develop a departmental culture that values assessment, we have enough invested people in this area to work on an improved assessment system that captures meaningful data.

Early on in development the assessment system, the department determined that embedded assessments would be too difficult to do for the faculty teaching the assessment courses. Only three courses fell under the assessment system's umbrella and to only have these faculty doing all of the assessment work seemed inequitable and raises the possibility of bias as only a small number of professors would then evaluate the data. We sought to completely remove the faculty member from the equation by using a non-native and broad assessment instrument to measure SLO1 and external reviewers to evaluate SLO2 and SLO3. At the time it seemed like a good idea. In retrospect, it was problematic. All faculty need to be intimately involved in assessment for it to give us meaningful data. We now believe that gathering data about student learning must happen for all faculty in the department and we are moving to revise the assessment system that does that.

The department's assessment journey began in 2014 when we updated our SLOs. The department hired a number of new professors the 15 years prior who decided that a good place to start in the assessment process is with revising our SLOs. We recognized that the criminal justice major is

broad. Student not only learn about the systems of criminal justice (law enforcement, courts and corrections systems), they also learn about criminals, victims, theories and research from an interdisciplinary perspective. Furthermore, professors in our department specialize in criminology and criminal justice as it related to immigration, law, women, race, gangs, rehabilitation and drugs. Lastly, the classes in the major were taught as if they are discrete. We had few prerequisites in the major save CRJU 100 and CRJU 300. Students were advised to take the core courses their junior year and the electives their senior year but we regularly saw students taking courses in whatever order they could get them. So, when rewriting SLOs in 2017, the department specifically chose to broaden their scope to cover our interdisciplinary differences rather than try to agree on standardized knowledge. We also sought to reduce the number of SLOs to make assessment easier since we were just starting the process. In retrospect, the SLOs may be overly broad. Perhaps by simplifying the assessment process we sacrificed important departmental conversations about standardized base knowledge for our graduates. Second, three SLOs is rather small for an undergraduate program. Most undergraduate programs at the university have 5 or more. Third, the most difficult actionable SLO we have is to *apply* criminal justice concepts. Shouldn't we be asking our students to produce work that is more substantial like analyze, evaluate and create? And fourth, our current SLOs poorly align with the university learning outcomes (ULOs).

Overall, our assessment process has perhaps informally changed what we do but we have no formal reflective process in the department as evidence of it. The assessment person completes the review of the SLO, documents the findings, adds it to the AMS system and emails the results to faculty. We have no departmental process for discussing the findings. Again, the work is lone and marginalized.

Recently an ad hoc assessment committee was formed to create a more meaningful assessment system for the department. Our mission is to make sure that we assess the educational effectiveness of the entire criminal justice department. In order to do this, all faculty must be involved in the process and student learning must be the focus of our efforts. We have done a significant amount of work to prepare for this. First, we modified and, in some cases, almost re-wrote the CLOs for all of our core classes in order to provide a benchmark of knowledge and skills for our graduates. This was a great feat because as of 7 years ago, our CLOs were unknown and outdated and certainly not listed on course syllabi as they are now. Second, with a departmental culture that is becoming more accepting of assessment, we can bring the evaluation piece of assessment to the individual faculty member.

We propose to decentralize the department's assessment system where faculty directly test the CLOs for their courses as described by our departmental curriculum map. The faculty member then submits their CLO assessment sheet to the designated assessment faculty member. S/he aggregates the CLO data to describe student learning for the program, meets with faculty about the results and posts it to the AMS system once a year. We argue that this system provides two feedback loops or reflection points where none existed before. First, the individual faculty member gets to test their CLOs in their class using native or embedded instruments that provide for them immediate

feedback about student learning. In other words, if a CLO was not met by the students for whatever reason, it can be reflected upon by the faculty member who then has the option to re-visit that content or skill later that semester or think of how to make changes in the next semester. The second feedback loop happens at the department level when reviewing the SLO data. We anticipate benchmarks of 75% or “satisfactory” ratings in this system.

