PART I. PREFACE/HISTORY AND INTRODUCTION

1. SCHOOL STRUCTURE

The School of Social and Community Services (SSCS) is housed in the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) along with the School of Nursing and the School of Rehabilitative Professions (including Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy). The College also houses two non-academic units: Tennessee’s Early Intervention System (TEIS) that assists families of developmentally disabled children and The Center for Community Career Education which is dedicated to promoting education, career development and workforce preparation.

The School was created in 1990 as an administrative umbrella for the merger of three academic programs: Criminal Justice (undergraduate and graduate programs [CRMJ]), Human Services Management (nonprofit administration degree programs [HRSV]) and Social Work (SOCW). Legal Assistant Studies (paralegal program [LAS]) was added in 1995. One of the reasons for the organizational change was interest in promoting collaboration among faculty and to reduce duplication of limited resources. While other departments in the University are interdisciplinary in nature, the CHHS is the only unit with Schools and Directors instead of Departments and Department Chairs.

Historically, the organization of the College and the School has posed challenges that are largely structural in nature. The diversity of health and human services programs in the College often challenges the units to find commonalities. This situation also is true at the School level. While there is overlap in the various disciplines in the School, the diversity of programs and complexity of the organizational structure often require faculty to work to identify common themes and interests. The School is trying to secure a more interdisciplinary focus and to work across program lines in creative ways. Programs in the School have some autonomy. Each program has a Coordinator who acts as a direct representative for their discipline to serve on the Departmental Coordinating Council and to represent their program to the Director. The Criminal Justice Program has both an Undergraduate and Graduate Coordinator. Programs have major responsibilities (such as initiating curriculum changes, identifying areas of need for recruitment of faculty, and targeting budget needs that directly impact the program). In most instances, however, the School functions as a unit of the whole (i.e., the entire School is involved in final curriculum approval, votes on faculty candidates, and School policies). Faculty hold tenure in the School and report to the Director who functions as the department head (see Figure 1).
The School has finally achieved some stability in leadership. Dr. Helen Eigenberg has served as the Director for the past five years. Prior to that, the School had three Directors in five years which created inconsistent leadership and made it difficult to establish and follow through on priorities. The Program, however, has had a great deal of turnover in faculty in the past five years. Four of the six, full-time, tenure track faculty have been hired in the past five years, although two of these faculty members bring significant prior experience to the Program. New faculty and major curriculum revisions have resulted in a period of major program development in the past five years. In addition, the Program was able to end an unsatisfactory partnership with the local community colleges. For the past 25 years, UTC has had a Consortium Agreement with two local community colleges: Chattanooga State Technical College (CSTC) and Cleveland State College (CSC). This agreement held that CSC would offer the introductory courses (the systems course and a law course) for both CSTC and UTC. UTC was prohibited from offering any 100 or 200 level courses. CSC, instead, taught the introductory courses under their call letters on our campus. Thus students had to register with two colleges, manage financial aid with two colleges, and had to juggle two different schedules. These examples are but a few problems this agreement generated. Most importantly, Criminal Justice was the only program on campus that had no control over the curriculum or instructors in the key introductory courses. Students also often avoided taking these classes until they had completed all other coursework in the major, thus, pre-requisites were ignored and the program curriculum failed to build upon courses that preceded it in a meaningful way. Internal and external consultants had consistently called for the dissolution of the Consortium for over a decade. Changing political environments, administrative initiative, and accreditation issues allowed us to negotiate an end to the relationship and the first UTC introductory courses were offered in Spring 2002.

2. SCSS MISSION STATEMENT

The School has a mission statement and strategic plan that complement those at the College and University level.

The SSCS provides its diverse undergraduate and graduate student body with the knowledge, values and skills necessary to be effective providers, practitioners, and administrators of social and community services. It also embraces research and service as a means to contribute to the College and University mission of being an engaged metropolitan university (passed 10/25/00, modified 11/21/02).

3. DEPARTMENTAL GOALS

The following departmental goals have existed in a variety of forms but were most recently incorporated into the School Strategic Plan which was passed in December of 2002.
1. Expand our use of technology.
2. Improve the inclusiveness of our course materials (i.e., gender, race, ethnicity, etc.)
3. Build upon our partnerships with community agencies.
4. Continue to improve our assessment instruments and practices.
5. Increase our scholarly productivity.
6. Participate in student recruitment and retention efforts to help increase enrollments.
7. Enhance the classroom environment.
8. Monitor the efficacy and adequacy of our curriculum in all five programs.
9. Continue to pursue efforts to promote inter and cross disciplinary cooperation and to solidify the School as a unified entity.

4. OVERVIEW OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE CURRICULUM

The Criminal Justice Program generally offers courses that are designed to serve their majors, although there are some exceptions. Recently, the Program created and secured approved to offer their first general education course effective Fall of 1999: Violence Against Women. This course and another one (Gender and Crime) also are cross listed as Women’s Studies courses. Non-majors also may take other courses for general electives. The Violence in America course, for example, is a popular elective.

The Criminal Justice Program currently offers one undergraduate major, one undergraduate minor, and one graduate degree.

**Undergraduate Major:** Students are required to take Introduction to Sociology and Psychology as supporting courses. They also are required to complete 36 hours in core classes in the field which include introductory courses in law and the criminal justice system, computer applications, a diversity component, policing, corrections, courts, research methods, juvenile delinquency, theory, interpersonal communication and a senior seminar. They also are required to take 15 hours in criminal justice electives which allow students to pursue individual areas of interest from a wide range of specialty courses; 9 hours of these electives must be at the 300/400 level. They may take up to 3 hours of internship credit as electives to be applied toward the major. They must achieve a minimum of a C in all required courses and an overall GPA of 2.0 in the major.

**Undergraduate Minor:** Students must take 18 hours of criminal justice courses including the introductory courses in the law and the criminal justice system. At least 9 hours of the electives must be at the 300/400 level. Internships, individual study, and senior seminar are excluded from the possible list of electives.
M.S. Criminal Justice: Students are required to complete 36 total hours. They are required to complete a 21 hour core which includes courses in research methods (2), theory, pro-seminar, administration, cross cultural diversity, and the justice system. They also must complete an internship for 3 hours credit, unless they have prior experience in the field. In that case, they are allowed to take another elective instead. In addition, students must either complete a thesis for 6 hours credit or take comprehensive exams and complete an additional 6 hours of electives for this requirement.

5. CHANGES AND TRENDS IN RECENT YEARS

Other sections in the report describe trends and changes in the Criminal Justice Program in more detail. Briefly, the Program continues to evidence increased productivity at all levels. Enrollments and student credit hours demonstrate steady increases, despite slight declines in the past five years at the University level. The Program has hired four new faculty members in the last five years who are bring new ideas and expertise to the School. Faculty continue to evidence high levels of productivity. They are excellent teachers who are rated highly by students. They also are becoming increasingly active in terms of research and scholarly products. The last several years demonstrate significant increases in publications and outside funding. Faculty are involved in a wide range of community service and are a prime example of how faculty contribute to an engaged metropolitan university. The Program has a long history of engaging in distance learning at the graduate level and has offered the Master’s Degree on the Knoxville campus for over 25 years. The Program has a diverse student body and is taught by an increasingly diverse faculty. Students appear to be quite satisfied with the Program and it generally exceeds university averages on a variety of indicators which assess their experiences in the major.

The following goals were identified after the last Program Review. The vast majority of them have been achieved. All of them are discussed in more detail throughout the report.

1). Reduce reliance on part time faculty.

In the last program review, the percentage of adjunct faculty ranged from 36 to 43%. In the past four years, it has ranged from 14 to 30%. This accomplishment is largely a result of three factors. First, there are less courses offered, especially upper division electives. Second, changing how teaching loads were calculated at the graduate level made it possible to assign full-time faculty to an additional two to four sections a semester. Third, curriculum changes reduced the number of concentrations and thus the number and variety of core courses that had to be covered every semester. The curriculum is simply more efficient (and effective) than it was in the past. There is little optimism; however, that these figures will remain as low as they currently are given the end of the Consortium and the large increase in lower division student enrollments which is going to accompany this change.
2). Improve faculty diversity.
   Recruitment of four new faculty members in the past five years has resulted in a more diverse group of Program Faculty. The Program also is using a more diverse group of adjunct faculty and remains committed to this goal.

3). Develop specific program outcomes and devise strategies to measure these outcomes at both the undergraduate and graduate level.
   SACS procedures clearly demonstrate that the Program has established an annual process for assessment. It continues to be refined each year.

4). Develop and administer a survey of graduate alumni.
   This goal was achieved but it was done at the Program’s expense. The return rate was horrendous. The Program needs more support at the University level in gathering data relevant to the graduate program.

5). Address low criminal justice student scores on the College Base Exam and the Senior Major test by: notifying faculty of dates of exam; having faculty notify all students in 400 level courses of the exam and its importance to the university and programs; and developing strategies to increase scores.
   These actions were implemented. There have not been appreciable increases in College Base Exam scores, but there is a limit to what the Program can do about this issue since there are no entry level requirements for the major. It is encouraging to see that students in the major are doing well in the social science area of the Exam, despite lower scores in English, Math and Science. In fact, Criminal Justice majors score higher in the Social Science area that other majors in the College who have selective recruitment criteria. In addition, student scores on the senior assessment exams are increasing. In other words, students are demonstrating a better mastery of content.

6). Assess workload issues.
   A workload policy has been developed and implemented that gives some credit to the extra work involved with distance learning. Faculty earn 1/3 course release time for each distance learning course taught.

7). Monitor the viability of the Roane State program.
   This initiative has been abandoned due to low enrollments. New distance initiatives have not been initiated as the Program has insufficient faculty to cover existing demands.

8). Improve multimedia skills among faculty.
The multimedia skills of faculty have improved dramatically in the past five years. All faculty have participated in multimedia instruction of some type.

9). Reward faculty for research productivity by giving priority to assigning graduate student assistants to faculty who have demonstrated productive research agendas.

This practice has been established. Faculty who are actively engaged in research receive priority when graduate assistants are assigned.

10). Improve communication among faculty.

Most important decisions are made at the faculty level with significant input from faculty who stay engaged in School governance. The Coordinators holds regular Program meetings and the Director holds regular meetings with the Coordinating Council. The School also holds monthly faculty meetings. Email is used extensively by the Coordinators and the Director to keep faculty informed about daily and emerging issues.

11). Evaluate the Criminal Justice undergraduate curriculum.

The undergraduate program has engaged in two important revisions since 1998. The first set of changes drastically changed the core requirements and abolished concentrations in narrow areas (i.e., policing, the courts, corrections, and juveniles). The second revision concentrated on eliminating out dated electives and adding new elective courses.

12). Evaluate new oral and written communication standards and devise strategies to implement new undergraduate, general education requirements in each discipline. Identify at least one course for possible submission for general education course and submit this course for approval.

