

SELF-STUDY FOR PROGRAM REVIEW¹

DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE²

Submitted December 2009

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Volkan Topalli, Chair
Brenda Blackwell
Timothy Brezina
Wendy P. Guastafarro**

¹ **Note regarding reference to timelines:** The review period for this academic program review is three years prior to the Fall 2009 semester (meaning that data were collected on many department related variables from Fall 2007 on). However, the last review of this department took place in Spring of 2002 (a seven year period). As a consequence, there will be times in this report when we refer to the period of time since the last report. This is especially the case when discussing progress made on the most recent stated objectives for the department (which were outlined in 2002). Also, the report includes data based on Calendar Year (CY), Academic Year (AY), and Fiscal Year (FY) where appropriate. In all cases, language in the report will accurately reflect the time periods in question.

² **Note regarding the use of terms:** Criminal Justice is somewhat unique in that it represents an interdisciplinary field of study rather than a traditional academic discipline. Criminologists and criminal justices are concerned, at the most basic level, with a particular behavior: breaking the law. As this behavior takes many forms, no one social or physical science is capable of fully predicting, describing, or understanding this behavior in the either the empirical or evaluative sense. Consequently, contributions to this field of study are regularly made by sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, biologists, among others, as well as criminologists and criminal justices. The field is generally comprised of two areas of focus: Criminology (the study of the causes of criminal behavior) and Criminal Justice (the study of how systems -- such as law enforcement, the courts, and corrections -- deal with crime). Although there is traditionally some degree of debate and discussion across these two areas, they are inextricably connected. Our department is called the Department of Criminal Justice, but the faculty have placed an equal emphasis on both criminology and criminal justice as they pursue their research and teach our students. This is reflected in our decision to name our upcoming doctoral degree a PhD in Criminal Justice & Criminology. In this report, we employ both terms in describing our identity, activities, and progress.

Section A: Unit Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses

A1. Quality of Instruction, Research, and Service

A1a. Strengths and Weaknesses in Instruction

Faculty Perspective: The faculty are generally pleased with the curriculum and its impact on the students. They have been given ample opportunity to participate in the recent redesign of the undergraduate program through two all-day departmental retreats. Additionally, faculty take part in the graduate programs through participation on the departmental graduate committee and on the doctoral program planning committee. They are generally satisfied with the frequency and diversity of course offerings at the undergraduate and graduate levels (although some have voiced a desire to expand the catalogue of potential graduate student offerings, something which will most certainly occur with the addition of our doctoral program). A perusal of faculty CVs (see Appendix F3) reveals that they are collaborative with teaching initiatives (evidenced by cooperative efforts to participate in University programs such as *Writing Across the Curriculum* [WAC]³, *Critical Thinking Through Writing* [CTW], the *Freshman Learning Community* [FLC] program, and the Department's new *Sophomore Learning Community program* [SLC]). A key weakness is the current 2/3 teaching load and emphasis on credit hour generation, which pressures faculty to teach larger classes with fewer student contact hours. Because we service a large number of majors (averaging 560 during the review period) and have a fully engaged MS program in Criminal Justice, our faculty (particularly the associates) are forced to prep a wide variety of courses. In addition, the sheer number of students we service in the major and from the University in general creates pressure to hire part-time instructors to teach classes that we would prefer handled by our tenure-track or full-time non-tenure track faculty.

Student Perspective (undergraduates): We solicited responses on the quality of our program from both current students and alumni (see Appendix D5). The faculty were ranked at or above the University average on items such as whether they are interested in the development of undergraduate majors, on whether the academic program is challenging, on how appropriately faculty are prepared for their courses, the extent to which the program adequately prepares students for their anticipated professional career or continued program of study, and whether class sizes have been suitable for effective learning. With regard to issues such as the availability of academic advisement, career advisement, availability of faculty, effectiveness of teaching methodology, procedures for student evaluation, frequency and variety of course offerings, and clarity of degree requirements, the department ranked at levels equivalent to the average of the University as a whole (though student comments reveal some criticisms, see Section D2 below). In addition, the program received a number of positive comments from alumni regarding preparation for the job market.

Perceived weaknesses and concerns among students were in the area of the internship experience and advising, class schedules, and variety of courses offered. The internship (mandatory for all students) occurs at the end of the undergraduate experience. In many cases, students have already identified an internship opportunity with a plan of action already initiated. Other students take advantage of the information at internship placement and reap the benefits of developing a proactive strategy. With regard to advisement, although most students praised the faculty for their involvement with advising students and for the opportunities the internship program provided, some wished to see a greater emphasis on career placement and advisement,

³ A legend of abbreviations with definitions can be found in **Appendix A1**.

and networking opportunities.

With regard to scheduling issues and course variety, the steady increase in credit hours and majors we have had in recent years, has made it challenging for the department to offer a wider variety of offerings while maintaining class sizes that are optimal for learning, attempting to reduce the number of part-time instructors in the program, and increase contact hours with students. Although, we have had success in these areas (see section D1).

Student Perspective (graduate students): Current graduate students and alumni responded to our survey, identifying program strengths and weaknesses (Appendix D5). They rate the department highly on the extent to which the faculty are interested in the careers of graduate majors, the extent to which the program of study is considered challenging, the quality of communication between students and faculty, and the extent to which class size was conducive to learning. In general, students find the program excels at preparing them for further graduate study.

In terms of weaknesses, three consistent themes were that students wished to have a greater amount of career advisement, that they were unsatisfied with the variety and frequency of course offerings, and that some of them would have preferred a greater emphasis placed on preparing them for applied careers in criminal justice rather than research or graduate school. In our estimation, many of these concerns (e.g., frequency and variety of course offerings) will be addressed by the advent of the doctoral program in Fall 2010, while others are simply not compatible with the mission of the department (e.g., deemphasizing research). More information on how we have dealt with these issues can be found below in Section D2.

A1b. Strengths and Weaknesses in Research

Faculty are strongly satisfied with the department's caliber of scholarship among their colleagues as a whole (an average score of 4.38 out of 5 in the faculty survey; Appendix D5). As a testament to both its careful hiring practices and the productivity of the people it brings in, The Department has successfully tenured all faculty presented to the University since 1996. Faculty CVs (Appendix F3) reveal they are collaborative in their scholarship, evidenced by the frequency with which they publish and seek grants together. Faculty productivity with regard to publications, grant applications and citations have all steadily risen throughout the review period (see Section F below). The faculty are appreciative that there is support in the form of research initiation grants, cooperative grants, and summer research fellowships grant writing at the college and University levels.

As for weaknesses noted from our faculty, the primary focus is on factors that hinder the department from being competitive in the current research and scholarship market. First, although the department has maintained a high level of productivity in terms of scholarship and teaching, it is heavily balanced toward the activities of assistant and associate faculty. The current make-up of the department is six assistant professors, seven associate professors (3 of whom were recently promoted during the 2007-2009 review period), and three professors (see Appendix B4). Of the three professors one (Brian Payne) is the Chair, a second (Mary Finn) is serving as the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, and the third (Robert Friedmann) will retire effective September 1, 2010. With two senior faculty on full time administrative appointments and one about to retire, the department lacks a core group of advanced scholars capable of seeking out large-scale funding, and providing associates and assistants with valuable collaboration and mentoring opportunities. Second, the faculty view the current resources available to them for grant application and administrative support to be inadequate. According to one faculty member, "There is serious need for more infrastructure to assist with pre-and post

grant award processing.” Another noted, “We need someone to administer grants and help with grant applications.” With the advent of a new doctoral program and our desire to increase our national reputation and that of the University, our Department is acutely aware of the need to increase the pursuit of significant external grant opportunities. In the absence of adequate research support, some faculty have noted that they have bypassed opportunities to apply for funding because the anticipated administrative tasks of some opportunities were deemed too daunting.

A1c. Strengths and Weaknesses in Service

The faculty are very well represented in terms of service to the department, college, and university, with all of our faculty serving on multiple committees at each level (an average of 2.6 committees at the departmental level, 0.8 at the college level, and 1.6 at the University level per each faculty member; see Table F5.1. below). The faculty are also strongly dedicated in their service to the discipline. The Department houses two academic journals, and our faculty serve on the editorial boards of 6 different peer-reviewed journals. They also consistently serve on committees of our national and regional professional organizations and as reviewers for various federal funding agencies (e.g., NSF, NIJ, NIH etc). A number have served on external tenure and academic program review committees for other Universities. Outside of academia, our faculty have served as consultants and advisors on a variety of community safety boards and municipal projects in the City of Atlanta. The Georgia International Law Enforcement Exchange (GILEE) and International Law Enforcement Enterprise (ILEE) carried out 88 professional training programs and symposia for law enforcement executives from around the world to enhance international cooperation to improve law enforcement services and public safety.

A key weakness is that there is an imbalance in service related workload resulting from the lack of senior, advanced scholars in the department. As mentioned previously, the weighting of the Department’s make-up toward assistants and associates and lack of senior scholars means that the associate professors are burdened with an inordinate amount of service that would normally be split between associates and full professors. This means that associates are squeezed between the necessity to engage in service that is essential to the Department’s functioning (e.g., serving on promotion and tenure committees, on scheduling committees, as representatives to the University Senate, the college Faculty Advisory Committee, etc) and the charge to engage in substantive research and teaching. Related to Section A1b above, a key danger is that the crush of service work may force associates to neglect either their teaching or research responsibilities in a manner that reduces teaching quality or puts them behind the curve with respect to publications and grant proposals. The derailing of faculty research agendas that can come with burdensome service is an especially troublesome potential outcome. The current workload situation works against the career development goals of the department to promote, retain, and advance careers beyond tenure. Promoting assistants to associates only to heap large amounts of service on them due to a dearth of upper level faculty is obviously counterproductive and represents a potential waste of resources and investment made by the University into those faculty members. If the department intends to take post-tenure review of faculty seriously in the future (and it does), a more even distribution of responsibilities, facilitated by the presence of senior scholars (see Objective 1.1 below), is essential.

A2. Centrality of the Department of Criminal Justice to the University: With regard to mentoring and instruction, the Department of Criminal Justice currently offers two degree

programs, a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) and a Master of Science (M.S.). In Fall 2010, we will launch a PhD in Criminal Justice and Criminology degree program, which was recently approved by the Board of Regents. The Department of Criminal Justice contributes to the advancement and the mission of Georgia State University in several ways with regard to teaching. We offer three different courses in the core - PERS2002: Global Perspectives on Aggression and Violence; PERS 2002: Global Perspectives on Domestic Terrorism, and CRJU2200 Social Science and the American Crime Problem. These courses routinely have high enrollments. The Department has also been an active participant in CTW, WAC and the FLC Programs. The number of majors we serve ensures that a large number of Georgia State University students are having their academic and career interests fulfilled.