We have more groundwork to lay before we implement this system. First, we may want to revise our SLOs. Second, the curriculum map and assessment grid need to reflect the new SLOs and new processes. Third, we must create the assessment plan that gets disseminated to all faculty so they know exactly what they shall do and when they shall do it. With a decentralized assessment system, one faculty member can continue to receive one semester of assigned time (say in the fall) and complete the work for the year as it will be much more manageable than it is currently.

The exact parameters of our new assessment system can only come from more conversations at the department level. We hope to have the groundwork done in the next academic year (AY 21-22) and the new assessment system live in the following academic year (AY 22-23).

In addition to the departmental level assessment protocol in place, we also administer Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs) at the end of every course. The SOQ asks a series of 11 questions measured on a scale of 0-4. Our tenure and promotion standards require an average of 3.0 or higher for tenure. Aggregate SOQ data were collected for item 11, “Overall, how would you rate this professor’s performance?” and the overall aggregate mean score for the department by semester since 2014. Consistently, professors are being rated well above 3.0 with the average for Item 11 at 3.62 and the average overall score as 3.60.

d. Describe other quality indicators identified by the department/program as evidence of effectiveness/success other than student learning outcomes (e.g. graduation rate, number of students attending graduate or professional school, job placement rates, etc.).

The faculty are in agreement that it is important to look beyond 4- and 5-year graduation rates. Two points are worth noting. Students graduation in 7 or 8 years are students who are still graduating. These numbers are often overlooked, but do indicate success. Secondly, much of what happens in the job market is beyond our control. If (and when) students leave our program and campus for well paying jobs in the community prior to graduation, we might still look at what goals they did achieve as students and how those achievements impacted their employment in the community. We often think of students leaving our program as a retention failure, but perhaps it is worth thinking of students who successfully land well paying jobs in the community prior to graduation as successful.

e. Many department/programs are offering courses and programs via technology (e.g., online, etc.) or at off-campus sites and in compressed schedules. How is student learning assessed in these formats/modalities?

We offer several courses in an online or hybrid format. There is no special or different assessment methods for these formats/modalities.

IV. Faculty

- a. Describe changes since the last program review in the full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) allocated to the department or program. Include information on tenured and tenure track faculty lines (e.g. new hires, retirements, FERP's, resignations), and how these changes may have affected the program/department's academic offerings. Describe tenure density in the program/department and the distribution among academic rank (assistant, associate, professor) [see instructions, Appendix C]. Attach faculty vitae (see Appendix D).**

Since the 2013 PPR, the CJ Department has had two retirements, Dr. Jill Rosenbaum and Dr. Kevin Meehan. During that same time period the department hired four tenure-track faculty members: Dr. Phillip Kopp, Dr. Veronica Herrera, Dr. Lidia Nuño, and Dr. Alissa Ackerman. We have essentially replaced two lines and added two lines. In the 2019-2020 AY we had a failed search.

All four of our recent hires are now tenured. This means that the entire full-time faculty is distributed among full professors and associate professors. We currently have 8 full professors and 6 associate professors. We are in dire need of additional faculty lines to support the number of students in our major.

Table 9 data were provided by IRAS at the division level. We recreated it at the department level. Our current FTEF (which includes part time faculty appointments) is 20. At the start of data in this PPR (2016) the ratio of FTES to FTEF was approximately 51.6. That ratio now stands at 57.2, an increase of 11% increase. In plain English, our student population continues to grow and we need our faculty lines and resources to grow at a commensurate pace. That said, we do not want to grow beyond a few more faculty lines. This suggests a need to slow our program's growth. It is unclear whether the move toward college-based admissions will help or hinder this.