Curriculum modifications were made to ensure criminal justice majors satisfied competency areas required as a part of general education. Approved courses outside the major were identified as a means to address written and oral literacy. The computer literacy requirements were integrated into the major when an existing course (211) was approved by the General Education Committee. Approval also was sought and granted for Violence Against Women to be a social science general education course. The School also submitted and had approved a general education statistics course which is currently being taught by a criminal justice faculty member (Berry), although, for several reasons the course uses the HSRV call letters.

13). Evaluate the Criminal Justice graduate curriculum and create procedures for comprehensive exams.
The curriculum in the graduate program is currently being evaluated. Comprehensive exams were administered to the first cohort beginning Spring 1999.

14). Identify issues associated with the Consortium with Cleveland State and identify strategies to resolve issues or make a determination to terminate the relationship and take steps toward that end.
   As stated previously, this agreement has been terminated. No other accomplishment was as important in the past five years as ending the Consortium Agreement.

15. Secure resources to add five new faculty lines.
   The most significant failure in the past five years involved the Program’s inability to secure new positions. All prior program reviews have indicated a dire need for new faculty lines, but the administration has not been able to fund any increases in faculty lines.
PART II: CURRICULUM

1. COMPETENCIES/EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

The Criminal Justice Program promotes both a theoretical and applied understanding of the criminal justice system to both majors and non-majors. For undergraduates, emphasis is placed on intellectual, experiential, and problem solving skills (i.e. interpersonal, computer, research) to prepare them for entry level employment in criminal justice systems and social service agencies. At the graduate level students engage in rigorous study in preparation for managerial and leadership roles throughout the justice system.

Undergraduates in the Criminal Justice program are expected to demonstrate their ability to master core material in the field including familiarity with the structure and operation of the justice systems, criminological theory, and research methods. Students are expected to demonstrate oral, written and computer literacy. They also will have the practical skills necessary to prepare them for a career in this field. Students in the Graduate Program are expected to demonstrate their ability to retain and integrate core material in the field. They also will demonstrate an increased mastery of skills as a result of the program, including critical thinking, problem solving, writing, evaluation research, oral communication, computer literacy.

Undergraduate student competencies are measured in three general ways: 1) a major field test taken by senior-level students, 2) self reported satisfaction and supervisor evaluations for internship placements, and 3) survey data from the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Institutional Research Office which provides self-report information about oral, written, and computer literacy. Graduate student competencies are measured by: 1) an exit survey that measures a self-evaluation of competencies and 2) success with comprehensive exams and theses (see SACS annual report forms).

2. MASTERY OF SKILLS

Undergraduate

UTC completed a massive overhaul of its general education program which became effective in Fall 1999. Specific attention was given to emphasizing written and oral communication abilities as well as computer literacy. Programs may address these requirements by integrating specific competencies into existing courses within the major or they may require additional courses from approved lists addressing a specific competency area.

Oral: Criminal Justice majors are required to compete one of the university wide approved oral communication courses. Several other classes in the Program also require presentations on occasion. In 2001-02, all (100%) of students who passed 485 (Senior Seminar) gave an oral presentation. Furthermore, criminal justice students are more
likely than other students university-wide to indicate that their education aided them in speaking effectively (according to 2001 data from the Enrolled Student Survey).

**Written:** Criminal Justice majors are required to compete one of the university wide approved writing courses. An additional in-house requirement is that every 300/400 level course must have a significant writing assignment. All students must complete the Senior Seminar course which requires preparation of a significant writing assignment. None the less, criminal justice majors are less likely than other students university-wide to indicate that their education aided them in writing effectively (according to 2001 data from the Enrolled Student Survey). This finding is consistent evaluations from the prior program review as well.

**Critical Thinking:** Development of reasoning abilities permeates the Criminal Justice curriculum, with increasing demands for higher cognitive skills and applications at the junior and senior levels. A wide variety of assignments throughout the curriculum also demonstrate that students are asked to demonstrate their ability to think critically.

**Computer/Technology Skills:** Criminal Justice majors are required to take CRMJ 211: Information Systems in Criminal and Juvenile Justice. This course requires students to master basic computer skills such as Word and Excel. It exposes them to computerized legal research through the use of Lexis-Nexis. They also get specific training on how to access criminal justice related information on the web and how to evaluate the quality of this information. These skills are reinforced through assignments throughout the program. In 2001, students who responded to the institutional Alumni Survey suggests that students feel they receive good foundations in computer literacy. On average, 89% of the criminal justice majors report that faculty make good use of technology to help students learn compared to 62% of the students university wide. In addition 86% of the criminal justice faculty use Blackboard and it is used in 87% of the courses taught by full time faculty. All (100%) of full-time criminal justice faculty have participated in some type of technology workshop each year for the past three years.

**Research Skills:** Criminal Justice majors are required to take CRMJ 311: Criminal Justice Research Methodology which exposes them to the foundations of research methods and some introductory statistics. These skills are utilized in various research assignments in the curriculum, especially in the Senior Seminar.

**Graduate**

At the graduate level, students are expected to demonstrate writing skills in all classes. All instructors require written assignments and most use essay exams. Critical thinking skills are also demonstrated by both assignments and exams. Students are required to take two research methods courses. There are some computer assignments, especially in the research methods courses where students are required to learn and apply SPSS. Apparently, however, graduate students do not feel they have had adequate groundwork in several areas. They report they have inadequate preparation which may
be related to the fact that it is challenging to integrate oral communication skills in
distance learning courses. In addition, data from the last departmental exit survey (2001)
suggests there is a need to improve in several other areas. Students in the graduate
criminal justice program rated their experiences lower than other graduate students on
campus when it came to using technology and the internet as a learning tool, and
couraging students to think critically.

In order to increase the use of technology in the classroom, including the use of
the internet, we will review courses in the 2002-03 academic year and develop additional
technological and internet related assignments. In order to address the issues associated
with critical thinking, we will examine and revise the curriculum in 02-03 as it has been
over 5 years since it was evaluated and is in need of some work. We also are making a
concerted effort to increase the rigor in the graduate program, in terms of the level of
critical thinking, types of assignments, quality of work, and difficulty level.

3. LEARNING ASSESSMENTS

Undergraduate

College Base Results

As Figure 2 demonstrates, Criminal Justice majors have scored below national
averages and below mean scores for the University and the College. There are, however,
some important distinctions that need to be made regarding these scores. First, this trend
is similar of criminal justice programs nationwide. Second, students in the Program score
below the College mean because of the nature of the other programs in the College:
Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, and Nursing. All of these programs are highly
selective and have their own application process whereby Criminal Justice has no process
to deny access to students who declare the major regardless of their CBASE scores.
Second, criminal justice majors score higher than other departments in the College on the
CBASE sub-test for social studies (see Figure 3). Not surprisingly, the other
Departments rank much higher on the CBASE in math and science (sub fields associated
with the health field professions). Unfortunately, criminal justice students also score
lower than other Departments in the College in English.

Major Field Test Results

In general, the scores on the major field tests have been lower than one would
like. The majority of students taking the ACAT Major Field Test in Criminal Justice
(developed and administered by Austin Peay) have not performed well. Program faculty
have been working on this issue for the past five years and have taken actions to improve
student performance (e.g., increasing reading and writing assignments; and increasing
grading standards). Significant curriculum revisions also were made to provide students
with better content in the core. There also, however, seemed to be some problems
associated with the ACAT exam. After reviewing a copy of the exam, it was determined
to explore the only other nationally developed major field test for criminal justice, prepared by ETS

There has been improvement in student scores on the major field tests. In 2000-01, 37% of the seniors taking the ACAT scored above the 50th percentile on the ACAT major exam; however, 50% of these same students scored above the 50th percentile on the ETS exam. This finding reinforced the idea that the ACAT exam was not as good as the ETS in testing whether students has mastered core content. In 2001-02, 93% of the seniors scored above 75th percentile and all students 100% (n=15) scored above the 50th percentile on the ETS exam. In addition, in 2000, students scored below the national mean, but in 2001 they were above the mean (see Figure 4). Thus, students appear to be demonstrating more mastery of content and the ETS exam appears to assess student knowledge better than the ACT test. It is important to note, however, that funding restrictions dictate that only a small number of seniors are tested each semester (usually about 10). Thus, the assessment scores are not representative and may fluctuate greatly depending on the particular set of students taking the test in a given semester (and how seriously they approach the task at hand).

Capstone Courses

All students in the Program must take the capstone course. It was just revised in 2001-02. The intent was to move this course from an overview of current issues to a capstone experience where students employ knowledge from methods and theory to prepare a final project.

Old Description for CRMJ 485: Senior Seminar (3 credit hours). Discussion of selected system wide problems and topics in criminal justice. Research and oral presentation by the student.

New Description for 485: (3 credit hours – effective Fall 2002) Capstone course. Students will plan, design, and carry out a research project on a criminal or juvenile justice topic. Final projects will be grounded in relevant literature and will emphasis the integration of knowledge acquired in previous courses. Final papers which report the results for the study will be presented in a formal research seminar. Prerequisite: Criminal Justice Majors only. Senior standing with CRMJ 110, 301, and 311 completed.

Graduate

There are limited data to use to assess learning outcomes at the graduate level where CBASE scores and Major Field tests do not exist. Exit exams administered by the department suggest that students are satisfied with course content and quality of courses. Students also reported being satisfied with the skills they developed in the program (including those related to critical thinking ability, problem solving, writing, and evaluation research; see SACS outcome reports for 2000-01).
An alumni survey was also developed and administered by the Program in 1999-00 (see 2000-01 SACS outcome report). Seventy-seven percent of the students reported they were satisfied with 7 of 11 items designed to evaluate the program. Students generally were satisfied with the quality of courses and faculty, and the degree to which the program prepared them for a career and/or further academic study, and reported they program increased their skills. They were least satisfied with the degree of career advise, career preparation, internships, and distance learning as a system of course delivery.

The internship has been re-vamped and 84% of students participating in a field placement reported they had a successful experience in 2001-02 (see SACS Outcomes Report). Hopefully any problems with that course have been addressed.

The data related to distance learning are difficult to interpret. A special survey on distance learning is being developed to try to ascertain the lack of satisfaction with this type of instruction and to isolate the specific complaints associated with this delivery method. Schedules have been modified to eliminate back to back offerings on the same night. Networking with UTK and advising has led to an increase in the number of electives available on the Knoxville campus since students can take some Sociology/Criminology courses. This arrangement also allows students in Knoxville to have some traditional classroom experiences. On campus, there also has been an increase in course offerings and some of them are not distance format so that students in Chattanooga also have the opportunity to take classes delivered in the traditional manner. Perhaps these actions (and other modifications) can be made to make the delivery method more palatable to students or perhaps their survey responses simply indicate, that in the best of all possible situations, they would prefer to have an instructor who is on site at all times.