With regard to research, our degree programs and scholarly activities are designed to specifically respond to the GSU Strategic Plan (see Appendix A2 for a summary of how our activities are tied to the University's strategic plan). Briefly, as the University strives to become a top 100 research university, the efforts of our faculty and the addition of our PhD program will result in another top-ranked PhD program at the University. Also, according to the University's Strategic Plan, "The overarching aspiration of Georgia State University is to become one of the nation's premiere research universities in focused areas that maximize our unique strengths." A key strength of the Department is that GSU is located in the heart of the City of Atlanta, within walking distance of the State and the City's most important criminal justice agencies and institutions, including the headquarters for the Atlanta Police Department, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit, the Georgia Supreme Court, State Pardons and Parole, the Department of Corrections, the State Capitol, and the Governor's Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, as well as a host of other state and municipal courts and law enforcement agencies. Few, if any, top programs in the country can boast this sort of access and proximity to so many criminal justice institutions within a state capitol. The proximity of these institutions provides our Department with enormous advantages in terms of the kinds of opportunities for research and collaboration that can be offered to our students and faculty. Faculty members in Criminal Justice take advantage of this strength in their scholarly efforts. Conducting research on topics such as justice in the urban community, urban crime and violence, and criminal justice policies, the faculty help the University maximize this strength in its effort to become a top research university. Our location within the city coupled with the Department's status as the premier criminal justice program in the state presents the University with the opportunity to foster and sustain one of the elite criminal justice programs in the country.

The University's strategic plan also recognizes the National Academy of Sciences (2004) report calling for interdisciplinary research and collaborative programs with outside agencies. In the Department of Criminal Justice, the study of crime and criminal justice is approached from an interdisciplinary perspective. The possibilities for developing interdisciplinary efforts out of a PhD program in Criminal Justice and Criminology are considerable. Many of our faculty currently collaborate with faculty from units within the college and across the University (as evidenced with co-authored papers and grant proposals with units such as Economics, Psychology, Social Work, Public Health, and Counseling and Psychological Services). As well, several opportunities for forming research partnerships with local and state criminal justice organizations are being exploited (e.g., Atlanta Police Department, Georgia Department of Corrections, Georgia Board of Pardons and Parole, and so on). Somewhat related, the University's Strategic Plan states, "Progress must also be continued in establishing and maintaining outstanding research programs...[programs] that are already competitive nationally

and internationally will be targeted and supported so that they can maintain their success and reach even higher levels of excellence.” The Department of Criminal Justice is already established as a nationally recognized program (ranked 8th in the nation in productivity in a recent empirical study in the *Journal of Criminal Justice*). Building on its strengths serves to help to build an outstanding research program at the University.

Finally, President Becker noted in his Investiture that GSU “will be the national model for retention and graduation of a diverse student body.” Our Department has always taken this challenge seriously. We have benefited in the past from the diversity of our students and take pride in the fact that of the students enrolled in 2008, 66% were minorities and 65% were females. We are committed to maintaining this diversity and promoting efforts at retention. Regarding diversity, it is expected the new PhD program will be attractive to minority students, allowing us to be a source of future minority scholars. Regarding retention, our *Sophomore Learning Community*, course sequencing requirements, and new advising system are initial steps towards keeping and graduating our students.

A3. Viability of the Department of Criminal Justice: The department’s undergraduate and graduate programs are vibrant and growing. Credit hour production for the department has increased in each of the three years covered by this review: from 8,990 in 2007 to 9,101 in 2008 to 10,130 in 2009. Through the use of full-time non-tenure track faculty members in 2008/09, an increase in full time tenure track faculty size from 12 in 2007 to 16 in 2009, and the willingness of some faculty to teach large University-wide courses, the department has managed to simultaneously increase undergraduate contact hours and reduce student to faculty ratios in the classroom (from 1/52 in 2007 to 1/46 in 2008 to 1/37 in 2009; see Appendix G1). According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, employment for law enforcement careers is projected to increase as much as 35% through 2010. In addition, students with a degree in Criminal Justice are candidates for a wide variety of other non-law enforcement careers (including legal, counseling, research, and administrative career paths). Criminal Justice remains a popular major within the University and the College with an average of 589 majors per year since 2007. Each year most courses for the department fill up well in advance of the start of a given semester. University-wide classroom size restrictions and number of faculty able to teach currently prevents the department from increasing enrollments further, though we would be happy to do so.

Attention must be given to our slight drop in graduate enrollment between 2007 and 2009 (from 40 to 25 students). This drop occurred as the result of a concerted effort of the graduate committee to improve the quality of our Master’s students. More stringent admissions criteria were used in an effort to increase quality of our Master’s students as we prepared for our PhD program. With the pending implementation of the PhD program, we expect both quality and quantity of students to increase in the years to come.

A4. Strategic Focus: The Department of Criminal Justice generates and disseminates knowledge and information that is theoretically driven and policy relevant for the fields of criminal justice and criminology. Our faculty accomplishes this by: (1) engaging in research and scholarly activities to address issues of crime and justice affecting diverse populations in urban settings; (2) producing students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for leadership positions in public and private sector agencies that address crime and justice problems; (3) collaborating with public and private agencies through

education, training, and research ventures that enhance our understanding of, and response to, issues associated with crime and the administration of justice.

We maintain a focus on issues related to communities and crime/violence reflected in the research that our faculty conduct, as well as in the types of electives that we offer to students that distinguishes our program from others. We meet the demands of students by providing coursework that is theoretically driven but responsive to their needs. A recent survey of 236 of our alumni (Appendix D5) showed that more than 90% of the alumni were satisfied with their careers, and most rated their learning outcomes favorably. Also, faculty actively work with local and state criminal justice agencies and academic associations such as the Criminal Justice Association of Georgia. In addition, half of our faculty members focus at least part of their efforts on international issues. These efforts include the following: (1) Dr. Robbie Friedmann directs the Georgia International Law Enforcement Exchange, a program identified as the College’s signature international program; (2) Dr. Dean Dabney is the editor of the *International Criminal Justice Review*, a journal created in our department nearly 20 years ago; (3) Drs. Mary Finn and Brenda Blackwell recently completed a federally funded grant focusing on child trafficking, and Dr. Finn is teaching a class on the topic in the Spring; (4) Dr. Lisa Muftic is conducting research on violence against Bosnian women and terrorism in Turkey, and she teaches a class titled Comparative Criminal Justice Systems; (5) Drs. Volkan Topalli and Brian Payne regularly teach courses as part of the Global Perspectives for the University core (Area B); (6) Dr. Sue-Ming Yang has an on-going (funded) research program focusing on responses to terrorism in various countries, and (7) Dr. Topalli is a Faculty Associate with the International Centre for Research on Forensic Psychology at the University of Hull, UK. Finally, in an effort to expand its influence and reputation and gain access to more significant sources of funding, the department will also begin to emphasize policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation in conjunction with our current strengths in community violence and urban crime.

A5. Financial Resource Analysis: In CY06, 2007 and 2008, Department of Criminal Justice faculty was awarded external grants and contracts with a total value of \$597,952 (with expenditures across all grants at over \$5 million during the review period (see Appendix B2b, B2c, B2d; see also, Section F below for a more in-depth treatment) The total state appropriation (FC 10 funds) to the department for this same timeframe was \$5,165,276. Table A5.1 details the state budget allocations for personnel, part-time instructors, graduate assistants, and travel over the review period. More recently, state budget reductions resulted in the department relying on foundation accounts and indirects to support many areas such as travel, graduate assistant support, supplemental instruction, and office equipment as the faculty grew from 12 to 16 members.

Table A5.1 State Budget Allocations, 2006-2008

	2006	2007	2008
Full-Time Personnel	\$1,020,711	\$1,103,135	\$1,208,473
Part-Time Instructors	\$55,978	\$55,978	\$46,978
Graduate Assistants	\$9,120	\$9,120	\$9,120
Travel	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$17,000
Supplies	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$32,000

A recent review of profit margin performed by the former provost developed ratios of revenue generation to cost based on student enrollment, grant/contract activity, and state budget allocations. This review showed that in that timeframe (which include part of the last fiscal year under review in this self study), the Department of Criminal Justice had a profit margin of 2.4. This means that we generated 2.4 times more revenue than we cost the University.

Revenue from academic-year course buy outs associated with grants is used primarily to provide funding for travel, supplies, and graduate assistants. During FY07 – FY09, the total dollar amounts of academic year course buy-outs was \$85,607 in FY07, \$40,996 in FY08, and \$57,032 in FY09.

Section B: Historical and Current Contexts

B1. History: Criminal justice and criminology as an interdisciplinary field of study has advanced a body of theoretically-driven, empirically-based knowledge relevant to a wide-array of crime and justice issues. The department has been meeting the needs of students and contributing to the development of our field since its inception over 40 years ago.

The Board of Regents charged Georgia State University to engage in instruction, service, and research programs that would address the institution’s urban environment in 1967. The first students enrolled in our two-year Associate of Arts and later in a four-year Bachelor of Science degree program. The first Master of Science Degree in Urban Life with a concentration in criminal justice was initiated in 1970. When the College of Public and Urban Affairs was created in 1981, the department became the largest unit of the self-governing College. In 1996, as part of a broader reorganization, the Department joined the College of Health and Human Sciences.

The Department of Criminal Justice emphasizes issues of crime and justice occurring in urban environments from a multicultural, interdisciplinary perspective to inform science, policy, and practice. The faculty undertakes empirical examinations of multifaceted issues including how violence, drugs, social inequities, behavioral health issues, criminal justice involvement, and public policy impact individuals, families, communities, and the criminal justice system.

B2. Current Context: We maintain a very dedicated faculty (see appendix B and F) who enjoy working together to achieve the objectives of the Department in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Much of the general positive feelings faculty have for the department is directly attributable to the care with which we have engaged in the hiring process since the last departmental program review. A strong emphasis for all hires (including that of the current chair of the Department) was placed on collegial fit as well as excellence in scholarship, the philosophy being that a collegial and communal atmosphere would maximize existing talents to produce the best scholarship, and the best pedagogical outcomes for our students. Indeed, a key facet of our reputation outside the University within our field is that our department is cohesive and collegial; a great place to work. This reputation has been a key determinant of our ability to hire the best young talent in the field. Emulating the finest graduate programs in the nation, the Department sought out its current faculty from among the best graduate programs around the United States and across a number of disciplines. In the past three years we have hired six of the top young scholars on the market, as evidenced by the programs from which they graduated: Leah Daigle from the University of Cincinnati (US News and World Report Departmental Ranking, 3rd), Brent Teasdale from Pennsylvania State University (ranked 5th), Wendy Guastaferrro from SUNY Albany (ranked 2nd), Sue Ming Yang and Joshua Hinkle from

University of Maryland (ranked 1st). Of the six assistants hired, three (Daigle, Teasdale, and Lisa Muftic) were seasoned tenure-track faculty at other institutions and elected to join our faculty as advanced assistants. In addition, we were able to hire a scholar from outside the department (Dr. Brian Payne) to serve as chair. That Dr. Payne was previously chair at Old Dominion University, a program that was itself about to launch a doctoral program, speaks well of the attractions of working at Georgia State. During the three year review period of this department we have also hired a respected associate faculty member, Dr. Timothy Brezina, who had been employed by Tulane University and the Centers for Disease Control prior to coming to GSU. These hires speak well of the support we have received from our college and the University, the desirability of Atlanta as a city to live in, and the reputation for excellence in scholarship and collegiality of our department.

During the past three years the department has reaffirmed its commitment to research, teaching, and service by increasing the quality and quantity of its scholarship, delivering award-winning education to its growing student population, and expanding our involvement in the field at the regional and national levels. The Department has positioned itself to be an national academic leader in criminal justice. We have improved the caliber and productivity of our faculty and students, secured external research funding, mentored undergraduate and graduate students, and implemented programmatic changes to enhance the educational environment of our students. Acknowledging that there is a demand for college-educated criminal justice professionals and for PhD prepared individuals to teach in the expanding number of criminal justice degree programs offered in higher education, we will admit our first PhD students in 2010. With the appropriate tools and resources, the department will continue to strengthen its visibility and improve its reputation for having a top-ranked research faculty that produces highly qualified students for professional and educational posts.