- b. Describe priorities for additional faculty hires. Explain how these priorities and future hiring plans relate to relevant changes in the discipline, the career objectives of students, the planning of the university, and regional, national, or global developments.**

Generally speaking, it is crucial that we hire new faculty simply to meet the demands of our large major. More importantly, however, new faculty hires will help us meet the demands of changing discipline. Over the last decade, the discipline as a whole has undergone a shift in terms of how we approach our understanding of criminal justice systems and the disparate impacts these systems have on non-white people. In other words, the field has shifted toward a more critical and nuanced approach to teaching and scholarship on criminal justice related topics.

This shift has required departments like ours to think, not only about our forward facing values, but also about our interactions toward one another and toward our students. However, while we may take a more critical approach to the study of criminal justice more generally, we do not always recognize the ways in which our language, actions (and inactions), and course materials may still negatively impact our students.

During that same period, the discipline has become far more competitive in terms of hiring, tenure and promotion standards and scholarly output.

It is with these changes in mind that we consider priorities for new faculty hires. New hires must reflect the students we teach. Searches could remain open as far as specialization. What is most critical is that students see themselves in the faculty who teach them. Currently, that is not the case. If it is our desire to make CRJU 385 a required course, it would behoove us to hire additional faculty who can teach this course as it is intended to be taught.

- c. Describe the role of full-time or part-time faculty and student assistants in the program/department's curriculum and academic offerings. Indicate the number and percentage of courses taught by part-time faculty and student teaching assistants. Identify any parts of the curriculum that are the responsibility of part-time faculty or teaching assistants.**

In Fall 2020, we had 74 sections. 37 were taught by tenure/tenure-track, and 37 by adjuncts. Some of those sections were "K2" sections, worth 6 WTUs—the equivalent of teaching two "normal" classes. Counting that way, we had 77 sections, 39 taught by T/TT and 38 by adjuncts. The T/TT faculty are teaching a total of 1277 students, and the adjuncts have 1448.

In Fall 2021, we have a higher-than-normal number of adjunct-taught sections, though. Between leaves and buyouts, there are 5 sections being taught by adjuncts that normally would have been taught by T/TT faculty normally.

We have instituted a policy that 400 level courses must be taught by individuals with a PhD. As such, many of our adjuncts cannot teach our 400 level elective courses.

- d. Include information on instructor participation in Special Sessions self-support programs offered by the department/program.**

Historically, criminal justice offers 4-5 courses during the January intersession and approximately 10 courses during the summer session, depending on student demand. Tenure-track and tenured faculty teach these courses. All faculty are offered the opportunity to teach one course before anyone is offered a second course.

V. Student Support and Advising

a. Briefly describe how the department advises its majors, minors, and graduate students.

Two faculty members, the Division Advising Office and the College Student Success Center currently offer academic advisement to the roughly 1,300 majors in the Criminal Justice Department. These advisors assist our majors with a variety of advising tasks including but not limited to general information about the major, detailed academic planning, TDA exceptions, how to read a TDA, semester credit extensions (>18), repeat course permits, graduation checks, changing catalog years, questions about graduation and how to declare the CJ major.

The faculty members who serve as advisors in the semester take one of two roles as a Major Advisor or a Probation Advisor. The Major Advisor meets with students about 3 hours a week and answers student emails about 2 hours a week. In total, the advisor serves about 100-120 students in a semester. We currently have **one (1)** major advisor and **one (1)** probation advisor. This is completely inadequate given the number of students we serve.

Other faculty members pitch in during “crunch times” at the beginning and end of each semester to assist with major advising and to complete graduation checks. We complete over 100 graduation checks each semester, which requires the program coordinator, SSI coordinator, division chair, and others to pitch in time to complete these.

The department also heavily relies on the Division Advising Office staffed by graduate students from the departments of Political Science and Public Administration to advise our students. The office is available for a mixture of walk-in and online advising by appointment for 20 total hours per week during the semesters and about 80-100 hours over the summer. This office sees students in all programs of the division and is specifically created to help students with academic planning and declaring the major.