The Office of Planning, Evaluation and Research also administered an alumni survey in 2001-02. These data also suggest that the program is doing well in terms of quality of the program and preparation for career and graduate study. Six items on program assessment, however, scored more than one standard deviation below the university mean. Students rated the Program lower than others on campus when examining: fairness of faculty evaluations of students, use of technology as a teaching tool, encouragement to think critically, learning a lot in general, and preparation for a career. The findings that challenge the fairness of faculty grading may well reflect a conscious decision to raise standards and increase workload in the program. In order to increase the use of technology in the classroom and the use of the internet, faculty will review courses in the 2002-03 academic year and develop additional technological and internet related assignments. Faculty also believe that the issues related to learning in general and critical thinking may reflect current curriculum deficiencies and validate the need to revise it. Changes were made to try to be more responsive to student needs regarding career issues. A minimum of 5 hours of classroom time in the ProSeminar course is now devoted to career related issues and a career fair was held in 2000-01 with 27 participating agencies. Students simply may have unrealistic expectations as criminal
justice majors sometimes think that the educational component of their degree program should teach them things that are on the job training.

Comprehensive exams also are used to assess the program. The first exams were completed in Spring 1999. Data suggest that students are mastering core concepts. For example, in 2000-01, 100% of the students who took the comprehensive exams passed at least one section of the exam. In 2001-02, 88% passed at least one section

Theses also provide evidence related to program assessment. While the completed theses are of high quality and clearly demonstrate that students’ writing, research, and computer skills, only a handful of students choose this option. Approximately xx students have completed a thesis in the past five years which is a small percentage of graduates from the program.

4. CORE COURSES AND CONTENT

Undergraduate Curriculum

The Criminal Justice Undergraduate Program has had two significant curriculum revisions in the past 5 years. Prior to Fall, 1998, the Program relied upon a curriculum that was first implemented in Fall 1991 and required the following coursework:

- Introduction to Criminal Justice (1010), Criminal Law (1070), Information Systems (211), Comparative Justice Systems (303), Interpersonal Skills (HSRV 405), Theories of Criminal Behavior (410), Research Methods (311), Crisis Intervention (465), Internship (470, 471) and a Concentration in either Law Enforcement; Corrections; Probation and Parole; Juvenile Justice; or Law and the Courts. These concentrations each required 9 hours of criminal justice courses specifically related to the concentration topic, 6 hours in social science electives, and an additional 3 hours criminal justice electives. This structure was revised for several reasons. First, and most importantly, it was too restrictive. Students at the undergraduate level did not need this level of specialization when in all likelihood many of them would have careers in various areas of the criminal justice system. Second, it provided too little expertise in any given area (e.g., 9 hours). Third, it led to staffing difficulties as it was impossible to offer all courses in sufficient rotation to meet demand with only six faculty lines. Fourth, it was consistent with the recommendations of the external reviewer who completed the 1998 program review process.

In Fall 1998 the curriculum was drastically revised and it became effective in Fall 1999. Significant changes were made to the core as recommended by the external reviewer. Faculty endorsed a broad-based core which included introductory courses, methods, theory, basic courses on each area of the system (i.e., police, courts, and corrections), comparative courses, a senior seminar, internships, and electives. Specifically the 1999 curriculum required the following coursework: Overview of Criminal Justice Systems, Criminal Law, Information Systems in Criminal and Juvenile Justice, Criminal Justice Research Methodology, Law Enforcement in Criminal and
Juvenile Justice, Correctional Perspectives in Criminal and Juvenile Justice, Law and Justice System, Juvenile Justice, Theories of Criminal and Delinquent Behavior, Crisis Intervention, Integrative Criminal Justice Systems Seminar, a diversity based course (Comparative Criminal and Juvenile Justice Systems, Minorities and Criminal Justice, or Gender, Crime and Criminal Justice) and fifteen hours criminal justice electives (nine of which must have been at the 300/400 level with no more than three hours of internship applied toward the criminal justice electives.). A requirement also was added to mandate that all students have a minimum of a C in all required, core courses in addition to a 2.0 overall G.P.A. in the major to graduate.

In Fall 2001 another major revision was made. The Consortium Agreement was dissolved which allowed UTC to offer the introductory courses. In addition to creating the new introductory courses (Introduction to the Criminal Justice System and Introduction to Criminal Law), pre-requisites were reviewed and added to existing courses to better sequence offerings. Outdated courses were deleted and some were folded into existing or new courses (Institute in Criminal Justice, The Volunteer in Criminal and Juvenile Justice, Advanced Administration, Administrative Advocacy, The Criminal and Society, The Psychology of Law Enforcement, Correctional Institutions, Correctional Casework, Prisoner’s Rights, Advanced Criminal Law, and Advanced Criminal Procedure). Other courses were consolidated to eliminate overlap and new electives were added (Correctional Administration and Legal Rights of Inmates, Police Procedure and Criminal Investigation, Crime, Society and the Media, Public and Private Security, Police Administration, Terrorism, Victimology, White Collar and Corporate Crime, Gangs and the Criminal Justice System, and Virtual Explorations in Community Problem Solving). In addition, several existing courses were modified (Correctional Perspectives, Law Enforcement, Probation and Parole, Law and Justice System, and Senior Seminar.)

Alterations to the Senior Seminar course ensure that the changes recommended by the last external review have been made (i.e., to remove material on career paths and getting a job and to replace this content with material that allows students to demonstrate mastery of basic skills including reading critically, thinking analytically, writing clearly, and speaking effectively.

Finally, the core was changed slightly. Students are no longer required to take Crisis Intervention (CRMJ 465). Instead, students are required to select a class from a block of interpersonal communications courses taught by other programs in the School (LAS 300: Interviewing and Interrogation, SOCW 311: Interviewing in the Helping Professions, and HSRV 405: Interpersonal Skills). These courses include content that really is outside the expertise of the criminal justice faculty and can better be taught in other disciplines where faculty have stronger interviewing and counseling backgrounds.

OUTLINE OF CURRENT UNDERGRADUATE COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Supporting Courses:
1): SOC 151: Introduction to Sociology
2): Psychology 101

Core (Required Courses -- Total 36 hours)

CRMJ 110: Introduction to the Criminal Justice System
CRMJ 170: Introduction to Criminal Law
CRMJ 211: Information Systems in Criminal and Juvenile Justice
CRMJ 303: Comparative Criminal and Juvenile Justice Systems OR
   CRMJ 317: Minorities and Criminal Justice OR CRMJ 425: Gender, Crime
   and Criminal Justice
CRMJ 310: Law Enforcement in Criminal and Juvenile Justice
CRMJ 311: Criminal Justice Research Methodology
CRMJ 312: Correctional Perspectives in Criminal and Juvenile Justice
CRMJ 325: Law and Justice System
CRMJ 375: Juvenile Justice
CRMJ 410: Theories of Criminal and Delinquent Behavior
CRMJ 485: Integrative Criminal Justice Systems Seminar
LAS 300: Interviewing and Interrogation OR SOCW 311: Interviewing in the Helping
   Professions OR HSRV 405: Interpersonal Skills

Electives (15 hours of Criminal Justice courses. No more than 3 hours of CRMJ 470 or
471 [internship] may be applied toward the criminal justice electives. 9 hours must be at
the 300/400 level.)

CRMJ 201: Violence in America
CRMJ 250: Media and the Criminal Justice System
CRMJ 295: Violence Against Women
CRMJ 303: Comparative Criminal and Juvenile Justice Systems
CRMJ 317: Minorities and Criminal Justice
CRMJ 330: Probation, Parole and Community Corrections
CRMJ 355: Public and Private Security
CRMJ 370: Drugs: The Law and the Community
CRMJ 390: Police Procedure and Criminal Investigation
CRMJ 400: Constitutional Law
CRMJ 401: Victimology
CRMJ 404: Police Administration and Management Issues
CRMJ 406: Juvenile Law
CRMJ 412: Correctional Administration and Legal Rights of Inmates
CRMJ 414: Terrorism
CRMJ 415: White Collar and Corporate Crime
CRMJ 425: Gender, Crime and Criminal Justice
CRMJ 430: Philosophical and Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice
CRMJ 434: Gangs and the Criminal Justice System
Graduate Curriculum

The graduate program in Criminal Justice was revised in 1995, following a 1993 review by external consultants. UTC faculty reviewed 47 graduate programs and examined professional standards proposed by the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, and then revised the curriculum that resulted in a considerably more rigorous program.

When the curriculum was revised, it was restructured along four dimensions: a) the depth of the core curriculum was broadened; b) students were required to integrate knowledge consistently from all courses taken; c) students were required to demonstrate their depth of knowledge and ability to integrate knowledge by passing a comprehensive examination, and d) specific concentrations (e.g., in corrections, policing, the law) were abolished and elective courses were added. The core curriculum was broadened because many graduate students received undergraduate degrees in disciplines outside criminal justice/criminology and lacked comprehensive knowledge of the field; however, students who do not have a criminal justice background prior to admission to the program are also required to take at least two undergraduate courses in Criminal Justice.

The core curriculum was revised to include courses relating to theory, ethics, the courts, corrections, and research. Five new courses (Research Methodology II, Criminal Justice Proseminar, Cross-Cultural Diversity and Crime, Theoretical Perspectives of Crime, and The American Justice System) were designed for the core. Research Methodology II was added to the core to strengthen student ability to conduct applied research, including computer applications and data analysis. A proseminar course was included to familiarize students with current research findings on crime, ethical principles of the profession, and career planning issues. A course on cultural diversity and crime examines racial and ethnic issues as they affect criminal justice, so that students develop the understanding necessary for leadership in the profession. A theory course was added to examine issues of theory-building, current theories in the discipline, and interrelationships between theory and research in the discipline. Finally, a course was added to the core to examine practices in criminal, civil and juvenile court settings, defining differences and interrelationships between the law practiced in each of these courts.

Four courses (Social Control and Prevention, Social Habilitation, System Planning, Crime and Public Policy) were removed from the core and are now offered as electives. Two new courses (Correctional Theories, Issues and Practices and Correctional Intervention) were developed and designed to meet the needs of students entering the correctional field.

OUTLINE OF CURRENT GRADUATE COURSE REQUIREMENTS
Core Courses (3 hours each: 21 Hours Total Required)
CRMJ 500: Research and Methodology
CRMJ 502: Research and Methodology II
CRMJ 503: Criminal Justice Proseminar
CRMJ 505: Social Administration within the Criminal Justice System
CRMJ 513: Cross Cultural Diversity and Crime
CRMJ 516: Theoretical Perspectives of Crime
CRMJ 525: The American Justice System

Elective Courses
Electives (3 hours each: 6 Hours Total Required)
CRMJ 501: Social Control/Prevention
CRMJ 507: Social Habilitation
CRMJ 510: Special Topics in Criminal Justice
CRMJ 520: Crime Analysis
CRMJ 530: Systems Planning
CRMJ 535: Correctional Theories, Issues, and Practices
CRMJ 536: Correctional Intervention
CRMJ 540: Crime & Public Policy
CRMJ 550: Crime Prevention
CRMJ 570: Criminal Justice Seminar
CRMJ 597r: Individual Studies

Thesis/Comprehensive Exam (6 Hours Total select one option)
Option A: CRMJ 599r: Thesis (6 hours)
Option B: 6 Hours Electives

Internship Requirement (3 Hours Total)
CRMJ 560: Internship

Students with significant criminal justice experience may substitute a criminal justice elective for the internship requirement. Approval must be granted by the Graduate Coordinator.

