

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Criminal Justice Minor, 2011-2012**

Date: Tuesday, April 17, 2012

Time: 4 – 5 p.m.

Place: White Hall Room 6C

Attending: Provost Beverly Kopper; Dean Mary Pinkerton; Department Chair Larry Neuman; Program Coordinator Marvin Free; faculty Ron Berger, Greg Jeffers, & Paul Gregory; Audit & Review Chair Greg Cook; Audit & Review team members Jonathan Ivry & David Nordstrom.

- 1) Call to order & introductions.
- 2) From the Program:
 - a) Dr. Free discussed the main strengths of the Criminal Justice program, including the flexibility of the minor and the emphasis areas that allows students to pursue their educational and career goals.
 - b) The group discussed areas to improve, e.g., potentially identifying a set of required courses to represent the core of the minor.
- 3) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) Enrollment: Dr. Free reported that the minor currently has 101 students officially enrolled, and the Criminal Justice emphasis in the Sociology major has 350 students. Combined, this yields 451 students in Criminal Justice. The group discussed staffing pressures, including the difficulty of staffing any courses that would be required for all of these students.
 - b) Curriculum: There is only one course (Soc. 276) that is required in this minor. The group discussed the desire to assure that all students achieve the learning outcomes (knowledge and skills) expected for this minor, but staffing remains an issue. Students currently have considerable flexibility in the minor with options to choose among several courses in each curricular category. This helps to distribute the enrollment load across a wider array of courses.
 - c) Faculty Diversity: Dr. Free discussed the difficulty of attracting minority candidates to faculty positions in this program—difficult to compete with salaries and teaching loads at other campuses.
 - d) Mission Statement: A mission statement is needed to communicate the purpose and value of the minor. Does the program have a mission beyond offering the minor? For example, do the faculty see a “mission” related to serving the community and campus, related to criminal justice issues?
 - e) Vision: A vision statement is needed to communicate where the program wants to go and what it aspires to become over the next 5-10 years. This vision should inform annual improvement goals for the program. The group discussed the difference between a mission statement and a vision statement.

- f) Program goals and evaluation: The group discussed how the program can improve develop a systematic process for involving faculty, staff, students, alumni, employers and other stakeholders in setting annual or regular goals for improvement in this program.
- g) Assessment of student learning (see Recommended Action #4 below): The group discussed strategies for assessing student learning, including the elements in the recommended action from the evaluation report.
- 4) **Recommended Actions**: 4 are listed in the evaluation report (see below), to support continued improvement.
- 5) **Recommended Result**: Continue with major concerns.
 - Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
 - Annual reports are required that explain progress toward meeting the recommended actions. Reports are due to the Dean and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by Oct. 1 of 2013, 2014, & 2015.
 - Next full self-study will be due in October, 2016.
- 6) Adjourned.

Review Team Summary
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2011-2012
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Program Criminal Justice Major _____ Minor X

Reviews submitted by: Paul Ambrose, Jonathan Ivry, David Nordstrom, Roger Yin, Greg Cook
Review meeting attended by: Paul Ambrose, Jonathan Ivry, David Nordstrom, Greg Cook

I. Program Purpose & Overview

A. Centrality

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.		1	4
2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.		1	4
3. The program has been responsive to actions recommended		5	

from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.			
---	--	--	--

Comments:

1. A number of general education and diversity courses are offered, related to this program.
2. The enrollment of the Criminal Justice Program is growing – is the number of minors showing a satisfactory trend?
3. Why is question (a) page 5 not relevant to the forensic documentation course page 6? [This is a question about alignment of courses to learning outcomes.]
4. CJ is a career-oriented minor. Due to it’s interdisciplinary nature (relying on many course outside the department), it is difficult to coordinate and administer the minor, and it is a challenge to assess student learning at the program level.
5. A graduate exit survey with specific objectives mapped into various courses was formed and conducted. Is direct assessment of student learning also occurring? Understandably, this is not an easy task with the sheer number of courses offered for this minor.
6. The self-study does not explain how the program addressed Recommended Action #2 from the previous Audit & Review evaluation (gather information from graduates, employers, and the advisory board; use this information to close the loop).
7. As recommended previously, it would be helpful to have an active Advisory Board consisting of employers and alumni to inform improvement of the program – it is important to have external stakeholders to help in the process of “closing the loop.”
8. Program needs a stronger assessment strategy, involving direct measures and linking assessment to specific student learning outcomes.