Section C: Progress Toward Goals and Objectives

C1. 2002 Strategic Objective 1 - Redesign the undergraduate curriculum to assure more choice in the selection of elective courses: The department addressed this objective in two phases. First, in 2004, the department voted to reduce the number of credit hours required in the program to graduate from 51 to 45. It was felt that this reduction would permit students to explore more opportunities for electives across campus, particularly in light of enhanced learning opportunities presented by the University's establishment of University-wide "Perspectives" courses, the inclusion of FLCs, and the introduction of curriculum requirements for writing-intensive courses (administered through the CTW and WAC programs). Second, the department participated in two consecutive all-day retreats in Spring 2008 focused on completely overhauling the undergraduate curriculum, resulting in a number of changes (see D1 below).

C2. 2002 Strategic Objective 2 - Appoint an undergraduate coordinator as the point person on a host of undergraduate issues: The department implemented and exceed this objective in 2008 by establishing an Undergraduate Coordinator position early on and then creating an Internship Coordinator position more recently. Both are supported through course releases and summer salary, and are rotating responsibilities within the department. The current Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies for the Department is Dr. Brenda Blackwell. The current Internship Coordinator is Dr. Sue Collins. In addition, the Department also maintains an Undergraduate Committee comprised of the UG coordinator and three Departmental faculty (Drs. Dean Dabney, Sue-Ming Yang, and Brent Teasdale).

C3. 2002 Strategic Objective 3 - Establish a strategy that is designed to enhance the quality of our pool of students majoring in criminal justice: To enhance the quality of the undergraduate pool of students majoring in criminal justice, in line with the *University of Georgia System 2007 Task Force Report on Retention and Graduation Rates*, the department has implemented a variety of strategies, some of which have met with greater success than others. First, we lobbied the University to permit us to establish minimum GPA requirements for entry into the major (to be set at 2.8). The department's request was denied by the University on the grounds that it could result in too much demand placed on other programs. Second, we developed a *Sophomore Learning Community* to increase connections between students and improve their performance in known high DWF rate classes within the curriculum, and systematically examine the effect that course sequencing has on student retention. Third, the Department recently voted to require that majors complete all of their criminal justice foundations of analysis courses (e.g., statistics and research methods) before being permitted to take 4000 level courses. This will ensure that students are enrolled in courses for which they are prepared. Fourth, the department added a legal studies track to attract students interested in law school, who typically are higher quality majors. Finally, the Department has used supplemental instruction to improve students' comprehension of statistics and reduce DWF rates in this bottleneck course.

C4. 2002 Strategic Objective 4 - Redesign the graduate curriculum, especially with the plan to assure more choice in the selection of courses: We have met this objective and, as a consequence of the new doctoral program, gone beyond it. The graduate program had been changed to bring the new doctoral program into line with the current Master's program. This was done to ensure a smooth transition for students leaving the MS program and entering the PhD program, and to permit the PhD program to operate within current faculty and staff limits. With respect to the MS program, we introduced a Capstone track alternative to allow practitioner oriented students avoid the thesis option, and also adjusted the scheduling plan so that we now offer required course on a staggered basis to assure better access and performance by students.

C5. 2002 Strategic Objective 5 - Appoint a graduate coordinator: This objective has been met and expanded upon. Since 2003, there has been a Coordinator of Graduate Studies for the Department. With the impending start of the Department's new doctoral program, the Department has created two separate graduate coordinator positions: Coordinator of the Masters Program (currently Dr. Barbara Warner) and Coordinator of the Doctoral Program (currently Dr. Timothy Brezina). Both positions operate under the auspices of the Department's graduate committee, which is comprised of the Department Chair (Dr. Brian Payne), the two coordinators, and three other faculty members (Drs. Volkan Topalli, Mark Reed, Lisa Muftic).

C6. 2002 Strategic Objective 6 - Produce a proposal for a PhD program in Criminal Justice: This objective was completed in 2007. The proposal was forwarded to the Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences, then to the Provost and President of the University in 2008. In 2009 the State of Georgia Board of Regents approved it for implementation. The Doctoral Program in Criminal Justice and Criminology will accept its first cohort of students in Fall 2010.

C7. 2002 Strategic Objective 7 - Reduce the teaching load to 2/2 for the academic year: This objective was met in 2002, and until 2006 the common teaching load was 2/2. Thereafter, we regressed back to a 3/2 teaching load due to a number of circumstances. At the time, departmental and college policies allowed for faculty to reduce teaching load to less than 2/2. First, new faculty were offered reduced teaching loads (2/1) for periods of anywhere from 1-3 years after arriving at GSU to permit new faculty to acclimate to the University and permit them the time they would need to establish a productive research agenda. Second, the college

maintained a general rule to define “large” sections. Faculty received a course reduction for each section over 40 students. Third, the department designated the two courses (CRJU 3020 Research Methods in Criminal Justice and CRJU 3610 Criminal Justice Statistics) as “intensive” and allowed faculty teaching them to count them as 1.5 classes in the workload equation. This meant that any faculty member teaching two sections of either course would be considered to have taught the equivalent of 3 courses and this would be reflected in their teaching load for the year (e.g., someone who taught statistics and methods in the fall would get to teach one less in the spring). The net effect of these policies was that the department’s average course load statistic over a Fall-Spring academic year fell to 3.4 (with a 2/2 load counting as a 4.0 statistic). In an effort to bring teaching loads in line with official Board of Regents expectations, in 2006 the Provost imposed a set of guidelines for establishing course loads. First, the designation of “large” section would no longer be valid for any unit. Second, the designation of courses as “intensive” would also not be allowed. Third, the only teaching releases not included in the calculation of the course load statistic were those that were officially approved administrative releases (e.g., for chair or undergraduate coordinator). Fourth, and most critically for our Department, the expected teaching load for units with doctoral programs was to be 2/2, while that for masters-only units (like ours) was to be 2/3. **To bring the department into compliance with these guidelines, our faculty have been on a 3/2 teaching load since 2006.**

C8. 2002 Strategic Objective 8- Increase the number of graduate research assistantships: The department has addressed this goal in a number of ways. First, we have advocated for and received increased funding from the College for our graduate program. Second, we have obtained significant graduate student dollars (\$32,000 annually) through our participation in the University’s Partnership for Urban Health Research. Third, we have tapped into University funding sources such as WAC, CTW, and the College level GTA program to supplement funding for MS students. Finally, we have significantly stepped up our application for external funding and included significant graduate student stipends in those applications.

C9. 2002 Strategic Objective 9 - Obtain new faculty slots: In 2002 the Department had 12 faculty members (6 assistants, 4 associates, and 2 professors). Though the department has experienced some degree of expected attrition (losing 2 assistants, 1 associate, and 2 professors), we have promoted a number of faculty since then (4 promotions to associate, 2 to full with one leaving in 2006) and made a number of significant hires. The Department now stands at 16 faculty (6 assistants, 7 associates, and 3 professors). It should be noted that of the professors, one is the chair of the department (Payne), one is currently serving as the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness (Finn), and one is going to retire September 1, 2010 (Friedmann). The Department plans to initiate a national search to replace Dr. Friedmann’s position of Professor and Distinguished Chair. We will also apply to the University for new senior faculty positions under the University’s *Second Century Initiative*. These actions are in line with our new set of Objectives moving forward (see Objective 1.1).

C10. 2002 Strategic Objective 10 - Add a staff member: Due to budgetary constraints we have been unable to address this objective. Its purpose was to provide grant management support to the department, alleviating our current business manager of those duties and enhancing the faculty’s ability to acquire external funding (but see Objective 2.4 below).

C11. 2002 Strategic Objective 11: Address various space needs of the department: In 2006 the College of Health and Human Sciences invested in a major overhaul of its existing infrastructure and space in the Urban Life Building (floors 8, 9, and 12). The resulting increase in offices and meeting space coincided well with our recent spate of hires, allowing us to accommodate all new

faculty. However, in anticipation of increasing our number of faculty in the near future, the potential addition of new staff, and the advent of the doctoral program, we anticipate a critical need for new space (see Objective 3.9 below).

In sum, we have made significant progress meeting our goals and objectives over the past seven years. The external reviewers from the 2002 review noted a number of specific concerns about the department. Appendix A-3 shows how these concerns have been fully addressed.

Section D: Curricula Quality

D1. The Undergraduate Program in Criminal Justice:

D1a. *The Undergraduate Curriculum in Criminal Justice:* Undergraduate students majoring in criminal justice receive a B.S. degree upon graduation. Students can enroll in the *Crime and Justice Track*, the default for entering students, or can opt into the *Legal Track*, which enhances legal course requirements. All students are expected to complete core courses to enhance their understanding of theories of offending (CJRU 3410: Criminology), as well as their understanding of core criminal justice agencies (CRJU 3110: American Police System; CRJU 3310: Corrections; and CRJU 3700: Judicial System). In addition, students must take courses to enhance their understanding and abilities to employ research tools (CRJU 3020: Research Methods and CRJU 3610: Statistics). Students enrolled in the *Crime and Justice Track* take six credit hours of legal issues courses and twelve credit hours of criminal justice issues courses. Students who opt into the *Legal Track* instead take fifteen hours of legal issues and three hours of criminal justice issues. The former is designed to address the needs of students entering into criminal justice professions as well as advanced degree programs in criminology and criminal justice, while the latter is most frequently taken by students who plan to advance into a law program in the future. Both tracks provide appropriate preparation for advanced degrees in a variety of programs and prepare students to advance into leadership positions in the professions.

In the spring of 2008, the faculty held two full-day retreats to review and revise the undergraduate curriculum. The new undergraduate curriculum will go into effect in Fall 2010. These revisions included: a) renumbering CRJU 4060 to 3060 and including it in a new area (“Area H”) of requirements: Foundations of Analysis, b) focusing the Criminal Justice Core (“Area G”) courses on Policing (CRJU 3110), the Courts (CRJU 3700), and Corrections (CRJU 3310), along with a course on Communication and Cultural Diversity (HHS 3000), c) recommending that the required courses in Areas G and H be completed prior to enrollment in upper level (4000) courses to improve student retention and progression to degree, and d) examining the courses in the catalog to ensure that they match the current research interests of the faculty. Appendix D3 provides the most recent version of our undergraduate curriculum and the curriculum coming into effect in Fall 2010. Finally, the department is an active participant in the University’s adoption of CTW, with three courses, CRJU 3020 (Research Methods), CRJU 3060 (Ethical issues in CJ), and CRJU 4930 (Capstone) having been formulated as CTW within the review period.

A review of our program requirements in comparison with our peer institutional programs indicates numerous program similarities. Entry into the major rests on requirements for entry into the University for our program as well as our peers’, and all programs require a 2.0 average GPA for graduation. Our majors must satisfy a somewhat higher number of credit hours taken within the major (45 at GSU, compared to a range of between 33 at University of Illinois at Chicago to 42 at Temple). Like all of our peer programs, our department requires that majors

take courses on Analytical Methods and Criminology. Consistent with the program at University of South Carolina, our majors must take courses that familiarize them with all components of the system (police, courts, and corrections), as well as a course familiarizing them with law. Other programs require students to select one or two courses out of these topics. Our program is distinguished from our peer institutional programs in its requirement of statistical analysis. While one program requires a course on methods and analysis, the other programs focus solely on methods. We believe requiring methods and statistics facilitates our students ability to be critical consumers of crime and justice data and information, as well as developing skills that will allow them to begin to do their own research. Finally, we require all undergraduates in the major complete a capstone/internship combination during their final semester. None of our peer institutions require an internship experience, and many do not provide the opportunity in their curriculum.