The Graduate curriculum is in need of revisions. It has been approximately 7 years since changes were implemented and many new faculty have joined the Program since the last revision bringing new areas of interest and expertise. The Graduate Coordinator is currently putting together a draft proposal and we are expecting that feedback from the Program Review will assist us in this endeavor.

5. COURSE SYLLABI
All course syllabi at both the undergraduate and graduate level clearly outline the course description as well as goals and objectives of the courses. All course syllabi for the past five years also are on file in the main office and may be examined by the external reviewer. Faculty also are free to use them to devise new courses or to prepare to deliver a course for the first time.

6. COURSE OFFERINGS

Almost all undergraduate courses were offered in the past two years (see Figure 5). Several courses were recently deleted because they were not offered regularly. With limited faculty, there are always challenges to scheduling but students usually do not have major problems getting the necessary classes for graduation (to date, see Figure 6). Most undergraduate courses are offered at least once a year at night (and often more frequently) to accommodate students who cannot attend during the day. The following principles guide scheduling assignments.

1. First priority is to cover core courses at both the graduate and undergraduate level. Multiple sections may need to be available dependent upon time considerations and demand.
2. Full-time faculty teach core courses. This approach builds in quality control. An exception may be made to this policy for extremely well qualified adjunct faculty. Electives are offered after all primary bases are covered.
3. Graduate courses are taught by full-time faculty.

Unfortunately, however, this philosophy leads to too few opportunities for faculty to develop electives in multiple areas of expertise. It also results in students taking too many electives from adjunct instructors which limits the overall elective experience for majors.

All graduate courses except one (530: Systems Planning) have been offered in the past two years (see Figure 7). This course has not been offered since 1997 and probably needs to be eliminated. Enrollments also suggest that while classes are often full, students usually can get into courses as needed (see Figure 8).

All graduate courses are offered in the evening. At least two courses a semester (on Tuesdays and Thursdays) are delivered both on campus and to Knoxville via satellite (involving two way audio and two way video connections). The Tuesday/Thursday distance learning courses are usually required courses. Every attempt is made to also offer at least two additional electives each semester. If system resources are available, courses are also offered to Chattanooga and through distance learning to Knoxville. If courses cannot be offered via distance learning on Mondays and Wednesdays, they are offered on campus in traditional format. Knoxville students may either commute to Chattanooga (which is rare) or they may take approved graduate courses in Knoxville -- usually criminology courses offered by the Sociology department.
Prior to 1998, students in Knoxville had better access to courses. Four courses a semester were available to both on-campus and Knoxville students using distance learning technology; however, they were offered back to back – two on Tuesdays and two on Thursdays (5-7:30 p.m. and 7:30-10:00 p.m.). The current Director ended this practice in 1998 contending that the integrity of the course offerings were compromised when students were asked to complete five hours of coursework when many of them also had already completed at least an eight hour work day. This change has made it more difficult to ensure sufficient variety of offerings, especially to the Knoxville students. Many of the Knoxville students, however, are taking courses part time and cannot handle a nine to twelve hour load even when it is offered. When Knoxville students are interested in a full load, they are assisted in identifying appropriate courses to complete on the UTK campus.

7. STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

Undergraduate

Students have writing requirements in 100% of their courses; however, not all of these assignments involve independent research per se. Instead, some faculty require book reviews, written exercises, legal briefs, and/or group projects. An analysis of the most recent syllabi for all classes that have been offered in the past three years indicates that 25% of the courses require traditional research projects (10 courses \([275, 303, 310, 314, 320, 330, 360, 425, 485, \text{ and independent studies}]\) out of 40).

All undergraduate students also are required to take the Senior Seminar which is the capstone course in the major. This course demands that students engage in a comprehensive research project as evidenced by the course description (see previous description in the Curriculum section).

Approximately 10% of the criminal justice majors also engage in independent studies (CRMJ 498). Prior to the last year or so, documentation of these experiences is poor and it is difficult to ascertain what types of activities were required of the student. They almost always, however, require independent and/or collaborative research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Enrollment in CRMJ 498</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1999</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2001</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2002</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recently, some undergraduate students have attended professional conferences. In September, 2001 five students attended the Southern Criminal Justice Association meeting in Baton Rouge (Selena King, Garrit Sullivan, Rachel Cooper, Jared Stokes, and Sean Rogers). In March 2002, seven students attended the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences meeting in Los Angeles (Garrit Sullivan, Kristin Kyker, Templin Rolen, Jennifer Barker, Sean Rogers, Shauna Holmes, and Sara Libby). In September 2002, three students co-authored a paper and presented a paper at the Southern Criminal Justice Association conference in Clearwater Beach (Pam Pangle, Heather Scoggins, Anne Jones). One of our newer faculty member, Dr. Jeff Rush, has been responsible for getting students interested in attending conferences and has facilitated their attendance and presentations. There has not been any equivalent success at the graduate level, perhaps, because so many of the graduate students are older, working, part-time students with competing obligations.

No students have received a provost student research in an honors project. No students have published papers.

There award or have participated is probably a need for more faculty involvement with students in quality, research oriented endeavors. While the course requirements and the capstone class require undergraduate students to engage in projects of their own, there is limited faculty/student collaboration. This statement also probably reflects the status of the independent study courses. Too often students are taking an independent study to avoid taking traditional classes. The Director is taking actions to try to curtail the number of independent studies unless the student is assisting faculty in research that has the potential for publication. There are several explanations for this decision. First, there are too few faculty to staff the program at both the undergraduate and graduate level and faculty do not have time to conduct multiple independent studies and ensure that the experience is rigorous. Second, there is a significant need for graduate students to have this type of collaborative research experience when faculty do have time for this type of arrangement.

Graduate

Students have writing requirements in 100% of their graduate courses. Most of these assignments involve independent research, although some faculty use alternative assignments (e.g., book reviews, written exercises, legal briefs, and/or group projects). An analysis of the most recent syllabi for all classes that have been offered in the past three years indicates that 76% of the courses required traditional research projects (13 courses [500, 501, 502, 503, 507, 510, 513, 525, 535, 540, 550. and independent studies] out of 17).
There is not a capstone course at the graduate level per se, although, all students are required to complete a thesis or pass comprehensive exams. In addition, all students are required to take two sections of research methodology (CRMJ 500 and 502) which requires them to formulate a research proposal and follow it through the process of data collection, analysis, and final reports.

Approximately 10% of our students also engage in independent studies of some fashion. CRMJ 597 is used for independent studies, CRMJ 598 for research projects, and CRMJ 599 for theses hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Enrollment 597</th>
<th>Enrollment 598</th>
<th>Enrollment 599</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here again, it is difficult to ascertain what types of activities were required of the student. While the majority (if not all) of these experiences involved independent research, the type of experience and degree of collaborative work with faculty is difficult to ascertain. Unfortunately, too many of the 597 courses historically have involved students using independent study to substitute for courses that were not offered or to fill out their schedules when it is impossible to take a full load in the department due to scheduling restrictions. Insufficient faculty resources clearly has contributed to this pattern.

In the past, graduate students could complete a thesis for six hours credit or complete an independent research project for three hours credit (CRMJ 598) and take an additional three hours electives. The course description for 598 was:

To enable a student to conduct independent research. Requires the submission of a formal prospectus two weeks prior to registration.

The difference between a research project and thesis was not well defined and it was often described as a “baby thesis”. Faculty have come to feel that this distinction was unwarranted. As such, this option was eliminated effective Fall 2002. Currently graduate students either take the comprehensive exams and six hours electives or complete a thesis for six hours credit.
The data above also demonstrates that approximately 3 students enroll in theses hours each semester (and students usually enroll in two or more semesters of theses hours prior to completion). The faculty would like to see the number of theses increase because this experience is one of the best opportunities for students to engage in independent research while collaborating with faculty. Unfortunately, there are significant barriers that limit the number of theses being produced by graduate students in the program. First, faculty workload is an issue. Theses take a tremendous amount of individual time and effort. There is little incentive or reward for participating in these type of time consuming projects. Faculty teaching 12 hours a semester, conducting research, and participating in service have too little time to devote to these labor-intensive, individual projects. Second, students increasingly are opting for the comprehensive exam option as a means to avoid a theses. This pattern is, in all likelihood, evidenced at most universities where theses are optional. Faculty are interested in re-examining the nature of the comprehensive exam as a result of this trend. One option that is being discussed would require students to demonstrate integration of skills including research abilities. For example, students might be given a policy dilemma and asked to write a briefing on it complete with literature review, analysis, and recommendations. Time limitations could be placed on the project so it more clearly resembled a “real” world work assignment. This type of exam and other options will be explored when the graduate curriculum revision is prepared.

8. INTERNSHIPS

Course syllabi for the internship courses are included in the appendices. Prior to 1999, all undergraduate majors were required to satisfy at least a three-hour internship (470) at an approved setting and graduate students could participate for elective credit (560). Undergraduates also can fulfill this requirement by taking 6 hours credit (471) instead of three. The faculty voted to change these requirements in 1998. They changed the internship from a required to elective course at the undergraduate level because so many criminal justice majors already had experience working in the field.

Thus far, enrollments suggest that undergraduate students still value this experience and seek it out as an elective (see Figure 9). SACS reports for both 2000-01 and 2001-02 also suggest that students are mastering competencies required for a successful field experience; 85% of the internships supervisors in 2000-01 and 100% in 2001-02 indicate that students mastered core competencies as outlined in the student rating form. Likewise, 88% of all students in 2000-01 and 100% in 2001-02 completed the internship with a passing grade.
At the graduate level, the internship was changed from an elective to a required course in 1998; however, students who have extensive experience can have the requirement waived. Faculty, at that time, felt that a student receiving a graduate degree in the field must have some practical experience. In reality, most students come to us with field experience and the requirement is waived frequently enough to warrant re-evaluation of this decision. Figure 10 demonstrates that enrollments in the graduate internship are up, but the increases are rather modest. These data also demonstrate that it may not be necessary to make the internship a formal requirement.

For the most part, interns at the undergraduate and graduate level are placed in similar organizations; however, the graduate internship is designed to place the student at the mid-level managerial level, compared to an undergraduate internship where the focus is more on front-line field experiences. The graduate intern is expected to observe agency meetings, casework management, and the development and implementation of agency policies. Undergraduate interns are expected to become involved in the roles and functions of criminal justice agencies and to acquire beginning skills associated with criminal justice intervention.

Students at both the graduate and undergraduate level are required to complete 105 agency hours. The procedure to secure an internship at both levels also is similar. Students begin by completing an internship application form and submitting the form to the faculty supervisor. The student and the faculty internship coordinator discuss the possible internship placements. The agency is notified in writing of the student’s desire to intern with the agency. The student calls the agency’s intern supervisor, makes an appointment with the supervisor and if accepted, notifies the faculty member, who in turn processes the internship acceptance forms. Once placed, interns participate in an initial internship meeting with all students doing placements. They also meet with the faculty internship coordinator as needed.

