



Academic Program Review: June 1, 2004–May 31, 2005

Unit: Department of Criminal Justice

Part III Academic Program Review

Instructions:

Complete this section for the Program Review Committee recommendations not achieved prior to June 2004, as reported in Table I.C of previous annual assessment reports.

Undergraduate Program: Criminal Justice

Program Review Committee Recommendations (Numbering corresponds to original numbering in PRC Report)	Responses to Recommendations (Describe changes or improvements.)
2. Develop and implement an alternate system of distribution for the mission statement and goals of the Undergraduate Criminal Justice Program to students and the faculty.	Beginning Fall 2004 the mission statement of the CJ Program & its goals were distributed by all instructors to all students as an attachment to course descriptions given on the 1st day of class.
4. Review the retention of majors and minors in the undergraduate program.	The data provided by URAP reveals that the retention of CJ majors in a cohort study improved from 36.1% in 2003 to 51.4% in 2004.
6. Evaluate regularly the effectiveness of the advisement process for its undergraduate students.	The CJ Program has some 790 majors. The CJ faculty discussed ways of improving academic counseling. As an element of that it was decided that all faculty should advise students, instead of having one or two advisors advising all students with teaching load reductions. As a continuous process, the advisement process will be evaluated and improved.
9. Develop and implement a formal process for periodic evaluation of the criminal justice curriculum.	The faculty periodically reviews the CJ curriculum. The last revision was made during the 2002-03 year, as a consequence of which some new courses were added and some were deleted. This year during Spring 2005 a formal learning outcomes assessment was conducted by using the Educational Testing Service Instrument for CJ. Based on the results of this assessment, needed improvements in the curriculum will be introduced.
13. Systematically document how the results of evaluations of instruction in the Undergraduate Criminal Justice Program are used to improve teaching effectiveness.	Every semester students evaluate all CJ instructors using an instrument approved by the university. The results are given to the faculty. Improvements that have to be made are suggested by the departmental and college level committees, and the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost. Evaluations are linked to merit awards, specific recommendations, warnings, and non-renewal of contracts.
14. In cooperation with the Office of Institutional Research and Planning,	The University Alumni Relations and Annual Giving Office have developed a

Annual Assessment Report, June 1, 2004–May 31, 2005

Program Review Committee Recommendations (Numbering corresponds to original numbering in PRC Report)	Responses to Recommendations (Describe changes or improvements.)
establish a mechanism for tracking its graduates.	mechanism to contact CJ graduates. This source will be used to contact our graduates.

Graduate Program:

(The **graduate criminal justice program** did not meet the criteria in the Academic Program Review Policy for review in the first cycle.)