B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. The program’s mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.	5		
2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.	1	4	
3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, and/making decisions about changes to the program goals.	3	2	
4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a “vision” for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.	5		
5. The program achieved or maintained accreditation (if applicable) and/or earned recognition or awards.	N/A		

Comments:

1. This minor is housed in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminal Justice and does not have a mission statement that is separate from the department statement. Does this minor perceive itself as a “program” that would have a mission? Does it aspire to be anything other than an academic minor (it might not). A mission statement is still needed.

2. The preamble to the student learning outcomes listed on p. 62 is a start to a mission statement for this minor. A well-crafted mission statement can communicate the purpose and value of the minor, e.g., is the purpose more vocational?
3. Goals listed in the self-study seem rather ad hoc—more of a list of what was achieved rather than a list of the goals they aimed to achieve.
4. A systematic process is needed for establishing program goals. It does not appear that the minor has a process for setting program goals and monitoring progress. What is the intentional process for working toward improvement?
5. Some attention to “vision” is necessary even if there are no immediate plans to modify the minor. Having a vision helps to prevent programs from stagnating and helps to keep the program current with changing trends in society and academe.
6. Puzzled why page 8 mentions TWO minors, criminal justice and forensics. Which one is part of this review?
7. What drives the direction of this minor: student demand or faculty interests and need?
8. There is no mention of recognitions or awards related to the program.

II. Assessment: Curriculum & the Assessment of Students' Learning

A. Curriculum

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).			5
2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA.	NA		
3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.	3 2-missing		
4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.		4	1
5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable).		4	1

Comments:

1. This is a 24-credit minor with one required course (Soc 276).
2. There are no dual-listed courses in the minor.
3. Curriculum has a broad range of course offerings. Might consider reaching out to History or Languages and Literature departments to encourage new courses on criminality from a historical or literary perspective.
4. There is no evidence that performance-based assessment data feed back into curricular revision actions.
5. There were no curricular changes in the minor during the review period.

6. Out-of-class opportunities include undergraduate research, independent study, internships, field trips, and speakers from off campus. It would help to demonstrate the extent to which students are involved in these various opportunities.
7. The intern visit report is expertly authored with a lot of careful thoughts going into the writing by the faculty intern supervisor (listed in Appendix E).
8. How typical are internships? Can these opportunities be extended to all minors? Please provide the percentage of minors who intern.
9. Online courses don't appear to require any evaluation other than the typical end-of-course student evaluations. The program should consider Quality Matters or other methods for assuring quality of online learning.

B. Assessment of Student Learning

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. The program has clearly articulated learning outcomes for students; courses are “mapped” to these learning outcomes; and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period.	1	4	
2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.		4	1
3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students’ progress in attaining the outcomes.	4	1	
4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.	4	1	
5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students’ learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.	4	1	
6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.	5		

Comments:

1. Four student learning outcomes are listed in Appendix D (p. 62), and outcomes are mapped to courses.
2. The learning outcomes (p. 62) need to be revised to communicate what students should know and be able to do. Currently, the focus is solely on knowledge: “an understanding of”, “a familiarity of” and don't really reflect what the students can do with their learning. It would help to consider the skills that students should develop, including the baccalaureate learning skills included in the LEAP essential learning outcomes.
3. The self-study does not indicate which learning outcomes received specific attention during the review period.
4. The map aligning the learning outcomes to the LEAP outcomes is not very helpful. Try mapping your outcomes to the bullet-point list of ELOs (a template was available for this purpose).
5. The assessment plan does not seem to be well connected to the listed student learning outcomes. Grades and student evaluations are not useful for this purpose.

6. In addition to student self-assessment and exit survey, with the learning objectives for each course clearly delineated and mapped, it is highly recommended that the program develop a list of traits/course activities and metrics/measures related to learning outcomes.
7. Student learning outcomes are included in the department's exit survey (good), but the question asks students how much the minor helped them acquire an understanding of the learning outcomes. For assessment purposes, we are more interested in the degree to which students achieve the learning expected in the minor. A revision would help here.
8. The self-study does not explain how assessment data are discussed or used in the minor. The self-study offers the argument that the faculty do not have adequate time to spend on assessment. I suggest that they explore assessment methods that are as efficient as possible. Assessment is required for every academic program.
9. What is the assessment plan for the required course (Soc 276)?
10. Exit survey may be a useful tool but it should not be the primary source of data. Direct measures are needed.
11. Assessment data are not shared with stakeholders.
12. P. 23 details the obstacles faculty face in conducting meaningful assessment. The program needs to work with the department, college, and director of assessment to solve this problem so that assessment happens.
13. How is the forensic documentation course (page 62, table 2) not related to learning objective (1)?
14. In learning obj (3) (page 62 table 1), is "diversity" shorthand for race and ethnicity?
15. Has the adjunct burden (page 23) been reported and discussed with the dean? Ditto for the minimal release time for the program coordinator?
16. Please clarify how the estimates of student proficiency by course (page 16) were derived.
17. Add the number of interns that the data represent.