Interns are evaluated by the agency supervisors and the faculty member in charge of the Criminal Justice internships. Any student who is terminated from a placement receives an F in the course. In addition, students also are evaluated based on their performance in the following areas at the undergraduate level: attendance at internship meeting, quality of student journals, and completion of required hours. Students taking the course for graduate credit also must complete a paper which applies theory to practice.

In recent years, graduate and undergraduate students have participated in a diverse range of internships including Southeast Legal Services, Holiday Inn Hotel Security, Chattanooga Police Department, Midway Rehabilitation Center for Women, Chattanooga Community Service Center, Dismas House, Tennessee State Probation Department - Adult, Tennessee Department of Child Services, United States Federal Probation, United States Federal Pre-Trial Services.

9. CONTINUING EDUCATION/DISTANCE LEARNING
The Master’s Degree in Criminal Justice is one of the oldest, distance learning programs at UTC. The degree was originally approved by TEAC in 1977 and a Center for Graduate Studies was established at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK) campus in 1980 to facilitate distance learning at that site. In the beginning, faculty commuted to Knoxville to teach the courses necessary for graduation. In 1993, however, the Program began to use synchronized video-satellite technology in interactive classrooms. Since that time, the primary delivery protocol consists of interactive classrooms. Instructors, primarily based in Chattanooga, deliver courses live to a classroom of students on site and simultaneously have the class broadcast to students in Knoxville. At least twice a semester, faculty also travel to Knoxville and teach the courses from there, transmitting to the Chattanooga students. Faculty also may incorporate other types of alternative delivery, depending on the nature and content of the topics and knowledge, including the world-wide-web, videotapes, and web-based classroom activities (using Blackboard). There especially has been a high demand for the MS in Criminal Justice in Knoxville because they do not offer such a degree. By providing the MS in Criminal Justice Program via ITV to Knoxville, we are able to accommodate students who have few other alternatives and who are not interested and/or able to relocate to Chattanooga. Delivery of this degree via distance learning was approved by SACS during both their 1990 and 2002 visits.

The Masters in Criminal Justice program is structured and targeted toward full-time employed professionals, although some traditional students also attend after completing their undergraduate degree in criminal justice or a related field. Individuals at the Knoxville site can complete the program in two years taking at least two courses per semester including summer terms. As discussed previously, a minimum of two courses are offered each semester via distance learning to Knoxville. More recently, there has been more opportunity to offer more courses than previously had been the norm. Distance students must travel to Chattanooga to take comprehensive exams if they elect this option (as opposed to a thesis). They also may need to make some commutes to work on theses or other research related activities; although, a great deal, if not most, of this work is accomplished via phone and email. There are no differences in the admission or graduation requirements for those students participating in the program via the alternate delivery protocol. There are no special arrangements for distance students with respect to grading, transcripts, or transfer policies. Students enrolled in a UTC distance education class may request services from the library by phone, fax, mail or email. The UTC library will make every effort to accommodate service requests as quickly as possible. UTC students also have full access to the UTK library which actually has a broader range of materials than at the Chattanooga site. Textbooks are made available either through the local campus bookstore, are ordered online, or are delivered to the distance site by UTC staff. E-mail accounts are assigned to students for access to UTC student services.
The Master in Criminal Justice degree program offered in Knoxville has the same administrative oversight as the on-campus program. The Criminal Justice Graduate Program Coordinator at UTC provides administrative and programmatic oversight. In addition, the Director of the School of Social and Community Services (Departmental Head for the Program) also provides administrative leadership and oversight. The Coordinator provides scheduling and advising for students and keeps the Director and other Criminal Justice faculty updated on issues pertaining to the graduate program. The Office of Planning, Evaluation and Research in coordination with the Division of Continuing Education and Graduate Council coordinates the evaluation of this program. Courses are evaluated by students whenever offered. The Program also conducts its own assessment measures such as alumni survey and exit surveys for graduating students. All of these measures include students at our distance site.

Delivery of the on-campus and off-campus course sections are considered as one course counted toward their faculty teaching load. All faculty in the program have responsibility for teaching in both the undergraduate and graduate Criminal Justice Program. The normal teaching load at UTC is 12 credit hours per semester. Faculty usually will teach one graduate course per semester, although at times it may be necessary to assign them two graduate courses per semester. Teaching assignments are considered, and adjustments are made based on total teaching load and other assignments (e.g. administrative responsibilities). The alternate delivery of courses does not affect the teaching loads for the program faculty.

Undergraduate

Currently, the undergraduate program is not engaged in any distance learning initiatives. In 1997, the Program began experimenting with distance learning at Roane State Community College. Despite a multiplicity of strategies to build this program, enrollments never materialized. Courses were offered at this site for approximately 3 years which enabled five dedicated students to secure their degree. However, the low enrollments and high costs of distance learning forced us to end this initiative once the original cohort had finished the degree. Any additional endeavors of this nature will have to be carefully reviewed as the Program has too few faculty to meet on-campus demands.

Command College
In 2000, UTK officials from the Law Enforcement Innovation Center (LEIC) approached UTC to develop a command college for senior law enforcement officers/chiefs in the state/region. UTC was approached because UTK has no criminal justice program and they needed our expertise. In consultation with LEIC, UTC faculty secured nationally known academicians with expertise in policing (most of whom also are former law enforcement personnel) to devise a curriculum and serve as instructors. The Faculty Liaison for the program (formerly Jeff Rush and currently Vic Bumphus) also teaches courses and serves as the academic conduit to the program. The Liaison coordinates the delivery of the curriculum, evaluates it, and grades student materials. The program currently is a seven week residential program. Students travel to Chattanooga for program delivery and spend 240 hours in the classroom. Participants are required to complete a variety of weekly assignments (both in and out of class). In addition, each of them must complete a power-point presentation suitable for a community presentation, write a grant or prepare a policy analysis paper, and pass a final exam. Students may elect to receive 12 hours of undergraduate or 6 hours graduate credit. Students who are taking graduate credit must perform extra assignments including writing an extensive research paper. Faculty in the Program approved this arrangement and find that the workload is appropriate. (For example, students in Command College attend about 25% more time in class compared to traditional students at the undergraduate level (168 hours in traditional courses versus 240 hours in command college) and about 66% more time than students at the graduate level (who spend 84 hours in class for 6 hours credit). All instructors are evaluated and these evaluations are reviewed by appropriate coordinating staff in Continuing Education, the UTC faculty liaison, LEIC officials, and the Director of the SSCS.

The first class began in Fall 2000 and graduated in Spring, 2002. The second class began in July 2002 and will graduate in February 2003. (Originally courses were offered every other month, but this has changed to a monthly format in the second round). The third cohort will begin in July of 2003.

This type of collaborative relationship is key to the university’s metropolitan mission. Police Chiefs and Sheriffs as well as command level law enforcement staff are often promoted to executive levels within their agencies with no additional training or education in management, supervision, leadership, or development. Some expert training exists in Tennessee, however, these courses generally are limited to specialized topics such as Hostage Negotiations, Homicide Investigations, Instructor Development, etc. These programs rarely are longer than 40 hours which is insufficient time to allow command level staff to develop responsible and superlative leadership within the law enforcement community. The UTC/LEIC Command College provides this type of experience. This type of education impacts individual leaders, but also helps ensure that our cities in the state are better managed and hopefully safer due to cutting edge leadership.

10. CURRICULUM EVALUATION
As discussed previously, the undergraduate curriculum has undergone two major revisions in the past five years. The first revision passed in 1998 generally focused on revamping the core courses and eliminating narrow concentrations in law enforcement, corrections, the courts, etc. The second revision passed in 2002 generally focused on creating the introductory courses as UTC courses and revising electives. The first revision was greatly influenced by the prior program review which suggested this action. The second revision was a result of several factors including elimination of the consortium, data regarding availability of course offerings, and consensus of the faculty that there was a need for changes in our elective courses. The graduate curriculum has not had a substantial revision in the past five years. The Graduate Coordinator is gathering data on other programs and will be submitting a proposal for approval in 2003-04. Input from the External Reviewer will assist the faculty in making decisions about revising this curriculum.

Data from the Student Survey conducted by the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Institutional Research suggests that students find, for the most part, that the curriculum meets their needs. Data from 2001 indicates that undergraduate criminal justice majors rated the program above the University and/or College means on seven of the nine items addressed (see Figure 11). Students indicate that the program: a) provides them with the practical skills necessary to obtain employment in the field; b) adds to their ability to speak effectively; c) prepares them for employment; d) provides coursework of quality that prepare them for employment; e) offers high quality instructors; f) offers the opportunity to apply what is learned in the classroom; g) offers clear degree requirements; and h) has high quality objectives for courses in the major. These data demonstrate marked improvement when compared to the 1997 Enrolled Student Survey and the 1996 Alumni Survey (both used in the prior program review). Previously, students and alumni rated the Criminal Justice Program below University and/or College means on items measuring: application of concepts learned in class; providing speaking skills (enrolled students only); quality of courses; ability to apply what was learned in the classroom; and quality of the internship experience.

In sum then, data indicate that criminal justice majors score lower on two items when compared to university-wide averages. These indicators also were evident in the prior program review when both enrolled students and alumni rated these items lower than University averages. These items assess whether the major prepared students to write effectively and whether they would choose the major again.

Program faculty have made a commitment to increase writing assignments and have used SACS measures to indicate a desire for writing in 100% of all 300/400 level courses. This standard also has been conveyed to all adjunct faculty. The data pertaining to the second issue are more difficult to decipher. It is not clear why criminal justice students are less apt than other students to report they would choose the major if they had it to do over. Perhaps, students who select criminal justice are slightly less informed about how the nature of the discipline relates to securing a profession in the field. In other words, perhaps there are some students who choose the major because they want to
“fight cops and robbers” and expect to learn about handcuffs and batons instead of criminological theory and research methods.

11. INFORMATION ON GRADUATES

Currently, the Criminal Justice Program has no consistent source of data pertaining to graduates. When available, data from surveys administered by the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Institutional Research are used; however, financial limitations prohibit annual administration of these surveys. The Program has insufficient resources, both in terms of personnel and dollars, to pursue data collection from alumni.

12. SUCCESS OF GRADUATES/DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The lack of information on graduates in general, makes it very difficult to ascertain other details about our alumni including whether they are admitted to graduate school or gain employment in the field. Faculty are aware of specific instances, particularly when they were mentors to specific students or when students have gone on to certain positions in the local area; however, we do not have any systematic data on this issue.

Students at both the undergraduate and graduate level are exposed to information about the University Career Placement Service. Information on this office is integrated into courses (Senior Seminar for undergraduate and Proseminar for graduate students). Students also are advised of local career fairs and on occasion (for example in 2001-02 academic year) the Program has offered its own career fair to focus specifically on employment in criminal justice related professions. Students are advised to consider taking internships as a way to get experience in the field, especially for those without any prior background in the field. Faculty are quite involved in any number of service roles in the community which allows them to provide contacts for students looking for local employment. Faculty write numerous letters of references for students and participate in background checks.