Students enroll in CRJU 4940: Criminal Justice Field Instruction for 3 credit hours, and are placed in one of over 200 agencies that the department collaborates with to provide students with hands-on experience in the field. Students enrolling for 3 credits work for 150 hours during a 15 week semester. This experience is combined with coursework in CRJU 4930: Internship Seminar in Criminal Justice, a 3-credit capstone course designed to assist students in bridging the gap between their practical experiences in the internship and their previous criminal justice coursework. Assignments are designed to facilitate applications of course materials with their day-to-day experiences “on the job.” The capstone course also provides a forum for program assessment. Typically, 35 - 40 students are placed at internships during the fall/spring semesters and 25 - 28 students are placed during summer.

D1b. Program Learning Outcomes: While content knowledge varies across the two tracks (Legal and CJ), the learning outcomes identified by the departmental faculty as appropriate for our students broadly apply to both. Over the past five years, the department has continued to refine its objectives and learning outcomes in the following general areas: 1) acquisition of knowledge skills, 2) scientific reasoning and analysis skills, 3) critical thinking skills, and 4) communication skills.

Students in this major are expected to demonstrate the ability to acquire knowledge about the etiology of crime and the criminal justice system, including the ability to explain criminological theories – their concepts and hypotheses. In addition, they must be able to identify and describe the different components and agencies related to the processing of justice. Second, scientific reasoning and analysis skills should be demonstrated, including the ability to read scholarly research and reports critically, and master the appropriate computer skills. Third, students are expected to demonstrate critical thinking skills, including the abilities to develop research questions and hypotheses, apply theoretical perspectives, utilize social science approaches, and analyze and interpret data. Finally, they should demonstrate useful communication skills, with a particular emphasis on effective written communication, involving the ability to edit and employ writing conventions and stylistic formats.

D1c. Undergraduate Program Assessment Plans: The Department has been recognized for the excellence of its past assessment activities. For example, in 2008, the Department was recognized with an institutional effectiveness award for its assessment activities. In 2009, Dr. Brenda Blackwell received an institutional award for her assessment of the department’s CTW activities. With a solid foundation of assessment activity in place, the department will continue to emphasize the importance of this area, valuing assessment as a process rather than an event – meaning that assessment activities will be on-going throughout the year and across years. At a

curriculum level, the departmental review that occurred in Spring 2008 was designed to ensure that the faculty is in agreement about the core learning outcomes for our major and to ensure the structure of the curriculum is designed to lead students towards these desired outcomes.

At the departmental level, assessment primarily is conducted through assignments generated in the CTW and capstone courses. The most recently available formal Assessment Plan for the Department was produced in 2004 for the Undergraduate Program and in 2006 for the Department's contribution to the GenEd Core. In the past two years, the Assessment Plans have been placed in the WEAVE system provided by the University and the Plan/s have evolved over the past three years. The most recent Assessment Plan for the Undergraduate Program is provided in Appendix D1.b.

D1d. Undergraduate Program Assessment Outcomes: At a programmatic level, program assessment has yielded positive outcomes for the Department. Specifically, it has prompted the department's curriculum review, development and continued refinement of assessment plans for learning outcomes, as well as in CTW courses and in the GenEd Core course (CRJU 2200).

For specific learning outcomes, our assessment methods, including a capstone examination in the capstone course, reviews of capstone portfolios, papers, and oral presentations all yielded satisfactory outcomes, indicating that high proportions of our students (no lower than 76%) are demonstrating attainment of our learning outcomes. Assessments of student learning outcomes for students enrolled in CRJU 2200, the GenEd Core also indicate that students predominately are successful at meeting our learning outcomes. All of our students in the past 3 years have been successfully placed into an internship. CTW assessments of specific learning outcomes are currently being developed. Reports for program assessment outcomes submitted for review to the GSU's Undergraduate Assessment Committee through WEAVE are available for review on-line or can be provided upon request. See also, Appendix D1.

D1e. Programmatic Changes to Improve Learning Outcomes: As previously noted, in the spring of 2008, a faculty retreat was held with the purpose of reviewing and assessing the state of the undergraduate curriculum. This review involved reformulating our educational mission statement, refining the desired learning outcomes for the curriculum and strengthening course content and program structure to enhance the probability of successful outcomes for our majors. It also included the decision to structure progress through the program, with the creation of Area H: Foundations of Analysis, and the decision to move toward requiring that students take these courses prior to enrolling in 4000 level courses. Specifically, it was noted that students who have a fear of math/statistics often put this course off until their senior year, at which point inadequate performance would lead to delayed graduation. Requiring students to take this course at an earlier point in their career should take some of this pressure off of students. In addition, requiring that this and other foundational courses (methods, theory, and ethics) be taken early in the major, should prepare students for higher levels of performance (e.g., critical thinking, analysis, and application) by providing them with the tools that they need to more fully engage with material in substantive courses.

In addition, the CTW initiative has yielded changes to the focus on student learning outcomes. With the passage of this requirement, the department opted to bookend two specific classes, allowing us to assess, eventually, whether students are improving their skills (reflected in student learning outcomes) over time. The assessment strategies are currently in development.

D1f. Role of Writing Intensive Courses in Attaining Learning Outcomes: Six of our faculty have been trained and approved as WAC instructors, and three have had specific courses

approved and offered as WAC courses. (The courses that have been taught as WAC and/or CTW, syllabi, and faculty who are WAC and CTW certified are presented in Appendix D2).

D1g. Reports of Satisfaction with Undergraduate Program - Faculty, Students and Alumni:

Results of the faculty program survey (Appendix D5) indicated that most faculty members believe the undergraduate curriculum is academically challenging (61.6% rated as a 4 or 5 on a five point scale, with 5 rated as excellent). However, only a narrow consensus was exhibited regarding the frequency of required course offerings and variety of advanced course offerings (53.9% rated as 4/5 for each). Few concerns by faculty about the undergraduate curriculum were noted in written comments.

The response rate for the undergraduate academic program survey was only 15.6%, with only 67 students responding. This was a significantly lower response rate than that reported university-wide (39.4%). Results of these surveys are therefore cautiously interpreted. Notably, 74.2% of the student respondents indicated that they planned to continue their educational studies. For the most part, students indicated satisfaction with the program's curriculum, course offerings, and faculty (responses were scored on a scale of 1, representing strong disagreement, to 5, representing strong agreement). The majority of students indicated that they found the program academically challenging (74.6% rating 4/5) and as good preparation for a criminal justice career (76.1% rating 4/5). Indeed, overall, 56% of our students indicated that they were very or extremely satisfied with the program, while 42% indicated that they were somewhat satisfied). Somewhat less satisfaction is evident with the extent to which faculty and students interact and with the advisement. Finally, and consistent with faculty survey data, only 29.9% of students scored the program as a 4/5 for frequency of course offerings, while 38.8% gave such ratings for the variety of course offerings. These concerns were reflected in the written comments submitted by students. Specifically, thematic issues that emerged in students' comments included the availability of courses, specifically requesting a greater variety of classes, a greater variability in the timing of classes, and concerns with advisement. Regarding the variety of courses, students indicated that while required courses were consistently and adequately available, upper level courses were less consistently offered, particularly during summer semester. Suggestions included expanding availability of additional classes and consideration of on-line courses. Students also expressed concerns about the timing of courses, however, these comments were somewhat conflicting; for example while one student indicated that, "Night classes are also offered, and they tend to be more varied, but not everyone can take night classes in the slots that are available," another student was concerned that the program does not offer enough courses, indicating that, "This program does not look kind[ly] on the evening class attendees which is highly disappointing."

After the last program review, the Department formed a scheduling committee and has strategically worked to provide core required courses in a variety of time slots to improve availability to all types of students (traditional and non-traditional). It appears from student comments that these efforts have generally been successful. The concerns of students now are focused on the availability of upper division courses. It is likely that students are identifying the courses that they specifically are interested in, and are frustrated when a course is not offered the semester that they want to take it. Unfortunately, given the slate of courses the department offers, it is not possible to offer every course, every semester. Instead, the scheduling committee works to ensure that an adequate number of hours are configured from semester to semester to facilitate students completing their degree in a timely manner. See Appendix D4.

Comments about advisement generally yielded information already under consideration by the Undergraduate Committee. Specifically, it is clear that students do not understand the complexity of course scheduling and the inability of the department to offer every course in the curriculum every semester. Efforts to address this include having the chair of scheduling provide an informational session to the Criminal Justice Student Association and the introduction of a Scheduling module within the SLC curriculum.

Some students indicated that they did not know who their advisor is, or that their advisor provided only a summary review of progress in the major but little contextual information about the program or the progress being made. Another student summarized confusion about both advisement and internship application deadlines, "I am having a hard time trying to figure out about deadlines for internship and related information. Once I figure out who my new advisor is, I should be able to obtain this information."

The Department conducted an alumni survey in Spring 2008 and reviewed these results at the same time that an analysis of retention was conducted. The need for a review of advisement procedures was identified at that point. The Undergraduate Committee has begun to take steps to address this. First, a new faculty training on advisement of the curriculum occurred this Fall (2009) semester. Second, the incoming UG Coordinator has begun to share duties of advisement of incoming students with the Department Chair. In this capacity, the Coordinator has begun noting the issues typically brought forward by students and is internally assessing the questions raised by students. Third, the UG Committee has begun to review surveys to assess the content of student concerns. By the end of the Fall 2009 semester, the UG Committee will begin to develop alternative strategies to approach advisement in the Department with the goal of bringing them forward to the faculty mid-semester in the spring for a vote. It is anticipated that significant changes in advisement will be implemented in the Fall 2010 semester.

With regard to alumni, the majority of (70.3%) indicated that the program was academically challenging and that it prepared them for their career or further education (69.4%). Furthermore, 67.5% of our alumni indicated that they were very or extremely satisfied with their experiences in the program, while another 25% indicated that they were somewhat satisfied; less than 10% indicated any level of dissatisfaction with the program. Alumni were somewhat more positive than students regarding the advisement that they received and the variety and frequency of courses offered.

A review of the comments offered by alumni indicated overwhelmingly positive views of the program and its faculty and experiences during their time at GSU. For example, one alumnus stated, "I would highly recommend anyone pursuing a Criminal Justice degree to attend the GSU program." Another, who indicated current employment in law enforcement, indicated that, "I feel like I received an excellent education which prepared me for the real world." Finally, others indicated that the internship provided valuable experiences in conjunction with the curriculum and faculty, "Not only were the professors and courses informative and educational, the internship requirement definitely helped with networking for a future career." Alumni were less likely to mention concerns with course availability or advisement.

Our own departmental survey of exiting students and alumni reflected these results, but with a more specific focus on the learning outcomes specified within the department. Results indicate that students' perceptions of their preparation in critical thinking and analysis, communication skills, and understanding of the justice system and law's role within it were significantly linked to their satisfaction in their careers. Also, the need to improve advising was identified from the departmental alumni survey (see Appendix D5 for a summary of the survey).

D2. The Graduate Program in Criminal Justice: The master's program is designed to offer graduate students an opportunity to develop an in-depth understanding of the nature of crime and the administration of criminal justice. It also provides students with the technical skills needed to assess and evaluate the criminal justice system, its component parts, and the nature of crime. Ultimately, our aim is to produce graduates who can assume positions within criminal justice agencies as either leaders or researchers and to identify and encourage a small number of graduates to continue their education at the doctoral level.