Current advisors wish that the department had more and better training for faculty and more structure to the advising process itself so they have guides to help them make advising decisions. Academic advising in the department is currently a learn-the-job experience and new advisors rely on current and former advisors on an informal basis for help. Lastly, advisors current and past lament at the lack of getting to know students during the advising process. They are so busy “checking boxes” and moving to the next student that very little time is available to get to know students, find out how their classes are going, talk about their interests to help them find appropriate courses and assist them with career counseling. Our current advisors estimate that 10% of their time is spent with students discussing potential career options. We would like to see that proportion increase.

Our advising is almost exclusively reactive in nature. In an ideal world, proactive advising in this department would mean that every major would meet with an academic advisor once a year, likely in

the spring semester before fall registration, in order to prepare their schedules for the next academic year. Using a more holistic approach, advisors could talk to their students about their academic experiences this far, available resources such as university and department clubs, their academic plans, a variety of internships, and their career interests. If done right, such close attention to student progress would render the graduation check almost perfunctory. But it is simply not possible to do with our large population of majors and comparatively limited resources. Given this reality, we believe that we have a good deal of online and face-to-face presence to serve our students' immediate needs. As the department continues to think of ways to continue to develop proactive advising, we our eyes on (1) better communicating with our students about our existing advising resources, (2) adding strategic interventions that target the specific students who need it and when they need it, (3) redistributing the grad checks.

b. Describe opportunities for students to participate in departmental honors programs, undergraduate or graduate research, collaborative research with faculty, service learning, internships, etc. How are these opportunities supported? List the faculty and students participating in each type of activity and indicate plans for the future.

There are unique and varied opportunities within which our students can participate. The Department of Criminal Justice offers two student clubs, including the Criminal Justice Student Association, which is currently co-directed by Drs. Christie Gardiner and Phil Kopp. Dr. Veronica Herrera is the faculty advisor to Alpha Phi Sigma, the Criminal Justice Honor's Society. Dr. Rob Castro is the advisor to the Pre-Law Society.

Students also have opportunities to participate in our internship course, which seats up to 20 students a semester. Dr. Georgia Spiropoulos is currently the CJ Internship coordinator. Criminal Justice students have had the opportunity to participate in several study abroad opportunities, including Australia (Dr. Stacy Mallicoat), South Africa (Dr. Jarret Lovell), and at the U.S. Mexico Border (Dr. Rob Castro). Both the Australia and South Africa Study Abroad courses are also service-learning courses. Two additional courses – our Courts Class (CRJU 304) and Policing the City (CRJU 415) – are service-learning courses. Dr. Pam Fiber-Ostrow runs the PAJ Moot Court Program, which CJ students can participate in.

While the department itself does not offer an Honor's Thesis option, criminal justice students who are in the university wide honor's program often seek out CJ faculty to oversee these projects. Drs. Nuño, Lovell, Kopp, Herrera, Gardiner and Ackerman have most recently been faculty advisors for honor's projects. Dr. Herrera has also supervised an undergraduate McNair Thesis.

In addition to Honor's Projects, students in the criminal justice major have the opportunity to enroll in CRJU 499, our independent study option. In the time since our last PPR, we have collectively served 73 students in independent studies. Students also have opportunities to serve as research

assistants to faculty and to write published chapters and peer-reviewed articles. For example, Professor Dery published an article with a student in 2015. Dr. Gardiner published with a student in 2017 and 2 additional publications forthcoming. Dr. Nuño published with a student in 2019 and with another student in 2021. Dr. Foust wrote a publication with a student who preferred to an acknowledgement highlighting her work order authorship.

It is obvious that faculty in the criminal justice department are generous with their already depleted time. We seek to support students to the best of our ability, often going beyond the requirements set forth in our retention and promotion documents simply because we know our students benefit. In a few instances, student research assistants are supported via faculty grant funding. Faculty offer independent studies simply by their good will. There is no monetary incentive to support faculty who work with students on an individual basis.