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation

A. Trend Data

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1-2. Five-year enrollments and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.		1	4
3. [Majors Only] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years [A & C, CoBE, L & S], or reasonably efficiently [COE].	NA		
4-5. [Majors Only] Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.	NA		
6. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.		2	3
7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.		4	1

Comments:

1. The self-study raises the question as to whether staffing needs for the minor are being sufficiently met given faculty members' other responsibilities to the larger department and to Gen Ed.
2. Enrollment appears relatively stable, varying from 51 to 75 minors during the review period.
3. Why did the enrollment dip in 2008, 2009?
4. Self-study states that resources are stretched to capacity with the current enrollment of 75 minors. How would the department handle any further increase?
5. More strategic recruitment is needed to attract more diverse and female faculty.
6. Since criminal justice is the most popular emphasis or minor offered by the Department, please add the total no. of offered emphases or minors.

B. Demand for Graduates

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.	1	3	1
2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.	1	3	
3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.	5		

Comments:

1. Do any alumni go on to law school, where they could become prosecutors, public defenders, paralegal aids, or other workers?
2. Justify why criterion 2 is "not applicable".
3. Placement data are not provided.
4. Bureau of Labor Statistics projects a 20% increase in placement opportunities in criminal justice.
5. The program does not have a system for tracking graduates. Why is the program not tracking any of its alumni?
6. It is imperative to perform alumni/graduate placement surveys and perhaps invite a number of alumni or the program to join the Advisory Board.

C. Comparative Advantage(s)

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs—giving it a competitive edge.	2	1	1

Comments:

1. What are the competing programs?
2. Flexibility in course options is the only advantage listed for the program. How does this minor compare to majors and minors at other area campuses?
3. What is known about the growth and assessment of those programs? Do they allow their students more, less, or same flexibility of course selection that UWW does?
4. Can the faculty discuss the pros and cons of its philosophy of letting students design their minor from a large list of courses?

IV. Resource Availability & Development**A. Faculty Characteristics**

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.).		1	4
2. Information is provided about the courses for which faculty and staff are responsible or usually teach.	2		3
3. Context is clear for understanding the expectations regarding faculty and staff support of the program.	2	1	1
4-5. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.	1	2	1

Comments:

1. The sex ratio of the program faculty—1 woman, 8 men—is a concern.
2. The faculty and staff listed on p. 28 are all white. Work is needed here to increase diversity.
3. The context for expectations is missing.
4. It is appropriate to include the research activities of faculty, such as Prof Salem, who retired near the end of the assessment period as these activities add a truer picture of the minor.

B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. Faculty & instructional academic staff are active in teaching enhancement and other contributions to teaching and teaching-related responsibilities.	1	2	2
2. The context is clear for understanding faculty & instructional academic staff activities to enhance their teaching, advising, involvement in course or curricular revision, new course development, etc.	3	1	1

Comments:

1. Efforts to enhance teaching should be listed for all teaching staff, e.g., Learn Center participation.
2. The context for expectation is not provided.

C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly or creative activities.		1	4
2. The context is clear for understanding faculty engagement	2	1	1

in scholarly/creative activity.			
---------------------------------	--	--	--

Comments:

1. Numerous books, articles, and other scholarly contributions are listed for the program faculty.
2. Very impressive scholarly achievements and creative writing publications by the program faculty members. Faculty intellectual contributions are noteworthy.
3. The context is not provided; e.g., please explain what the research and scholarly requirements are for tenure and promotion.

D. External Funding

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.	2	1	2
2. The context is clear for understanding faculty expectations for attracting grants, contracts, and/or gifts.	3	2	

Comments:

1. Faculty did not submit any grant applications during the review period.
2. What are the expectations for grant writing?

E. Professional & Public Service

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service.		3	2
2. The context is clear for understanding faculty engagement in professional and public service in ways that benefit internal and external constituencies.	2	1	2

Comments:

1. Faculty are active in professional and community service, but activity on college and university committees is nearly absent. What is the level of engagement here?
2. Appears professional and public service activities are not uniformly spread across faculty.
3. Context is not provided.

F. Resources for Students in the Program

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.	2	1	2

Comments:

1. The response to this question on the report did not really address the question of resources other than pressures on faculty (not to minimize this issue).
2. The advising load presented in the self-study is not uncommon across other programs on campus and is manageable.