When first established in the 1970s, the master's program was designed to meet the needs of practitioners with an emphasis on practical courses such as interpersonal management skills. The program mainly attracted "in-service" students who were seeking to obtain an advanced degree in order to enhance their careers. In the 1990s, the graduate curriculum changed to reflect a more balanced and contemporary selection of courses emphasizing theory, methods, and practice. Within the last decade, the graduate student body has represented more traditional or "pre-service" students who are employed but have yet to enter the profession.

The master's program remains attractive and available to working professionals and part-time students. As is the case with many graduate programs at GSU, most of the courses are offered in the early evening in order to accommodate students' work schedules. This is in keeping with GSU's commitment to serve the educational needs of non-traditional students.

Following the 2002 program review, the department elected to strengthen the graduate program by addressing several areas of need. First, the department appointed a Graduate Coordinator. Second, the department instituted orientation sessions and formal advising procedures. Currently, all students in the master's program are required to attend a lengthy orientation session, and develop a program of study in consultation with the graduate program coordinator. The approved plan of study lists the required and elective courses to be taken by the graduate student to meet the program requirements and details a path to either the thesis or non-thesis (i.e., Capstone course) option. Third, the department continued to recruit faculty with significant research agendas, including advanced professors who had prior experience in program development and in the successful mentoring of graduate students.

A majority of the students enrolled in our master's program apply successfully for assistantships, which usually involve 8 hours of work per week. The typical assistantship provides a \$4,000 stipend (per academic year) and full tuition waiver for full-time students. This level of support is low in comparison to the typical award available at the peer institutions. At Northeastern University, University of Illinois-Chicago, and the University of South Florida, typical stipend amounts for master's level students range from \$9,000 (USF) to \$14,000 (UIC), along with tuition remission. The criminal justice program at Temple University listed the stipend amounts for their master's students as "variable," with the most lucrative award amount listed at \$15,000. See Appendix D7, Table D7a for more details on MS funding.

Currently, our graduate students take six required courses (18 hours), including CRJU 7010: Crime and the Criminal Justice System, CRJU 7510: Organization and Management Theory in Criminal Justice, CRJU 8050: Criminological Theory, CRJU 8610: Research Methods in Criminal Justice, CRJU 8620: Statistics in Criminal Justice, and CRJU 8710: Legal Aspects of Criminal Justice. Beyond additional elective course requirements (12-15 hours), all graduate students are required to complete a "capstone experience" during the later part of their degree program. The experience provides students with a choice of activities (thesis or non-thesis options) designed to enhance and consolidate their knowledge and application of criminal justice

and the research process and to prepare them for entry into a doctoral program or a professional career (see Appendix D3 for details).

Students who select the non-thesis option enroll in a capstone seminar in which theory, research, and practice are integrated to solve specific organizational challenges and policy concerns involving crime and justice issues. In this seminar, students complete written and oral critical analyses of scholarly literature and apply their knowledge to real-world problems and questions within the field. During the past four years, the majority of our students have selected the non-thesis option, with a smaller number of students (5) completing a thesis. It appears this pattern is beginning to change following the hiring of additional research-active faculty members. In the current academic year alone (2009-2010), three students have selected the thesis option. One additional student has intentions to pursue the thesis option and is currently drafting a thesis statement for approval.

These requirements for the master's degree correspond closely to the requirements at peer institutions. For instance, all peer institutions require criminal justice coursework in theory, research methods, and statistics. The master's degree programs at Northeastern University, Temple University, and University of South Florida offer thesis and non-thesis options (students selecting a non-thesis option in these programs are typically required to complete a comprehensive exam, research paper, or research proposal). The master's-only track at the University of Illinois-Chicago does not offer a thesis option. Rather, all students in this program or track complete a comprehensive exam following the completion of their coursework.

D2a. Graduate Program Assessment: At the time of graduation, it is expected that students will be able to: Demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical knowledge base in criminology; demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical knowledge base of criminal justice responses to crime and criminality; critically analyze crime and justice issues and/or information utilizing theoretical, methodological, and statistical skill bases; apply learned terminology and theory to real-world situations that both relate to and expand beyond the fields of criminology and criminal justice; communicate effectively, in oral and written form, their understanding and analyses of crime and justice issues as they apply their knowledge to real-world problems and questions; apply acquired research and statistical skill bases to evaluate the quality of scholarly products and their contribution to the fields of criminal justice and criminology; and provide an integrated view of crime and criminal justice systems and processes and how the components interact and intersect to provide coordinated justice administration.

Outcomes assessment is determined through the capstone experience, either the capstone seminar or the thesis. For each student, a faculty-rated knowledge assessment survey is completed by the capstone seminar instructor or thesis supervisor. The desired performance is to have at least 80% of non-thesis students, and 80% of thesis students, obtain an average score of 4.0 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items that measure each program learning objective. During the 2008-2009 academic year, this performance goal was met or exceeded for each of the learning objectives. See Appendix D1 for information on Assessment.

D2b. Reports of Graduate Student Satisfaction: Nine of our current 21 graduate students (42.9%) responded to the academic program review survey (Appendix D5). Although small in number, their responses indicate a pattern of general satisfaction with the master's program. Eight out of the nine students report that they are "somewhat," "very," or "extremely" satisfied with the program overall. Likewise, eight out of nine respondents report some level of satisfaction with the ability of the program to prepare them to "objectively identify problems and think and reason about potential solutions in the field of criminal justice." Moreover, eight out of

nine respondents agree or strongly agree that the graduate program is “academically challenging” and that the faculty “are appropriately prepared for their classes.” In contrast, the survey respondents rated the frequency and variety of course offerings less favorably.

The written comments of current graduate students focus on several issues, including thesis guidance, assistance with career placement, the frequency and scheduling of course offerings, and the academic/research orientation of the graduate program. Several students expressed dissatisfaction with the amount of guidance available to those interested in the thesis option (as described earlier, this situation appears to be improving, with a very recent surge in the number of students pursuing theses). At the same time, one student stated that s/he was “very thankful to have excellent teachers who have expanded my thinking and challenged me.”

One student questioned the usefulness of the research orientation of the program, with its emphasis on the ability to “interpret and apply research,” especially for working professionals who are mainly interested in career advancement. As the Department will not be abandoning its emphasis on research any time soon, such comments may indicate a need to better inform prospective applicants of the nature of our graduate curriculum, with its balanced focus on theory, methods, and practice. Some recent steps have been taken in this direction. During the previous academic year, the master’s program brochure was revised accordingly. We have also taken steps to screen for applicants that understand the MS program at GSU is not a purely professional or administrative degree, not a forensics degree. Unfortunately, course scheduling may still be an issue for some students, even though we offer most graduate courses in the early evening in an effort to accommodate working individuals (see section D4).

The results of the alumni survey parallel those described above. Thirteen recent graduates of the program responded to the survey (46.2% of the target population). They report overall satisfaction with the academic rigor of the program and the role it has played in the development of their research skills, critical thinking, and knowledge of criminology and the criminal justice system. However, a number of respondents express dissatisfaction with the amount of career advice they received and with a perceived lack of program emphasis on career development issues. The written comments reveal a divide between those graduates who obtained career-relevant training, and those who feel they did not. As two graduates describe, “The professors were extremely knowledgeable and I learned a lot, where I use [this knowledge] everyday working in the criminal justice system” and “The research skills I developed at GSU were wonderful [and] applicable to [my] career in CJ. I use them in my job everyday.” However, two other graduates write, “I believe that the courses can be improved by offering more networking events with the professionals in the field. Also, the career advisement for the professions needs improvement” and “The program prepares students for [the] Phd, not a real CJ career.”

In Spring 2009, a long-term goal of the department was realized with the submission and approval of a proposal to develop a PhD program in criminal justice and criminology. The program will be the only one of its kind in the state of Georgia, where demand for such a program has been high, especially in the Atlanta area. It will also be the only program of its kind in the Southeast from between Florida and South Carolina to Mississippi. The new program will provide additional in-depth training in criminological theory as well as advanced statistics and research methodology. It will prepare students for careers in teaching, research, management, and community service. To date, the department has appointed a separate coordinator to oversee the PhD program and is currently accepting applications.

For both faculty and students, the development of the new PhD program (along with a joint M.S./PhD track) should enhance opportunities for research, teaching, and collaboration. As

the possession of a PhD program is more typical of higher-ranked criminal justice departments, we anticipate that this program will enhance our ability to compete for and recruit higher-quality students and accomplished faculty at all levels.

Section E: Student Quality

E1. Undergraduate Input Quality Metrics: Given the lack of a formal application process no numerical data (such as SAT scores or GPA) of students entering into the criminal justice program are available, and there is no minimum GPA requirement for entry into the major. Furthermore, students must have earned grades of C (or C- in the 2009-2010 academic year since departmental adaption of plus/minus grading in Fall, 2009) or higher in core and upper division courses in the major. Finally, students must have a GPA of 2.0 or higher to register for upper division courses in the major. A grade of C or higher in CRJU 1100 (Introduction to Criminal Justice) in an equivalent transfer course and a 2.0 GPA are required to graduate.

E2. Undergraduate Output Quality Metrics: No numerical comparison data are available to make comparisons of our students with students in peer programs at other universities. However, it is notable that our undergraduate students have co-authored papers that have been presented at regional and national conferences as well as papers that have been published (See Appendix E, Tables E1c, E1d). Undergraduate students have found employment in recent years at with the ATF, the GA Multicounty Public Defender's Office, HUD, DEA, Secret Service, US Marshalls, and numerous local area police, probation and parole departments (Appendix E, Table E1e). Furthermore, numerous undergraduate students have gone on to obtain Master's degrees from our own program as well as programs at GSU in Public Health and Policy Studies. Other undergraduate students have gone on to pursue Master's and Doctoral Degrees at Ohio State, the University of Missouri-St. Louis, West Georgia, and George Mason (Appendix E, Table E1f). The department and college have recognized the academic achievements of students who have excelled in the field (see Appendix E, Table E1g).

E3. Graduate Students Input and Output Metrics: To apply to the Master's of Science (M.S.) program in criminal justice, applicants must submit GRE scores, official transcripts, and letters of recommendation from people who are qualified to assess academic potential. In addition, applicants are required to submit a 2-3 page statement of academic and professional goals, which specifies how the program is expected to facilitate these goals. Admission is based upon the quality of the undergraduate record and GPA, GRE scores, and suitable preparation for the program (e.g., undergraduate coursework in social science research methods and statistics). The minimum requirements for full graduate status in the MS program include a composite GRE score of 900 (verbal and quantitative) and a 2.7 cumulative undergraduate GPA.

During the FY 2007-2009 time period, the master's program enrolled an average of 30.7 students per year (including a number of minority and female students), with an average of 9.7 degrees conferred each year. During the last two years, the department has been focusing greater attention on the preparedness of applicants for the graduate program, such as grades in previous criminal justice courses, especially research methods and statistics. This is reflected in the higher average GPA's observed among recent cohorts, but has also resulted in cohorts that are somewhat smaller in size than in years past. In FY 2009, the department accepted 16 out of 40 applicants to the graduate program (a 40% acceptance ratio), with 13 students enrolling.