VI. Resources and facilities

- a. Itemize the state support and non-state support resources received by the program/department during the last five years (See instructions, Appendix E).**

As criminal justice is part of a larger division, it is difficult to tease out the budget specific to our department. The most relevant line items include our operating expenses (including faculty travel) and professional development. Our operating expenses budget has remained relatively stable over the last five years, as has professional development. In the 2020-2021 AY our state support budget was decreased due to an overall reduction in state allocation due to budget reduction. As a division we remain in dire need of additional staff support.

- b. Identify any special facilities/equipment used by the program/department such as laboratories, computers, large classrooms, or performance spaces. Identify changes over the last five years and prioritize needs for the future.**

In 2021-22, PAJ's enrollment target was 1282.38 FTES. This translates into approximately 6412 physical seats occupied per semester. However, a large component of these assignments is due to the large GE presence for POSC 100, so the targets for CRJU alone are 506.88 FTES (2535 physical seats per semester). CRJU makes up approximately 40% of the Division's overall target; we can approximate the overall Division major target by subtracting out the approximately 400 FTES for POSC 100, yielding a demand in the Division for enough seats for 882.38 FTES (4412 physical seats).

The overall Division target is relevant in that classrooms are allocated to the Division as a whole, and not specifically to the Criminal Justice Department. The Division is allocated the following rooms:

Room	Capacity
Gordon Hall 305	38

Langsdorf Hall 401	44	
Langsdorf Hall 401A	45	
Gordon Hall 248	57	
McCarthy Hall 406	39	Only on MWF

In addition, the Division has first rights to a number of larger classrooms; however, in practice, the need for these rooms for our POSC 100 classes leaves CRJU effectively 1-2 timeslots per week in rooms that can seat 100 students.

If these classrooms were filled to their capacity, that would be 3763 physical seats per semester. However, our pedagogically-determined enrollment caps are 50 for large introductory courses, 45 for most core classes, 40 for 300-level electives, 35 for 400-level electives and CRJU 330, and 30 for CRJU 340. Similar numbers are used for POSC courses. Thus, these room capacities are best thought of as 35, 45, or 50, yielding a somewhat smaller capacity of 3547 seats for all Division major courses. As noted above, we are budgeted to teach students that would take up 4412 physical seats per semester. Thus, the Division is asked to teach 25% more students than we have seats to possibly teach.

A previous analysis of classroom ownership in the Political Science/Public Administration PPR noted this problem. Additional rooms, particularly 50% of McCarthy 406 and larger rooms for large GE courses, were then allocated to the Division, for which we are grateful. However, at the same time, we were instructed to reduce enrollment caps in those large courses from 215 to 120, nearly doubling our need for these large rooms and effectively sucking up all of those new large room allocations we received. Since that time, our programs (and, in particular, Criminal Justice) have grown, but our room allocation has remained fixed. This means the Division must spend significant staff and chair/vice-chair/coordinator time each semester scrambling and begging for class space to meet our needs. In addition to the time (and thus money) spent doing this, it also reduces the ability to schedule based upon student and faculty needs. Scheduling is often based on room availability instead of faculty preferences and student needs. In comparison, other departments have total room capacity of almost twice their FTES target. While we are thankful to the Dean's Office for working out an arrangement to get us the use of an additional half-classroom (we get first rights to the room on MWF only), given the massive size of Criminal Justice, we are constantly having to remake the schedule and offer classes at inopportune times. In addition, the emergence of online course offerings, while somewhat reducing the pressure on our classroom, has also reduced the demand from students for classes in the early morning (anything before 10am) and nighttime (in particular) classes. At this moment, our Spring 2022 schedule has 199 students on waitlists for Criminal Justice courses, while simultaneously there are 123 open seats in courses at night or in the early morning. (At the time of writing, not all incoming transfer students have registered, as well as there being a few straggler continuing students) Our students are putting themselves on waitlists rather than taking our nighttime offerings, which are largely being offered only because there are few times we can book rooms in the core 10am-4pm timeslots. In short, we would characterize the Division's need for additional classrooms to be critical.