G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.		4	1

Comments:

1. The office and lab spaces continue to be a challenge for the faculty and students in the program and courses offered. Would the renovation of Carlson Hall become a solution?
2. There are other resources on campus to address the classroom issue.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. Program strengths are discussed.		3	1
2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.		2	2
3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.		3	1
4. Other comments by program (not rated)	----	----	----

Comments:

1. Nice to see the program in fall 2011 (page 36) created a UWW-recognized official “criminal justice club”.
2. Large class size is the only concern or area of improvement that is discussed in the self-study. It is disappointing that the self-study does not indicate a desire to improve assessment, program evaluation, and other areas of need.
3. The program would like to add 6 credits of internship to the minor (to be required), but resources are lacking to support this expansion.

Strengths of the Program:

1. Good curriculum.
2. A committee is evaluating the one required core course in the minor.
3. Several students in the program obtain valuable internships in criminal justice despite not earning credits toward the minor.
4. CJ is a career-oriented interdisciplinary minor.
5. Enrollment appears relatively stable, ranging from 51 to 75 minors during the review period.
6. Faculty research output is noteworthy.

Areas for work or improvement:

1. A comprehensive system for assessing student learning needs to be developed, including both direct and indirect assessment of all learning outcomes.
2. Creating a vision so that the minor is prepared for future challenges.
3. Using assessment data to make meaningful improvements in the program.
4. The program did not respond to the recommended action from the previous review to use data to “close the loop” (improve student learning and improve the program).
5. A systematic process is needed for setting program goals and monitoring progress toward achieving the goals.
6. The process for assuring quality of online courses needs to be improved.
7. The student learning outcomes are very specific to CJ content; they can be revised to align more effectively with our campus baccalaureate learning goals (LEAP ELOs).
8. A system is needed to assess the degree to which students are achieving the student learning outcomes.
9. Service on college and university committees needs to be demonstrated.
10. The program could identify and describe the “competing programs” in criminal justice in Wisconsin. Do the other programs offer a major, minor, or emphasis in criminal justice? Do the other programs resemble or differ from UWW in the “flexible” freedom in which students can design their own minor?
11. Implement strategies to recruit and retain female and minority faculty and staff to enhance diversity in this program.

Other comments/questions:

1. The locus of and the relationship between the UWW criminal justice and forensic science minors is somewhat unclear.
2. The department houses this Minor program has the highest SCH/FTE ratio (1327.52) at UWW.
3. [From one reviewer:] What is the program’s reaction to and the implications for the curriculum in this minor of the 2009 congressionally mandated report from the National Research Council that found “serious deficiencies in the nation’s forensic science system and calls for major reforms and new research”?
4. [From one reviewer:] Research and teaching activities of the faculty show an interest in the deficiencies of the nation’s criminal justice system. In this light, it seems unfortunate that the typical job goal for program students is in law enforcement. Without appearing to direct students’ career aspirations, the program could probably describe itself in a more balanced way. I assume there are also opportunities for criminal justice program completers in non-profit, non-govt organizations that try to undo some of the harm done by law enforcement. Examples include the ACLU, the Innocence Project, and other reform- and rehabilitation-oriented groups.

Recommended Actions:

1. Develop a mission statement that communicates the purpose and value of the Criminal Justice minor as well as other purposes for the program (other faculty and staff aspirations or purposes).
2. Develop a vision for where this program wants to go in the next 5-10 years.
3. Develop a systematic plan for setting program goals and monitoring progress toward meeting the goals (and vision).
4. Develop a comprehensive plan for assessing student learning that includes:

- a. Revision of the learning outcomes to include what students should be able to do as well as know, and align outcomes (where appropriate) with our campus baccalaureate learning outcomes (currently the LEAP essential learning outcomes);
- b. A plan for both direct and indirect assessment for each learning outcome, including a mix of qualitative, quantitative, internal, and external types of assessment;
- c. Collecting assessment data on at least a few outcomes each year, with a plan for measuring all outcomes over time (e.g., 5 years);
- d. Meeting at least once each year as a program to discuss assessment results and actions;
- e. Closing the loop by using assessment data to guide improvements in teaching, learning, and assessment; and
- f. Sharing results with stakeholders (students, alumni, advisory board, campus).

Recommended Result:

- Insufficient information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.
- Continuation without qualification.
- Continuation with minor concerns.
- * Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress reports to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress in addressing the major concerns.
- Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.
- Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.
- Non-continuation of the program.

* Annual reports are required that explain progress toward meeting the recommended actions. Reports are due to the Dean and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by Oct. 1 of 2013, 2014, & 2015. The next full self-study is due October of 2016.