Among the peer institutions, there is substantial variability in program size. In terms of the number of students, our master's program most closely resembles the program at the University of Illinois-Chicago, which reports an average of 25.5 active master's students between 2007 and 2009, with a total of 6 incoming students and 8 degrees conferred in 2009. Other programs are relatively large in size, with as many as 56 active master's students enrolled at Northeastern University, and 78 at the University of South Florida. However, it should be noted that, unlike GSU, the Northeastern University offers a master's degree program online, while the University of South Florida now offers a master's degree in criminal justice administration that is taught during weekends and does not require GRE scores for admission. The criminal justice program at Temple University reports a very small number of active students in their master's program (only 2 in 2008). However, it appears that this is because most of the students at Temple University are admitted directly into the doctoral program.

In FY 2009, average GRE scores of newly admitted students in our master's program were 440 (verbal) and 546 (quantitative). The peer institutions provided scores of newly admitted *doctoral* students, which may not be directly comparable since they typically require higher GRE scores. Nevertheless, the average GRE scores of our master's students were similar to the scores of newly admitted doctoral students at the University of Illinois-Chicago (483 verbal, 592 quantitative), but lower than those at Northeastern University (611 verbal, 593 quantitative), Temple University (512 verbal, 562 quantitative), and University of South Florida (530 verbal, 534 quantitative).

Our master's students are encouraged to participate in professional organizations and to publish their work. Since 2005, our students have presented papers at national and regional conferences, including the meetings of the American Society of Criminology, Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Southern Criminal Justice Association, Southern Sociological Society, and the Criminal Justice Association of Georgia. Students have had their research published in such journals as *Applied Psychology and Criminal Justice*, *College Student Journal*, *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, *International Perspectives in Victimology*, *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, and *Aggressive Behavior*. Our graduate students have also received various awards and scholarship (see Appendix E, Table E1d).

Our graduate students have found employment in a variety of federal and state agencies, such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug Enforcement Agency, Georgia Bureau of Investigation, Georgia Department of Corrections, The Georgia State Board of Pardons and Parole, and the Georgia International Law Enforcement Exchange. They have also obtained employment in local police departments, universities and colleges, laws firms, and have served as project managers on federally-funded research projects. A number have risen to top managerial positions in state and federal criminal justice agencies. Several of our master's students are pursuing or have completed doctoral studies at such institutions as Auburn University, Florida State University, and the University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Section F: Faculty Quality

F1. Quality and Quantity of Scholarly Productivity: Faculty members in the Department of Criminal Justice have been active as researchers over the three year review period. This level of scholarship builds on earlier success the department demonstrated. For example, **our Department was ranked 8th in the nation** in terms of the number of scholarly publications in top journals per faculty member in a published study in the *Journal of Criminal Justice* (2006).

Table F1a below shows the number of publications over the review period. Many of the publications appear in top journals including, but not limited to, *Criminology*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *The British Journal of Criminology*, *The Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *Crime and Delinquency*, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *Violence Against Women*, *American Journal of Public Health*, *Prevention Science*, and *Journal of Criminal Justice*. Our faculty publish in both discipline-specific and interdisciplinary journals, as well as in international journals. The number of reprinted articles (9), particularly in recent years, suggests that the research is well received. Faculty research is cited often, an especially telling statistic given how young some of the faculty are. The average number of cites per faculty member is just under 219 (with Dr. Brezina being cited 632 times).

Table F1a. Scholarly Productivity, 2007-2009 (see Appendix B-5, Table B6 for more detailed individual faculty productivity data across 2007-2009).

Year	Total Pubs.	Journal Articles	Average JA per faculty	Books	Reprints
2007	32	24	1.50	0	1
2008	42	33	2.06	4	5
2009	56	41	2.56	1	3
Total	130	98	***	5	9
Average	43.3	32.6	1.37	1.67	3.0

In addition to the published works, faculty made 146 presentations at numerous regional, national, and international conferences including the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, the American Society of Criminology, the Southern Sociological Society, the Southern Criminal Justice Association, the International Conference on Terrorism's Global Impact, and the British Society of Criminology.

F2. Results of Promotion and Tenure Reviews: During the review period faculty have been successfully tenured and/or promoted with the overall result being that no individual applying for promotion and/or tenure has been denied at the departmental, college, or university levels. In fact, the department has an excellent track record of promoting and tenuring its faculty, with no denials occurring since 1996. Within the review period two assistants (Daigle, Guastaferrero) have successfully advanced past the college's standard third year review, one associate (Warner) was tenured and a second (Brezina) has passed the review of the Department and is now being assessed by the College's Dean, two assistants were tenured and promoted to associate (Collins, Topalli), and one associate was promoted to professor (Finn).

F3. Faculty Honors

Department of Criminal Justice Awards & Honors received, 2007 – 2009
Sue Collins: Nominated for Georgia State University Instructional Effectiveness Teaching Award, 2007.
Leah Daigle: Winner of William L. Simon/Anderson Publishing Outstanding Paper Award.
Robert R. Friedmann: Georgia State University Exceptional Service Award, 2008.
Robert R. Friedmann: Governor's Public Safety Award, 2008.
Robert R. Friedmann: House Resolution 617. Recognizing and commending Dr. Friedmann for his service, 2007.
Robert R. Friedmann: J. Edgar Hoover Memorial Scholarship, 2009.
Wendy P. Guastaferrero: Fellow, Center for Teaching & Learning, Georgia State University, 2008.
Wendy P. Guastaferrero: Fellow, Center for Teaching & Learning, Georgia State University, 2009.

Wendy P. Guastaferrero: Finalist, Georgia State University Instructional Innovation Award, 2008.
Wendy P. Guastaferrero: Georgia State University Instructional Effectiveness Award, 2009.
Brian Payne: Distinguished Alumni Scholar Award, Department of Criminology, Indiana Univ. of PA, 2008.
Brian Payne: Outstanding Educator Award, Southern Criminal Justice Association, 2008.
Mark Reed: Departmental Instructional Effectiveness (IE) Award, Georgia State University, 2007.
Professional Leave Awarded: Finn, Friedmann, Dabney, Blackwell (withdrawn due to budget)

F4. Dollar Level and Source of Sponsored Research (2007-2009): Faculty have aggressively sought external funding to support their graduate students and research (see table below). In FY2006-2008, the department acquired \$597,952 in grants (\$5,891,709 expenditures for grants in the review period into 2007-2009). During that time, 37 applications (totaling \$11,208,302) for external funding were made to such entities as the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, Centers for Disease Control, National Institute of Justice, etc.

Grant #	Grantee	Grantor	Total	Directs	Indirects	Grant Period
Grants Awarded in 2002						
	Friedmann	National Institute of Justice	\$3,051,999	\$2,532,291	\$519,608	10/01/02 - 9/30/09
Grants Awarded in 2003						
	Friedmann	National Institute of Justice	\$1,490,250	\$1,133,533	\$356,657	10/01/03 - 9/30/09
Grants Awarded in 2004						
FLCD7	Friedmann	Dept. of Justice: COPS Office	\$98,948	\$98,948	\$0	1/23/04 - 7/31/2008
FLCD8	Friedmann	Dept. of Justice: COPS Office	\$494,739	\$494,739	\$0	1/23/04 - 7/31/2008
Grants Awarded in 2005						
GLC17	Topalli	National Science Foundation	\$127,384	\$104,400	\$22,984	9/15/05 - current
Grants Awarded in 2006						
GLC23	Topalli	American Statistical Association	\$44,592	\$44,592	\$0	1/1/06 - 12/31/2007
H3004	Finn	Dept. of Justice	\$451,864	\$359,654	\$92,210	7/1/06 - 6/30/08
H3230	Topalli	Centers for Disease Control	\$10,507	\$10,507	\$0	9/1/06 - 12/31/08
Grants Awarded in 2007						
I3506	Guastaferrero	DeKalb County Superior Court/ Drug Court	\$25,487	\$20,228	\$5,259	7/1/07 - 12/31/08
Grants Awarded in 2008						
J3471	Yang	NIJ/Dept. of Homeland Security	\$33,000	\$23,751	\$9,249	6/1/08 - 5/31/11
J3472	Yang	NIJ/Dept. of Homeland Security	\$10,002	\$7,938	\$2,064	8/1/08 - 12/31/08
J3953	Yang	NIJ/Dept. of Homeland Security	\$22,500	\$17,857	\$4,643	9/1/08 - 5/31/10
Grants Awarded in 2009 (grant # not yet assigned)						
	Guastaferrero	DeKalb County Superior Court/ Drug Court	\$30,447	\$20,577	\$9,870	10/1/08 - 9/30/09

The following applications were made during the review period (with the last 8 in 2009 still under review):

Submissions in 2007					
CJ Faculty Involved	TITLE	AGENCY NAME:	AGENCY TYPE:	SUBMIT DATE:	PROPOSAL TOT AMT
Friedmann	Policies & Practices Adopted by Other Countries to Prevent and Respond to Terrorist Activities	National Institute of Justice	Federal	1/11/07	\$810,064
Friedmann	The Nature and Extent of the Links Between Terrorism and Corruption, Organized Crime and Smuggling (e.g. Drugs, Human Trafficking, Natural Resources)	National Institute of Justice	Federal	1/11/07	\$1,000,000
Blackwell	Assessing the Effectiveness of Evolving Electronic Monitoring Strategies in a Probation Population with a Multi-Method, Quasi-Experimental Strategy	National Institute of Justice	Federal	1/30/07	\$231,196
Topalli	Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design	Center for Disease Control	Federal	1/31/07	\$0
Camp	MARTA/GSU Joint Project on Training-Based Promotion of Police Personnel	MARTA	State	10/26/06	\$23,372
Guastaferrero	Program and Outcome Evaluation for Dekalb's Superior Court Drug Court	Dekalb County	Other	6/21/07	\$25,487
TOTAL AMOUNT FOR PROPOSAL SUBMITTED IN FY 2007					\$2,090,119