- c. **Describe the current library resources for the program/department, the priorities for acquisitions over the next five years and any specialized needs such as collections, databases, etc.**

Our library resources are acceptable. However, there has been specific asks for the library to acquire *The Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *The Oxford Policing Journal* and *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*.

VII. Long-term Plans

- a. **Summarize the unit's long-term plan, including refining the definitions of the goals and strategies in terms of indicators of quality and measures of productivity (see instructions, Appendix F).**

Developing long-term goals for this department is difficult to do because of many of the issues outlined throughout this PPR. Much of why this is difficult is because of issues that are beyond conventional metrics provided within the appendices. Our faculty are stretched so thin and burnt out because of the burdens placed on us, that our utmost concern must be on the health and well-being of the faculty.

As part of the larger Division of PAJ, some members of the faculty, including part-time lecturers, receive the help of a graduate assistant. However, none of the CJ faculty are offered this help, except in cases where faculty teach 100 students in a section. This is not the case in other departments in the division and contributes to the feeling that we are undervalued as faculty members in this division.

Asking us to strategize around goals for productivity devalues our well-being, given that we do not have the resources available to us to successfully engage in scholarship or meaningful service. The lack of support at the institutional level is not available to us to assist us in making any meaningful contributions to teaching, service, or scholarly productivity.

- b. **Develop a long-term budget plan in association with the goals and strategies and their effectiveness indicators. What internal reallocations may be appropriate? What new funding may be requested over the next seven years?**

The Criminal Justice Department offers opportunities for growth for the College and the University. To this end, our long-term budget plan addresses two distinct but important needs. The first is budgeting for faculty lines. We have always found that the quality of the adjunct pool is uneven. For example, we will almost always be able to staff law classes with quality adjuncts. However, this is not the case for courses like Policing or Corrections. With more faculty, especially faculty with whom our students can identify, we can continue to grow. It is important to note that the sheer size of the

division and PS 100 component gives us an internal flexibility to be able to lead with a CJ hire that will raise our TT density slightly higher than the university may want because we have an internal cushion within the division.

Similarly, in order to have an outward facing presence, it would be beneficial to our department and to the division as a whole to have a staff member whose focus was on community engagement and involvement. The roles and responsibilities of this staff person would include social media, webpage updating and maintenance, support for faculty and program-led events. Growing our presence in the community is an asset.

APPENDIX A. UNDEGRUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

Table 1. Undergraduate Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments			
Table 1-A. First-Time Freshmen: Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments			
Fall	# Applied	# Admitted	# Enrolled
2016	2,139	579	152
2017	2,307	614	168
2018	2,590	623	160
2019	2,511	861	202
2020	2,312	1,136	259

Table 1-B. Upper-Division Transfers: Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments			
Fall	# Applied	# Admitted	# Enrolled
2016	1,037	379	176
2017	1,060	252	134
2018	1,064	285	114
2019	1,130	389	156
2020	1,179	607	196

Table 2-A. Undergraduate Program Enrollment by Course-Based FTEs			
Academic Year (Annualized)	Enrollment in FTEs		
	Lower-Division FTEs*	Upper-Division FTEs**	Total FTEs
2016-2017	58.0	459.5	517.5

2021/2022 Program Performance Review
Criminal Justice Department

2017-2018	42.8	478.0	520.8
2018-2019	40.8	509.9	550.7
2019-2020	44.3	512.8	557.1
2020-2021	55.0	500.0	555.0
* All students' FTES enrolled in lower-division courses of the program, regardless of student major.			
** All students' FTES enrolled in upper-division courses of the program, regardless of student major.			

Table 2-B. Undergraduate Program Enrollment (Headcount & FTES by Major Only)							
Academic Year (Annualized)	Majors						
	Lower-Division		Upper-Division		Total		
	Headcount	FTES*	Headcount	FTES**	Headcount	FTES***	FTES per Headcount
2016-2017	376	324.6	855	671.8	1,230	996.4	0.81
2017-2018	372	330.4	833	669.6	1,204	999.9	0.83
2018-2019	365	327.4	825	662.2	1,190	989.6	0.83
2019-2020	402	368.3	873	715.9	1,275	1,084.1	0.85
2020-2021	458	423.4	889	720.1	1,347	1,143.5	0.85
*FTES of the lower division students who are majoring in the program.							
**FTES of the upper division students who are majoring in the program.							
***FTES of all students who are majoring in the program.							