13. CONCLUSIONS REGARDING CURRICULUM

Undergraduate

The faculty have responded to the majority of the issues which were identified in the last program review. They have revised the curriculum to respond to new general education requirements, identified strategies to improve student’s College Base Scores, increased academic standards, eliminated the Consortium Agreement, and responded to external reviewer comments (especially those related to elimination of the concentrations). Two issues from the last review are also relevant for this review. There continues to be an absence of university policies about distance education and the Program has less opportunities for student research than is optimal.
The lack of policies on distance learning initiatives is an issue that is largely outside the scope of the Program. In the past five years, UTC has had three Provosts (Berry, Trimpey [Acting], and newly appointed Friedl) and a dramatic change in organizational structure which impacts the office in charge of distance learning. Provost Berry was not inclined to initiate any central policies related to distance learning and it made it difficult to pursue these activities without any outside guidance and/or support in terms of policy. Continuing Education is the unit responsible for distance education programs and it has been re-assigned to the newly created Metro College. It remains to be seen whether new leadership and structure will result in more unified policies in this area.

The relative lack of student research, especially at the undergraduate level, is generally a result of two few faculty who are stretched to thin in terms of time and commitment. Faculty should examine this issue to determine: 1) how they can increase Provost Research Award applications, 2) whether they should modify course requirements to emphasize more individual, student research, 3) whether there is a need to identify a specific writing course(s) outside the department to assist students in improving their writing, and 4) whether the newly modified Senior Seminar will help address this issue by providing a capstone, research experience.

Another related issue concerns writing competencies. Majors in the Program consistently indicate that they do not feel they have learned sufficient writing skills compared to other majors in the university and majors consistently score low on College Base Exams in this area. Graduate students also echo these concerns and do not feel confident about their writing experiences. Faculty need to examine writing assignments in more detail at both levels and try to devise programmatic strategies to deal with the issue. Perhaps there is a need for more writing assignments in each class (beyond one) or perhaps there is need to isolate particular types of writing assignments to help majors become more proficient in this area. It might be useful to have faculty attend some development workshops related to writing across the curriculum or to have a retreat on this subject.

The structure of the undergraduate curriculum appears to be solid given the major revisions that have taken place in the past five years. The single most important accomplishment in the last review period was the elimination of the Consortium. For the first time in 25 years, the Program is able to offer the introductory courses. Efforts are underway to seek approval for the Introduction to the Criminal Justice System to be offered as a social science, general education course.
Changes to the curriculum appear to have had an important impact. Student outcome measures in surveys suggest the program and its curriculum are responsive to student needs. Improvements in major field test scores also suggest that curriculum changes have been effective. It also appears that efforts to maintain continuity in faculty teaching required courses may be contributing to better mastery of core content. It is, however, going to be a challenge to ensure that full-time faculty teach all required courses and to offer a variety of electives. It will be challenging to create schedules that allow full-time faculty to teach upper-division electives so that adjuncts are not completely in charge of this aspect of the curriculum. Not only does this limit the educational experience of students, but it also keeps faculty from teaching in areas of expertise. Unfortunately, most of the time, there are few opportunities to assign faculty to electives after required, core courses are covered.

In sum, then, the major challenges for the undergraduate program are to: 1) create more research and writing assignments for majors; 2) continue to improve the rigor of courses so that students score better on achievement tests (including the College Base Exam and Major Field Tests), and 3) find ways to offer electives taught by full-time faculty.

Graduate

The faculty also have responded to several of the issues which were identified in the last program review of the graduate program. Specifically, they have implemented a system for administration of comprehensive exams. They also have managed to somewhat improve data tracking systems for graduate students by administering an alumni survey. They have demonstrated some progress in increasing student research as evidenced by participation in theses, independent studies, and research courses.

As stated previously, the graduate curriculum will be revised in the next academic review and will have the benefit of this program review for input and reflection. Current discussions suggest that there is a need for a smaller core of required courses, more consistency in scheduling the core (so students and faculty can better plan schedules), and offering a broader range of electives including topics that are currently lacking (e.g., victimology, white collar/corporate crime, media issues, drugs, and terrorism to name but a few). There also is a need to continue dialog about the nature and administration of comprehensive exams. Perhaps there is a need to make this experience more rigorous in terms of writing (i.e., more like a take home exam/assignment) and to alter the nature of the assignment so students are applying knowledge instead of demonstrating recall of the material (i.e., doing a policy analysis or a position paper on a particular issue). This type of assignment might well provide a better assessment of mastery of skills and content and also may decrease the tendency to avoid a theses because comprehensive exams are perceived to be less painful experience.
PART III. FACULTY

1. Faculty Profile

The program has seven full time faculty, including two seasoned faculty, Dr. Ken Venters and Dr. Roger Thompson, who have been in the program over 20 years. Four faculty members, Drs. Phyllis Berry, Vic Bumphus, Jeff Rush, and Mr. Richard Hogan, have been at UTC less than four years, although two of them (Bumphus and Rush) come to the university with significant prior experience. One faculty member, Mr. Mark Neyland, is on a one-year temporary contract. All faculty except Mr. Hogan have terminal degrees. He is A.B.D. and is expected to finish his dissertation in Spring 2003. Two faculty also have part-time assignments to teach in the Program. Mr. William Hall is completing his third year of a four year phase-out retirement agreement and teaches one course per semester (including summer). Dr. Helen Eigenberg, Director of the School also has a one course a semester teaching load in the Program (including summer). The Program also is currently recruiting another full-time faculty member with expertise in the law and the court system.

FACULTY AND DEGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Berry</td>
<td>Assistant Prof. Ph.D. in Sociology</td>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Bumphus</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof. Ph.D. in Criminal Justice and Criminology</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Eigenberg</td>
<td>Professor Ph.D. in Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hall</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof. J.D., M.P.A.</td>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hogan</td>
<td>Assistant Prof. A.B.D. in Sociology</td>
<td>University of Missouri – Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Neyland</td>
<td>Assistant Prof. J.D., M.S. in Criminal Justice in progress</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Rush</td>
<td>Assistant Prof. D.P.A.</td>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Thompson</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof. Ed.D. - Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Venters</td>
<td>Professor Ph.D. Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The wide variety of education and experience among our faculty serve our students well and ensure that we are able to cover all needed areas of the curriculum. All faculty are generalists with strengths in certain areas. Faculty have expertise in law enforcement (Bumphus, Rush, Thompson), corrections (Berry, Eigenberg, Hogan, Venters), research (Berry, Bumphus, Eigenberg, Hogan), theory (Berry, Hogan), juveniles (Rush), law (Hall, Neyland), victimology (Eigenberg), multicultural/diversity issues (Berry, Bumphus, Eigenberg, Hogan) and crime prevention/policy (Rush, Thompson).

The following list outlines more specifically areas of interest held by each faculty member:

Phyllis Berry: community policing, domestic violence, incarcerated women, and community based corrections.

Vic Bumphus: police accountability systems, proactive police strategies, family and crime, and criminal justice privatization.

Helen Eigenberg: institutional corrections, violence against women, gender and crime, and women in academe.

William H. Hall: distance education and law related areas.

Richard Hogan: prisons, research methods, criminological theory, constitutional law, upperworld crime, and restorative justice.

Mark Neyland: criminal law, criminal procedure, policing.

Jeff Rush: law enforcement, juvenile justice, gangs, and child abuse.

Roger Thompson: crime prevention, public policy, and law enforcement.

Kenneth Venters: corrections, restorative justice, and criminological theory.

Most of our faculty also have practical experience in the field. Dr. Berry was a probation officer for two years. Dr. Bumphus was a police investigator for the U.S. Army for four years and a correctional unit supervisor for one year. Dr. Eigenberg was a correctional officer and then a case manager, each for approximately two years. She also worked for about two years with a domestic violence shelter and a rape crisis center. Mr. Hall was a police officer for 12 years and has practiced law in Tennessee for over 20 years. Mr. Hogan was a police officer for seven years and a special agent for the IRS for three years. Dr. Rush was a juvenile probation officer for five years and has worked for over a decade in policing in a variety of capacities.
2. DIVERSITY OF FACULTY

The Program also has a diverse faculty with respect to gender and ethnicity (see Figure 12). Two women (Berry and Eigenberg), two African-Americans (Bumphus and Neyland), and one person of Native American decent (i.e., Cherokee, Hogan) are on the current faculty.

3. TEACHING QUALITY/STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Alumni surveys and student evaluations, individually and collectively, indicate that the faculty do a good job in the classroom at both levels of instruction (graduate and undergraduate). Student evaluations of individual faculty generally demonstrate a median score of 5 or 6 (on a 6 point scale – 6 being the most positive score). These evaluations consist of five core questions developed and used by faculty university-wide. They assess whether: 1) the faculty member is an effective teacher, 2) the subject matter is presented clearly, 3) the instructor is well prepared for class, 4) the instructor grades fairly, and 5) the instructor is willing to help students.

Data from the Enrolled Student Survey conducted by the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Institutional Research also ask students to evaluate the faculty as a whole based on the same five criteria discussed above (i.e., student evaluations of specific faculty for each course). Student Survey data suggest that students experience quality teaching in the Program. As illustrated in Figure 13, student ratings for the Criminal Justice Program closely match or exceed those of the College and the University.

4. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Faculty development is ongoing. UTC is fortunate to have a foundation attached to the university, thereby making a variety of monies available for several types of activities. UC Foundation programs available to faculty are shown in the appendix.

There is a specific fund to send faculty to conferences where they can secure faculty development. Criminal Justice faculty have been relatively successful in competing for UC Foundation funds prior to 2001-02 (see Figure 14).
Figure 14: Faculty Awarded Development Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Activity/Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigenberg</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Attended American Society of Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Attended American Association for Paralegal Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venters</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Attended Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenberg</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Attended American Society of Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Attended American Association for Paralegal Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Third Crime Mapping Research Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venters</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Attended Advanced Mediation Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Attended Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenberg</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Attended American Society of Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Attended Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venters</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Attended Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant change in practice in determining how these funds were awarded in 2002. Prior to that time, the Dean’s Council made these awards and the Program had almost all of their proposals funded. The decision was made to move these awards to a faculty committee and the Program has not had one award funded. The Committee appears to have an over-representation of Arts and Sciences faculty and they consistently have ruled that applications from our Program fail to meet the criteria for faculty development because almost all existing opportunities for development are linked to national conferences. Fortunately, program faculty have been successful securing funding to attend conferences from a new, special fund created in 2002 to provide monies for conference attendance (known as Lupton funds).

Another financial resource to improve the quality of teaching is available via the Instructional Excellence Committee. In addition to granting financial awards to faculty who submit applications targeted an improving instruction, this committee sponsors an annual conference in May specifically focused on teaching (Watts Bar retreat). One former faculty member from the Program attended this retreat.