Submissions in 2008					
CJ Faculty Involved	TITLE	AGENCY NAME:	AGENCY TYPE	SUBMIT DATE	PROPOSAL TOT AMOT
Brezina	Intimate Partner Violence: An Examination of Perpetrators Reported Reasons for Committing Acts of Physical Aggression	Research Office	GSURF	1/10/08	\$3,500
Yang	Deterrence of Brutalization: The Effect of Governmental Interference on Domestic Terrorism-Using the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) as an Example	Research Office	GSURF	1/11/08	\$9,850
Dabney	Stress and Coping Among Homicide Investigators	CHHS Intramural	CHHS	3/5/08	\$5,000
Brezina	Intimate partner Violence: An Examination of Perpetrators' Reported Reasons for Committing Acts of Physical Aggression	Center for Disease Control	State	7/25/07	\$59,446
Warner	Preventing Youth Violence Through Developing Community Capacity for Informal Social Control	Center for Disease Control	Federal	1/25/08	\$2,103,316
Payne	Elder Abuse Training Needs of Police Officers in Georgia: Ties to Individual and Institutional Abuse	National Institute of Justice	Federal	2/1/08	\$347,842
Dabney	Stress and Coping Among Homicide Investigators	National Institute of Justice	Federal	2/27/08	\$283,593
Yang	Deterrence or Brutalization: The Effect of Governmental Interference on Domestic Terrorism-Using the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam as an Example	START	PrivateFound	4/11/08	\$33,000
Yang	The Criminology of Place: Developmental Patterns and Risk and Preventive Factors	National Institute of Justice	Federal	5/23/08	\$10,002
Camp	MARTA/GSU Joint Project on Training-Based Promotion of Police Personnel	MARTA	Other	10/16/07	\$42,739
Terrill	Criminal Justice Review and International Criminal Justice Review	Sage Publications	PrivateOrg	11/15/07	\$500
TOTAL AMOUNT FOR PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN FY 2008					\$2,898,788
Submissions in 2009					
CJ Faculty Involved	TITLE	AGENCY NAME	AGENCY TYPE	SUBMIT DATE	PROPOSAL TOT AMT
Teasdale	Hidden Heterogeneity in Educational Careers and Midlife Health Disparities	Univ of Akron/NIH	Federal	9/24/08	\$118,950
Guastafarro	Program and Outcome Evaluation for Dekalb's Superior Court Drug Court	Deklab County	Other	9/10/08	\$11,855
Payne	Advancing Awareness about Victims' Issues to College Students: A Multidisciplinary Model	U.S. Department of Justice	Federal	12/9/08	\$299,666
Brezina & Topalli	Criminal Self-Efficacy, Legal Punishment and Deterrence: A Multi-Methods Investigation	National Institute of Justice	Federal	1/12/09	\$34,588
Payne,Brian	Integrating Criminological and Traditional Explanations of Elder Abuse Through a Consideration of Victimization Experiences and State Policies	National Institute of Justice	Federal	3/27/09	\$303,138
Topalli	Investigation of Individual Differences that Influence Police Officer Shoot Decisions	National Institute of Justice	Federal	3/31/09	\$459,303
Dabney	Stress and Coping among Homicide Investigators	National Institute of Justice	Federal	3/25/09	\$422,733
Brezina	Urban Legends, Folk Devils and Contemporary Racial Prejudice: Integrating Research and Rumor and Racism	National Institutes of Health	Federal	4/20/09	\$278,093
Yang	Using Global Terrorism Data to Model Counter Terrorism Policies in Sri Lanka	National Institute of Justice	Federal	4/22/09	\$22,500
Guastafarro	Dekalb County Drug Court Program Evaluation	Dekalb County	Other	5/18/09	\$30,447
Dabney	Stress and Coping among Homicide Investigators	National Institute of Justice	Federal	5/13/09	\$422,733
Brezina	The Cultural Transmission of Racial Prejudice in Contemporary Society: A Case Study of Hurricane Katrina	Amer Sociological Assoc	PrivateFound	6/9/09	\$6,352
Yang	Deterrence or Brutalization: The Effect of Governmental Interference on Domestic Terrorism-Using the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam as an Example	START	PrivateFound	8/18/08	\$33,000
Yang	Risk Evaluation of Terrorism in South East Asia	Univ of Maryland	Federal	6/15/09	\$30,149
Yang	Deterrence or Brutalization: The Effect of Governmental Interference on Domestic Terrorism-Using the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam as an Example	START	PrivateFound	6/30/09	\$33,000
Topalli	Foreclosures and Crime	National Science Foundation	Federal	8/31/09	\$307,727
Topalli	Youth Violence Prevention Initiative	Dept of Justice (earmark)	Federal	11/30/09	\$2,772,000
Topalli	Police Officer Decion-Making in Shoot/Don't Shoot Situations	National Science Foundation	Federal	6/30/09	\$171,865
Daigle, Teasdale & Topalli	State-Wide Victim Notification Satisfaction Survey	Criminal Justice Coord Council	State	11/30/09	\$29,883
Daigle & Teasdale	Alcohol, Risky Behaviors and Youth Crime	National Institutes of Health		6/30/09	\$431,413
TOTAL AMOUNT FOR PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN FY 2009					\$6,219,395
TOTAL EXTERNAL APPLICATIONS DURING REVIEW PERIOD					\$11,208,302

F5. Service and Outreach Contributions (2007-2009): Service activities are performed in various ways. The Department houses two academic journals, *Criminal Justice Review* and the *International Criminal Justice Review*. Our faculty serves on editorial boards (*Journal of Crime and Justice*, *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Journal of Drug Issues*, *Western Criminology Review*, *Open Criminology*), committees of our national professional organizations (the American Society of Criminology, the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, and the Southern Criminal Justice Association, for example), as reviewers for various funding agencies (including NSF, NIJ, CDC, etc.) and serves on external tenure and academic program review committees. The Georgia International Law Enforcement Exchange (GILEE) and International Law Enforcement Enterprise carried out 88 professional training programs and symposia for law enforcement executives from around the world to enhance international cooperation to improve law enforcement services and public safety. Table F5.1. below provides additional details about service activities.

Table F5.1. Criminal Justice Faculty Service & Outreach Contributions, 2007 – 2009

Service to:	Examples (non-exhaustive):	2007	2008	2009
Department (by # of committees)	Undergraduate & Graduate Coordinators; Undergraduate & Graduate Cmtes; Search Cmtes; Library Liaison; Promotion & Tenure Cmte; Criminal Justice Student Association Advisor.	31	26	22
College (by # of committees)	Faculty Advisory Cmte; Faculty Appeals Cmte; Student Services Cmte; By-Laws Cmte; Academic Affairs Cmte; Search Cmte;	10	10	12
University (by # of committees)	University Senate; Executive Cmte of the Senate; Associate Dean's Working Group on Graduate Enrollment; Committee on Academic Programs.	24	27	16
Service to profession & community outreach	Editorial Board Members; External reviewer for tenure, various universities; Planning Cmtes for academic conferences; Atlanta police Department, Zone 2 Citizen's Advisory Council; Board member Atlanta Police Foundation; grants reviewers (NSF/NIJ).	25	42	25
Manuscripts reviewed (by # of scholarly journals)	Journals (non-exhaustive): <i>Criminology</i> ; <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i> ; <i>Criminal Justice & Behavior</i> ; <i>Journal of Crime & Justice</i> ; <i>Criminal Justice Review</i> ; <i>Justice Quarterly</i> ; <i>Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency</i> ; <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> .	50	65	55

Section G: Resource Adequacy

G1. Faculty Resources: We have increased the number of tenure track faculty since the last review period from 12 to 16. Due to reductions in the state budget, the amount of funds available to support travel and administrative needs has not increased at the same pace. We have addressed this by using indirects and funds from foundation accounts to support such activities.

However, these funds are limited and the Department has imposed a cap of \$1,250 on travel expenses per year until further notice.

As mentioned above in Section A, we have hired new junior faculty into the department recently which has helped us to slowly increase the number of required and elective courses offered and steadily reduce the average ratio of students to tenure-track faculty over time (from 1 to 52 in 2007, to 1 to 46 in 2008, to a current level of 1 to 37 in 2009; see Appendix G1). To produce these ratios while increasing our credit production levels, a number of our faculty have volunteered to teach large sections of university-wide core courses (such as Global Perspectives in Aggression and Violence and the department's recent addition of a course entitled Social Science and the American Crime Problem). Though we would prefer to reduce the number of courses taught by part-time instructors, two things must be kept in mind. First, unlike other disciplines, the criminal justice system maintains a number of individuals in applied areas (e.g., judges, probation and parole professionals, corrections directors, etc.) who provide our students with valuable real-world expertise in the classroom. In many cases, it is actually preferable to have such individuals teach courses in their areas of expertise, as they are able to provide students with a unique hands-on perspective. Second, in an effort to reduce the number of part-time instructors teaching our students and provide greater continuity and control over the semester-to-semester teaching portfolio of the department, we have employed for the past two years temporary full time non-tenure track (NTT) faculty. The addition of NTTs has permitted us to increase the number of required courses offered, provide greater variety of electives, control scheduling, and give faculty a larger number of teaching options from year to year. Although the advent of our doctoral program will temporarily squeeze the department in terms of overall teaching load (because of the new slate of doctoral courses that will need to be taught) we anticipate that some of this pressure will be relieved shortly thereafter as the doctoral program matures and our PhD students begin to take on course instruction as part of their graduate experience.

More importantly, with the start of a PhD program in 2010 we have a critical need to acquire senior scholars to serve the needs of new graduate students, increase applications for external funding, balance the teaching portfolio of the department, reduce the burden on Associate professors in the department, and to mentor our cadre of assistant professors (refer to Objective 1.1).

G2: Administrative Resources: Our two staff members are called upon to do far more than their share. In 2008, they have been serving 19 full-time employees (16 faculty, two non-tenure track employees, one full-time employee, and 8-10 part time instructors). By comparison, other departments have the following full-time employee to staff ratios: 17 to 3 (Political Science), 28 to 4 (Modern and Classical Languages), and 8 to 2 (African American Studies).

G3. Technological Resources: The department has 18 PCs, 1 workstation, 1 Apple, 20 laser printers, 17 notebooks, and one network printer. We have used our indirects to purchase advanced software where necessary. With the development of our PhD program, additional computers and advanced software will be necessary for laboratories used by doctoral students.

G4. Space Resources: Office space is assigned by the Dean's office of the College of Health and Human Sciences. To date, we have had the benefit of adequate office space. As we grow and add faculty and doctoral students, space will become a major issue. Our shared computer lab with Social Work and the School of Health Professions has greatly benefited our Master's students. That space, however, would not meet the needs of our coming doctoral

students – many of whom will need to be available for undergraduates who are enrolled in the courses they will be teaching.

G5. Laboratory Resources: n/a

G6. GSU Foundation Resources: The department has 6 accounts with the GSU foundation. The Foundation has provided the department with significant support in managing these accounts.

G7. Library Resources: The library resources have been adequate over the review period (due in no small part to the fact that the Department’s contract with Sage Publishing to produce the Department’s two journals allowed us to negotiate with Sage for it to provide its entire criminal justice and criminology catalogue to the University for free, a major acquisition and source of cost savings). As part of the planning for our PhD program, we will develop a new collection plan with the criminal justice librarian. This includes de-emphasizing some areas and increasing the emphasis on others, such as communities and crime, urban violence, and violence prevention policy. See Appendix G2 for an analysis of Criminal Justice/Criminology holdings by the University Library.

Section H: Goals and Objectives

H1. Goal 1 – The Department of Criminal Justice at Georgia State University will become a highly ranked PhD granting program in Criminal Justice and Criminology: In his Investiture address, President Mark Becker commented that Georgia State University, “has built a solid foundation for excellence.” In a similar way, as demonstrated by the national ranking for publications, receipt of individual and departmental honors and awards, and commitment to quality education, the Department of Criminal Justice has also “built a solid foundation for excellence.” By meeting its specific objectives, the department will become a highly ranked Criminal Justice program in the nation in the next 5 years. This will be reflected in empirical national studies of criminal justice/criminology programs and independent rankings such as the US News & World Report Ranking of Graduate Criminology Programs. This will help the University as it aspires to become a top 100 research university. Supporting objectives are outlined below.

◇ **Objective 1.1 - Hire at least four senior level faculty members:** The Department of Criminal Justice is in a unique position to make great strides forward in its productivity and national visibility. The addition of a group of collaborative senior scholars would open up opportunities for our department to acquire additional funding, accelerate our production of research, and promote the reputation of GSU. Unlike other disciplines, criminal justice and criminology is a relatively new field with a smaller community of scholars and departments both nationally and worldwide. There are now 32 doctoral programs in the field (as opposed to hundreds in sociology, psychology, and the natural sciences for example). These programs have become established and produced scholars of consequence with doctoral degrees in Criminal Justice and Criminology. They have also been strongly linked to the functioning of the criminal justice system and the national research infrastructure. As well, the impact of criminal justice researchers and scholars is considerable because the field’s areas of interest (crime and justice) represent significant components of the both the national economy and the functioning of federal, state, and municipal governments. As a result, criminal justice and criminology has achieved a legitimacy of status equal to other established social sciences and US News & World Report now ranks doctoral programs in criminology.