Table 3. Graduation Rates for Degree Program						
Table 3-A. First-Time, Full-Time Freshmen Graduation Rates						
Entered in Fall	Cohort	% Graduated			Equity Gap*	
		In 4 Years	In 5 Years	In 6 Years	By Pell Status	By UR Status
2013	176	22.2%	56.8%	67.0%	-5.5%	-6.5%
2014	163	23.9%	50.3%	59.5%	4.4%	-4.6%
2015	179	26.8%	60.9%	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016	145	30.3%	60.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
2017	163	39.9%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Note: Equity gap is calculated as the percentage point difference in six-year graduation rates between two sub-populations of each cohort year (e.g., 2013 non-UR six-year graduation rate – 2013 UR six-year graduation rate). Please consider cohort sizes when interpreting the equity gap data.*

***Note: Data will be available Fall 2021*

Entered in Fall	Cohort	% Graduated		
		In 2 Years	In 3 Years	In 4 Years
2015	157	49.0%	77.1%	80.9%
2016	177	44.1%	71.8%	78.5%
2017	136	44.1%	69.9%	N/A
2018	115	47.0%	70.4%	N/A
2019	158	41.8%	N/A	N/A

**Note: Data will be available Fall 2021*

APPENDIX B. GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

N/A

APPENDIX C. FACULTY

Table 9. Full-Time Instructional Faculty, FTEF, FTES, SFR

Table 9. Faculty Composition

Fall	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Sabbaticals at 0.5	FERP at 0.5	Full-Time Lecturers	Actual FTEF
2016	25	8	0.5	1.0	2	34.5
2017	25	9	0.5	0.5	3	37.0
2018	23	9	0.0	0.0	4	36.0
2019	23	9	0.0	0.0	6	38.0
2020	23	9	0.0	0.0	7	39.0

**Headcount of tenured, tenure-track, sabbaticals at 0.5, and FERP at 0.5 includes full-time and part-time faculty.*

Headcount of lecturers only includes full-time faculty.

Table 9. Faculty Composition CJ ONLY

Fall	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Sabbaticals at 0.5	FERP at 0.5	Full-Time Lecturers	Fall
2016	10	3	1	1.0	1	19.3
2017	10	5	4	0.0	1	22.4
2018	10	5	0.0	0.0	1	20.6
2019	10	4	0.0	0.0	1	19.8
2020	10	4	0.0	0.0	1	20.0

* Includes PTF appointments

APPENDIX D. FACULTY CURRICULUM VITAE

APPENDIX E. RESOURCES

Table 10. Provide a table showing for the past five years all department resources and the extent to which each is from the state-supported budget or from other sources, such as self-support programs, research, contracts and/or grants, development, fund-raising, or any other sources or activities.

Year	State OE (Including Travel) (1)	Student Assistants (1)	Professional Development (1)	Total State Support	CSFPF Accounts (2)	Comments
AY 20/21	\$35,860	\$-	\$16,000	\$51,860	\$87,621	Reduction in state allocation due to budget reduction
AY 19/20	\$55,000	\$22,000	\$19,500	\$96,500	\$69,435	
AY 18/19	\$55,000	\$11,500	\$19,500	\$86,000	\$62,295	
AY 17/18	\$55,000	\$10,750	\$21,000	\$86,750	\$52,979	
AY 16/17	\$51,517	\$10,250	\$20,100	\$81,867	\$30,554	
(1) Fiscal year allocations						
(2) Balance as of June 30 th of FY						

APPENDIX F. LONG-TERM PLANNING

See Section VII for why this Appendix is not completed.