UTC’s Walker Teaching Resource Center also sponsors numerous workshops each semester on improving teaching techniques. For example, almost all (6 of 8 tenured or tenure-track) Program faculty have attended Blackboard training and use it regularly in at least some of their classes. Faculty also have attended a variety of special training programs to improve their individual technology skills. In addition, the Walker Teaching Resource Center administers the university Faculty Fellows program. Eight faculty members university-wide are selected each year to participate in an specialized project they have designed to integrate technology into their specific classes or coursework.
School has had three Fellows (one each year since its inception) and last year it was Dr. Rush from the Criminal Justice faculty.

Additional funds are available for other activities. There are monies available from the Center of Excellence in Computer Applications which allow faculty to pursue computer related activities in the classroom. Faculty Development funds also are available to bring in speakers for special events and to support a reduction in teaching load to allow faculty to engage in research. Sabbaticals are available for tenured faculty with six years of service (although the number granted is quite limited university wide). In sum, there is a great deal of opportunity for faculty to engage in faculty development, especially relating to those activities that take place on campus. On the whole, the Program would benefit from making better use of these various funding pools and should seek to increase their applications for these monies.

The School also has provided some in-house development in the area of technology training. In the past five years, there have been several training sessions provided for School faculty on web page development and Power-point. There also have been shorter sessions on using a variety of equipment owned by the School (including digital camera and camcorder, memio [whiteboard program], scanner, and SCANTRON machine). Most of these training sessions have been conducted by faculty with individual expertise, although a few times faculty from the Walker Teaching and Resource Center made special presentations. The School and the Criminal Justice Program has had good success integrating technology in the classroom and these in-house development activities have been key to creating familiarity with various technology and a culture which encourages the use of it.

5. MENTORING

The School has a mentoring policy and any new faculty member who requests a formal mentor will be assigned one (either a from School faculty or from faculty outside the School or College based on the wishes of the faculty seeking mentoring). No Program faculty have requested this type of mentoring. There is a culture in the School, however, which encourages untenured, and new faculty to seek the guidance of senior and tenured faculty for help adjusting to the Program and new responsibilities.

All new, full-time faculty attend an extensive three day orientation in August. Adjunct faculty are asked to attend a university-wide orientation when it is available; although, it has been rarely offered in the past five years. All new adjuncts meet with the Program Coordinator and/or the School Director to discuss course assignments. They are provided with an adjunct handbook that outlines expectations with students in and outside of the classroom. (The handbook will be available for review by the external consultant during the site visit.) They also are provided with copies of syllabi for the course(s) they are teaching.
Program faculty are quite active in terms of research. They also are involved in a wide variety of university, community, and professional service, and their community connections facilitate the university metropolitan mission.

Faculty have demonstrated an increase in scholarly productivity in the past five years in terms of grants (see Figure 15), conference presentations (see Figure 16), and publications (see Figure 17). With new hires and changing institutional values that require faculty to engage in more active research and publication agendas, there has been a concomitant increase in research outcomes. Faculty also are increasingly active by serving as officers in professional and community organizations (see Figure 18). The following individual summaries provide an overview of faculty accomplishments including information on publications, grants, journal review service, conference presentations, offices in professional organizations, service with grant review panels, professional awards, university and community service, and other significant professional activities.

**Phyllis Berry** (hired Fall 1999): Dr. Berry (and her co-authors) have had four papers accepted for publication and has another paper accepted pending revisions. The publications include papers on: structural ritualization to be published by the *Humbolt Journal of Social Relations*, mothering in prison to be published by *Women in Criminal Justice*, police approaches to domestic violence and an evaluation of private probation, both published in the *American Journal of Criminal Justice*. She and her co-authors also have an additional paper on protective orders accepted pending revisions with the *Journal of Criminal Justice*. She and her co-authors have presented six papers at conferences including The Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, The American Society of Criminology, and the Mid-South Sociological Association. She has served as a reviewer for several journals. Dr. Berry also has served on the College Recruitment and Retention Committee and the University Graduate Council (and several of their sub-committees). She also served as Graduate Coordinator for the Criminal Justice Program from 1999 until Fall 2002. She volunteers as a Court Appointed Special Advocate for Hamilton County and is a member of the Hamilton County Foster Care Review Board.

**Vic Bumphus** (hired Fall 2002): Dr. Bumphus just joined the Program. He comes with over 10 journal publications, 7 technical reports, and 19 conference presentations. He has been principal investigator for several major grants. He currently has two papers under review. He also is Book Review Editor for *Police Quarterly* and is on the Editorial Board of the *Eastern Scholar*. In addition, he is Faculty Liaison for Command College and responsible for administration of that program. He also has served as Graduate Coordinator since his arrival. He has recently been appointed to the Chattanooga Area Law Enforcement Council.
Helen Eigenberg (hired Summer 1998): Dr. Eigenberg has had one book and nine journal articles and/or book chapters published since she was hired by UTC. Her textbook is on woman battering. She also has published book chapters on victim blaming, male rape, and police officers who engage in domestic violence. She has published journal articles on correctional officers’ views of homosexuality and male rape in prisons. These articles appeared in the *Prison Journal* and the *Journal of Criminal Justice*. She and a co-author have a paper forthcoming on mothering in prison to be published by *Women in Criminal Justice* and another article (also with co-authors) on protective orders accepted pending revisions with the *Journal of Criminal Justice*. She and her co-authors have presented papers at seven national conferences. She also gave two invited presentations (both on correctional officers and their attitudes and responses to rape in prison – one presented at the Texas Association Against Sexual Assault and one at the ACLU, Amnesty International, and National Prison Project, Human Rights Watch, Interloc Media, Stop Prison Rape, and Washington College of Law Conference on Rape in Prisons). She was just awarded a $200,000 federal grant to devise programs to prevent and address violence against women on the UTC campus. She was Vice President of the American Society of Criminology’s, Division on Women and Crime (1998-2000) and currently is Chair of the Nominations Committee. She is on the Editorial Board of *Women and Criminal Justice* and is a Fullbright Senior Specialist in Criminal Justice and Violence Against Women. She has served on over twenty university-wide committees and the College Committee on Multicultural Awareness. She is currently a Board Member for Chattanooga Domestic Violence Coalition and the Tennessee State Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence.

William Hall: Dr. Hall is a special judge for Chattanooga City Court, Hamilton General Sessions Court, City of Soddy Daisy and Hamilton County Juvenile Court. He provides training and is a legal consultant to several law enforcement agencies in Hamilton County on police liabilities. He has presented papers at the American Association for Paralegal Education in 1996 and 1995 and at the Southern Criminal Justice Association and Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences in 1994 on distance learning and intellectual property rights. He and his co-authors have a paper on protective orders accepted pending revisions with the *Journal of Criminal Justice*.

Richard Hogan (hired January, 2002): Mr. Hogan is finishing his dissertation. He also has published works on private prisons including a book chapter and a journal article in *The Journal of Prisoners on Prisons*. He has presented one presentation at a national conference. He is making contacts and working on specialized projects with the Chattanooga Police Department and the Chattanooga Housing Authority. He also is leading the effort to establish a crime analysis unit on campus directed by the Criminal Justice Program.

Mark Neyland (hired Summer 2002): Mr. Neyland is on a one-year appointment and as a result does not have responsibilities associated with publication and/or community service.
Jeff Rush (hired Fall 2000): Dr. Rush has published three books, two which focus on examinations for probation/parole officers and for court officers. The third book is an edited volume on gangs. He also has published a two book chapters, one on gangs and one on organized crime, and four encyclopedia entries. He has presented seven papers at national and regional conferences including the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences and the Southern Criminal Justice Association. He and his co-authors have just had a book chapter on terrorism accepted for publication. He is currently on the Editorial Board of both the Journal of At-Risk Issues and Juvenile Justice and Youth Violence. He is an Executive Board Member for the East Tennessee Chapter of the American Society of Public Administration and was a Member of the Program Committee for the 2000 Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Meeting. He also is currently an Executive Board Member of the Juvenile Justice Section of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences and also serves in that capacity for the American Society for Public Administration Section on Criminal Justice. He is a member of the University Faculty Development Committee and faculty sponsor for Alpha Phi Sigma, the National Criminal Justice Honor Society. He is the former Faculty Liaison for Command College and was given a UC Foundation Professorship in Fall 2002.

Roger Thompson (hired 1976): Dr. Thompson is extremely well known and respected in the community. It is rare to find anyone who is involved in criminal justice system who does not know him and speak highly of his commitment to community involvement. These are a sampling of some of the agencies that he has volunteered for: Southeastern Tennessee Regional Prisons, Dismas House, Chattanooga Neighborhood Enterprise, Hamilton County Sheriff’s Department, Chattanooga Police Department, Chattanooga Venture, Metropolitan Council for Community Services, and Chattanooga Law Enforcement Commission. Most recently, he has been a key player in the MLK initiative and is working with Dr. Medley to secure funds for a Project Hope grant. He is working closely with the Chattanooga Housing Authority to devise crime strategies for public housing. He was just appointed by the Federal Prosecutor for the Eastern District of Tennessee to sit on an advisory board dealing with violent crime. He also is working with local officials to secure the final funding for the police memorial to honor law enforcement personnel killed in the line of duty. Dr. Thompson recently Chattanooga Housing Authority to develop and submit a grant on Project Safe Neighborhoods (2002). He is currently working on providing crime analyses of the MLK area (Faculty Research grant). In 2001 he received the College Advising Award and in 2002 the College Community Service Award. He has served on numerous College and University Committees. Most recently, he is a member of the College Technology Committee and he Chair’s the College Community and Alumni Relations Committee. At the University level, he recently completed a three year term on the General Education Committee. He currently serves on the Financial Aid Appeals and Faculty Research Committees. He has served as Coordinator for the Criminal Justice Undergraduate Program since 1998.
Ken Venters (hired 1973): Dr. Venters and his co-author have worked on a substantial (approximately $75,000 a year) U.S. Department of Justice COP Grant titled Orderly Schools to prevent school violence and it has been funded for two years. He has presented two papers at two national conferences. He is on the Advisory Board for the Dushkin Publishing Group providing input into the publication of Criminal Justice, Annual Edition. He is a member of the University's Petition Committee and the Faculty Advisor to the Criminal Justice Student Club. He has served on the Recruitment Committee for Dismus House which was a local half-way house and he currently serves as an Advisory Board Member for the Comprehensive Sanction Center at the Salvation Army. He also is a certified Mediator and Arbitrator.

8. FACULTY WORKLOADS

As discussed previously, the regular workload of a full-time faculty member at UTC is 12 hours. Every attempt is made to ensure that no more than three different course preparations are required by any one faculty in any given semester.