Because the field is relatively small and relatively new, the current national rankings are subject to a great deal more volatility than those for such areas as Chemistry, Psychology, Law, or Engineering for example. This presents an excellent opportunity for the University to quickly gain a visible and highly nationally ranked program. The addition to the department of a cadre of senior scholars with national reputations would produce an instant and substantial spike in our rankings, our access to criminal justice related external funding, and in the reputation of the University. A 2002 *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* article provided an empirical study of criminal justice and criminology departments across the country indicating our department ranked 14th in overall productivity among all criminal justice and criminology programs, *including those with doctoral programs*. Four years later, our department was ranked eighth in the nation in terms of the number of scholarly publications in top journals per faculty member in the *Journal of Criminal Justice* (2006). Based solely on our productivity as it currently stands, one could reasonably extrapolate that within 2-3 years of the start of the department's PhD program (which will make us eligible for ranking) the Department of Criminal Justice will very likely debut within the top 20 of the US News & World Report rankings. However, the addition of a group of productive high impact senior scholars would have a profound and almost immediate impact, allowing us to debut and remain much higher. As an example, the University of Missouri-St. Louis debuted in the US News and World Report rankings at 4th in the country, where they have remained since (despite the proliferation of new doctoral programs nationally). They debuted so highly due to an existing cadre of senior scholars with national reputations but also because they had recently hired one of the top scholars in the discipline to join them the year before the rankings came out.

Though we have one of the best groups of junior and associate scholars in our field in the country, senior faculty are needed to advance doctoral programs to the highest level and maximize the output of the faculty we currently have. A key limiter on productivity is that our associate faculty are burdened with an inordinate amount of work in terms of research, teaching, and especially service. The lack of senior scholars has meant that our associates are doing the work expected of associates in any department coupled with more advanced duties expected of full professors. We propose to focus our hiring of senior scholars on those with experience in obtaining external funding to support the graduate students we bring to the program as well as provide our current faculty with opportunities to participate in larger (e.g., "center" level) grants and receive mentoring in their own applications for funding. We are particularly interested in scholars with a track record of successful doctoral mentoring. Senior faculty will serve to stabilize the staffing of advanced courses in criminal justice and criminology and allow the department to balance and serve the needs of both of its graduate programs (MS and PhD) as well as its undergraduate (BS) program. One of these senior faculty can be hired to fill the distinguished chair position to be vacated by Dr. Friedmann. For the others, our department intends to take advantage of Georgia State University's *Second Century Initiative* as a possible outlet to fund the lines.

◇ **Objective 1.2 – Seek Opportunities to increase funding for the doctoral program:** In becoming a top-ranked program, a need exists to provide more research support with graduate research assistantships. While the department is appreciative of the graduate assistantships that we have received in the past, most faculty do not have a research assistant or share an assistant with another faculty member. More importantly, there is national competition for the best students in criminal justice and criminology. As we will be contending with a number of top-ranked and established programs for these students, and as these programs provide sustained

support (3 years or more) for their students at anywhere between \$16 - \$20,000 per year it is critical that we obtain similar or better funding to attract the best students to our program be competitive in the current market. Related to this, we will also be seeking to secure graduate teaching assistantships for those candidates who wish to prepare for a career in higher education. As noted earlier, we recognize the importance of funded research to the national reputation of the department. Obviously, this objective is congruent with objective 1.1 in a number of ways.

H2. Goal 2 – The Department of Criminal Justice at Georgia State University will increase the amount of external funding it receives over the next five years: Connected to the goals outlined in the University and College of Health and Human Sciences strategic plans, the Department is committed to developing strategies to increase the external funding it generates. Although we are pleased with the modest success that we have had, we acknowledge the need to focus more attention on tapping outside funding sources for our research endeavors. Part of the problem centers on the fact that we do not have a substantial core faculty with a consistent track record of securing outside funding (see objective 1.1 above). Some senior faculty have been, and some junior faculty show a great deal of promise in this area. This should not be construed as a criticism of the current faculty, as they have managed to bring this department to its present standing with far less resources than our more established competitors. There is a need, however, to improve in this area and move to the next plateau in the development of the department (see Objective 1.1). We propose to do so those through the objectives described below.

◇ **Objective 2.3 – The Department of Criminal Justice will launch the Center for Crime and Violence Prevention Policy:** The department is in the process of establishing the *Center for Crime and Violence Prevention Policy* at Georgia State University (Spring 2010) as a world-class resource and authority on the causes and prevention of crime and violence. Its mission is to make the application of scientific research and analysis key components of policy formulations on crime and violence prevention. Designed to coincide with the advent of the doctoral program in criminal justice and criminology, the Center, Under the direction of Dr. Volkan Topalli it will actively pursue the following activities: perform data warehousing and analysis; pursue “center level” grants; pursue research and grant application partnerships with academic and private research entities external to GSU; formulate and disseminate substantive and applicable policy geared toward short- and long-term reductions in crime and violence; publish an interdisciplinary peer-reviewed academic journal, *The Journal of Violence Prevention Policy*; engage in community education and outreach, and legislative advocacy; train and educate the next generation of crime and violence prevention professionals.

◇ **Objective 2.4 - Hire a Staff Person with expertise in grants management:** The department is fortunate to have two full-time staff members, but they are clearly overworked. A particular source of strain currently is the increased grant application activity of faculty members (see Appendix F). These activities are expected to significantly increase with the advent of the department’s new doctoral program, as will the variety and volume of graduate student related administrative tasks. They are also expected to increase as the department’s forthcoming Center for Crime and Violence Prevention Policy begins to engage in grant application and research activities. As such, there is a critical need to supplement the staff by hiring an individual with specific expertise and experience in grant writing, and pre- and post-award responsibilities.

H3. Goal 3 – The Department of Criminal Justice at Georgia State University will continue to improve the quality of education it provides to undergraduate majors: In his Investiture

address, President Becker indicated that his vision for Georgia State University included GSU being “known for the quality and impact of its graduates.” Our past graduates have gone on to positions of leadership in local, state, and national businesses, agencies, or institutions. Our program and its graduates are well regarded across the state and nation. Responding to current and future needs, the department will continue to be “known for the quality and impact of its graduates.” Advancing the graduate program will require some changes in the undergraduate program to continue to foster excellence in all programs. We will do this through working towards the objectives listed below.

◇ **Objective 3.5 - Increase the Number of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty:** Over the past two years, the department has come to rely on temporary full-time non-tenure track faculty to assist in course delivery. With the anticipated reduced teaching loads for some faculty participating in the PhD program, a need exists to balance departmental teaching loads. Hiring additional non-tenure track faculty will help in this way. We propose that the standard teaching load for these faculty be a 5/5, with reductions given if the non-tenure track faculty member is performing administrative or service-oriented duties as part of their workload.

◇ **Objective 3.6 – Develop a New Advising System:** An advising system will be developed in response to students’ concerns about advising. This system will be formulated and proposed by the undergraduate committee. Once it is developed, it will be clearly communicated to students and faculty. A culture of advising will be promoted in the department, with an eye toward issues of retention (a key strategic issue for the University), improvement in performance, and placement post-graduation. In doing so, connections between students and faculty will be improved. In addition, the advising system will be routinely evaluated to determine its success.

◇ **Objective 3.7 - Acquire More Space:** While space is a problem for a number of units throughout the University, our department has a serious problem. The general office area is inadequate for our two staff members with file and supply cabinets dominating the space. If we were able to hire additional staff, as suggested above, we would have a difficult time finding an appropriate work station for them. We have no office space for part-time faculty who play an important role in the delivery of courses to our students. They generally meet with students before or after class at the classroom or out in the hallway. There is no office space for our graduate assistants. In the ETS surveys, both students and faculty reported a low level of student-faculty interaction. Also, the criminal justice faculty have expressed a general concern about the lack of cohesion among students. While a number of factors are probably at work here (e.g., urban university with a large number of part-time working students), clearly the fact that there is no common area for graduate students or undergraduate students to interact with one another and faculty contributes to this situation. It is difficult to establish a sense of community among the students when they have no place to congregate and interact. Assuming the addition of new faculty, staff, and doctoral students we will need at least 6 new offices and large graduate student cubicle area (able to accommodate 15 to 20 graduate students).

H4. Goal 4 – The Department of Criminal Justice will enhance its emphasis on international issues related to criminal justice: In his Investiture address, President Becker stressed that “GSU must be globally oriented, to achieve the highest levels of education and research and to serve Atlanta and Georgia.” Our department has a long history of promoting an international focus to address issues related to crime and justice. We must maintain and build on those efforts. We will do so by working towards the objectives outlined below.

◇ **Objective 4.8 – Expand and enhance the Department’s “international footprint” through research and pedagogical activities:** We intend to expand the international participation of students and faculty in research and pedagogy that promotes learning, research, and the reputation of the University. The costs of participating in such activities are often substantial and we believe it is the responsibility of the Department and its faculty to identify funding for such activities. We will do this in a number of ways. For example, study abroad programs are common in other criminal justice programs. Similar opportunities should be developed here. Very few of our students have participated in such opportunities due to a lack of emphasis and infrastructural support. The Department will explore ways to promote study abroad for our majors through the office for international studies as well as through partnerships with program at other Universities. The department will also work with the international studies office to attract international students to its graduate programs. Plans are currently under way to establish a relationship with the Turkish government to solicit applications from students in their Turkish International Policing Studies program for our new PhD program.

With regard to faculty, a small number have participated in international conferences and the Department currently houses the very successful GILEE program, which has received numerous state, national, and international awards for its successful development of international partnerships. Expanding the participation of our faculty in international research and international conferences will enhance the reputation of the Department and the University. It will also increase opportunities for faculty to partner with international colleagues on grants and research activities. Various funding sources will be solicited to encourage participation in international conferences.

◇ **Objective 4.9 – Increase the impact and reputation of ICJR:** *The International Criminal Justice Review* is the premier scholarly journal focused on international issues related to criminal justice. ICJR has grown significantly in terms of the quality of its articles and its readership base since its inception here at GSU in 1990. A key goal in this regard is to obtain ISI status for the journal within a year and a corresponding impact factor rating before the next review.

H5. Goal 5 – The Department of Criminal Justice will continue to develop local, state, national, and international partnerships: The College’s Strategic Plan and Dr. Becker’s vision for the future outlined in his Investiture address emphasized the need to develop and foster partnerships with various agencies. The Department has a long history of maintaining relationships with agencies through its internship program and the GILEE. As noted above, we have partnerships with more than 200 agencies allowing our students to intern with them. More recently we have begun to develop a strong relationship with the Governor’s Criminal Justice Coordinating Council through our establishment of the Center for Crime and Violence Prevention Policy. It is important, though, that we enhance these partnerships where possible. The objectives discussed below outline ways these partnerships can be enhanced.

◇ **Objective 5.10 – Develop an Alumni Advisory Board:** The CHHS Strategic Plan calls for departments to develop advisory boards. We are in the early stages of this effort and will develop such a board before the next review.

◇ **Objective 5.11 – Develop MOUs and Data Sharing Agreements with Agencies:** The Department developed a data sharing agreement with the Atlanta Police Department in Spring 2008. Similar agreements are being explored with other agencies. Such agreements foster continued partnerships between our department and the other agencies. A key conduit for such agreements will be the newly established Center for Crime and Violence Prevention Policy.