Adjustments to faculty load are made for administrative assignments. For example, both the graduate and undergraduate coordinators receive one course release time per semester. Occasionally special circumstances and/or assignments also warrant release time which is negotiated with the Director and approved by the Dean. Prior to 1998, faculty teaching distance learning courses had each of those courses count as two courses for the purpose of workload assignment. The Dean abolished this policy during the 1998-99 academic year as the Program could not afford this formula. As discussed earlier, there currently is a departmental workload policy which allows faculty to generate some release time (as funds allow). Faculty who teach distance courses to Knoxville accumulate 10 points toward a course off (30 points being required per course off). This policy has just recently implemented and is funded by the Dean of the College. As such, the number of faculty in any given semester who may redeem their points is somewhat restricted (usually one per semester). In general, however, faculty are accruing 1/3 a course load credit per distance course in recognition for the extra effort required when one teaches using an alternative delivery method (i.e., preparation time, travel to the site twice, etc.). Two faculty (Berry and Rush have received course reductions since this policy was implemented).

9. COURSE OFFERINGS AND ADJUNCT FACULTY

In the last program review, the percentage of adjunct faculty ranged from 36 to 43%. In the past four years, adjunct faculty have taught between 14 and 30% of all courses (excluding independent studies/research sections from the calculations). Figure 19 portrays these data in terms of percent of student credit hour and Figure 20 illustrates the proportion of courses taught by adjuncts. Both figures use Fall data for each year. There are no graduate courses taught by adjuncts during these periods.
10. RETIREMENT OUTLOOK
Two senior faculty will be eligible for retirement within the next five years. Definite dates or plans for retirement are not known at this time.

11. OVERALL FACULTY QUALITY

Clearly, the Criminal Justice Program has outstanding faculty at all levels. The Program is fortunate to have seasoned leadership and to have new hires to build the program in the future. Faculty, historically, have had strong commitments to the community and they are increasingly becoming more research oriented. The amount of publications and external grants are increasing. The Program is lucky to have a talented pool of dedicated adjunct faculty, without which it would be impossible to cover current demand for courses. The faculty could and should, however do a better job of accessing internal resources.
PART IV. CONNECTING WITH STUDENTS

1. ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Undergraduate

Students wishing to declare a major in Criminal Justice must meet the standard admission criteria of the university which requires applicants to: 1) have a GPA of 2.75 or higher and a score of at least 16 on the ACT or 750 on the SAT or 2) have a GPA of 2.0 or higher and have a score of at least 21 on the ACT or 970 on the SAT. If the GPA is satisfied but test scores fail to meet minimum requirements, other criteria may be used to grant conditional admission. Adult freshmen (age 21 and over) do not have to submit ACT or SAT scores. The admissions decision for transfer students is based on their college GPA. Minimum averages vary by the number of hours attempted. Students who have attempted 1-23 hours must have a 1.0 or higher; students who have attempted 24-39 hours must have a 1.5 to transfer. Students who have attempted 40-55 must have a 1.8 GPA and students who have attempted 56 or more hours must have a 2.0 GPA. Articulation agreements are in place with community colleges defining standards and course equivalencies.

Graduate

The criteria for admission to the Division of Graduate Studies at UTC is a 2.5 GPA; however, when the Criminal Justice Program was revised in 1995, faculty decided to increase the GPA requirement for Criminal Justice students to 2.7. Students must also take the GRE or MAT, submit two letters of recommendation, and a writing sample. All of the above factors are considered in the application process and admissions decisions are made by the Graduate Program Coordinator. The Graduate Office does the initial screening of all applicants and forwards the application to the Graduate Coordinator for further evaluation and a recommendation for admission. Once a decision is made, the Graduate Office officially informs the student of the decision. Since the university GPA limit is lower that the Program, it is possible that a student may be admitted to the Graduate Division at UTC and take classes in a specific program, including criminal justice, without actually being admitted to the program.

2. RETENTION CRITERIA

There are no formal retention criteria within the program. Students must meet minimum university standards at both the undergraduate and graduate level to remain in the programs.
3. ENROLLMENT TRENDS

As Figure 21 and 22 indicate, the number of majors and degrees awarded have been rather stable in the past five years. Figure 23 and 24 demonstrate that this trend also is true at the graduate level. Figure 25, however, shows that total student credit hours in the Program have increased steadily since 1999 at the undergraduate level despite rather flat enrollments university wide.
Figure 26 demonstrates that student credit hour production at the lower division has increased quite a bit in the past five years. Increases prior to 2002 probably reflect enrollments in the newly created Violence Against Women course which is a new general education course and a women’s studies course. Increases in lower division enrollments in 2002 clearly demonstrate increases that have resulted from ending the Consortium. The concomitant decreases in upper division enrollments represent staffing constraints. No new faculty were given to the Program when the Consortium was dissolved resulting in a dramatic increase in teaching responsibilities (approximately 4 courses a semester). The Graduate Program cannot be pared back as course offerings already are at a bare minimum. In fact, the Graduate Program cannot sustain much growth as most courses are filling with about 20 students a section. Without additional offerings, these courses risk becoming unacceptably large. Thus, the only scheduling option available is to cut back on upper division electives, thereby decreasing enrollments at the 300/400 level.

Figure 26

4. RECRUITMENT/RETENTION EFFORTS
Efforts to recruit undergraduate students are carried out in traditional ways including participating in parent/student visits to campus and other events sponsored by admissions (including freshmen orientation and Career Day). In fact, at least one faculty member has been present at every recruitment event in the past two years. Likewise, Program staff attend special recruitment events sponsored by the Graduate School. Letters are written to all students who indicate an interest when applying to the Graduate School. Program staff also maintain close relationships with criminal justice agencies in the community and use these contacts to recruit students at both levels. New web pages have been designed for both Programs which outline course requirements, explain the major, and provide an overview of employment opportunities in the field. Brochures have been re-designed and are being printed. A College wide newsletter was initiated in Fall 2002. Efforts are also underway to purchase CD business cards which will be mailed out in the community to recruit students. The Graduate Program is listed in the Peterson Guide. Criminal justice undergraduates also are heavily recruited for the Graduate Program by faculty.

Program staff are deeply committed to recruitment efforts and continue to take any and all actions they can to promote the Program. Less effort is directed at retention efforts. This situation likely occurs because of a dearth of information. At the Graduate level, the Coordinator writes letters to students who fail to return in any given semester. This practice is facilitated by the Graduate Office who provides this information to the Program. No similar service is provided at the undergraduate level.

As Figure 28 demonstrates, the Program has good undergraduate retention and migration rates. In fact, the Program retention rates exceed that of both the College and the University. The Program has retained between 60 and 71% of its students in the past five years.

5. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

There are limited financial awards or scholarships at either level. The only undergraduate scholarship is a recent addition. The Judge Suzanne Bailey scholarship was established in 2000 by the Tennessee Juvenile Court Services Association in honor of Judge Bailey who has served the Hamilton County Juvenile Court since 1990. One graduate student a year receives the Fjeld Scholarship which was initiated in Fall 1997 in honor of a former criminal justice faculty member. It provides $1000 per semester to the recipient. The Graduate Program also has three half-time graduate assistantships funded by the university. Students work 10 hours a week for faculty and receive a $2200 stipend and in-state tuition. In addition, the School funds another full-time assistant from funds that are made available because of participation in Command College. This assistant is funded for $4400 but no tuition waiver is available. Occasionally, criminal justice graduate students also receive a Black Fellows scholarship which pays for 9 hours of tuition in addition to a $4400 stipend. This fellowship is available to African-American students with any graduate major.
Most of the students in the Criminal Justice Program, at both levels, are working in addition to attending school. There is a great need for additional financial aid; however, it is very difficult to raise funds since most of the Program alumni tend to work in fields where the pay is somewhat limited. The School has identified Program scholarships as a major fundraising priority and has requested that the Development Office assist in this endeavor.

6. ADVISING

Advising responsibilities are divided among full-time faculty at the undergraduate level. Students are assigned an advisor that corresponds with a scheme that alphabetically divides students based on their last names. The Undergraduate Coordinator does not have a regular advising load, but he deals with all new students, transfers, and students who present special issues. He also is responsible for monitoring and approving petitions that request exceptions to any curriculum requirements. The Graduate Coordinator is responsible for advising all graduate students and does not have an undergraduate advising load. Figure 29 demonstrates that students generally rate Program faculty favorably when asked to evaluate undergraduate advising. Criminal Justice students report that faculty in the Program are slightly more available to help students outside of class and to talk informally than are faculty university-wide. Likewise, students rate the quality of advising in the Program higher than students rank faculty university-wide. Only one item scores below university averages. Students report they have developed relationships with slightly less faculty than other students in the university. These evaluations are quite impressive given the small number of faculty and the large number of majors in the program. Clearly faculty are committed to finding time for students out of class and to providing them individual assistance and career guidance.

7. STUDENT INCLUSION IN DEPARTMENTAL MATTERS

The sheer number of majors makes it difficult to include students in decision making activities. There are two undergraduate, student organizations: Alpha Phi Sigma (honor society) and the Criminal Justice Club. Both organizations interact with faculty and are used on occasion to secure opinions about issues that concern majors.

8. ENRICHMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS

As stated above, there are two student organizations that allow undergraduates to be involved with the Program and faculty outside of the traditional classroom setting. There have been few enrichment activities in the past five years, in large part, because faculty are simply over-extended. It would be beneficial to students and faculty if more faculty development funds were accessed to secure guest lectures and other special programs.
9. **STUDENT INTERACTION WITH PROFESSIONALS IN THE FIELD**

Many faculty bring in guest speakers to expose students to “real world” situations and to facilitate networking. Students also may enroll in an internship which allows them to apply what they have learned. Faculty also use many creative exercises in their courses which allow students to engage in applied analysis (i.e., conducting policy analyses). Faculty also held a career fair for criminal justice majors in 2001-02.

10. **OTHER PROGRAM CONNECTIONS**

As discussed previously, faculty are quite involved in community service which facilitates program connections with agencies. Command College also assists in solidifying partnerships with UTK and has allowed the Program to engage in an important collaborative endeavor. The Director and the Graduate Coordinator maintain a good working relationship with faculty in the Sociology program at UTK which also facilitates better service to our Knoxville students.

11. **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF LINKAGES WITH STUDENTS**

Overall, linkages between faculty and students appear good. Students, in general, and student organizations, in particular, might be more involved in program decisions and faculty might do a better job of establishing special events such as guest lecturer. Nonetheless, the data clearly indicate that students feel connected to Program faculty and that they do a good job of advising. Retention data also suggest that students are connected to Program faculty and that the Program meets student needs.
PART V: INCLUSIVENESS

1. DIVERSITY OF STUDENT BODY

The Criminal Justice Program has a diverse student body as evidenced by Figures 30 and 31. There is a higher representation of male students in the undergraduate program than in the university as a whole; 49% of Criminal Justice majors are male compared to 43% of undergraduate students university-wide. Representation of males in the graduate program is virtually equal to that of the university; 39% of the graduate criminal justice majors are male compared to 40% of graduate students university-wide. It is not surprising to find that males are over-represented at the undergraduate level given that the field has been traditionally male dominated. It also is not surprising to find that females represent the majority of the students in the Program at both levels given national enrollment trends. This data clearly demonstrate that current and projected enrollments will be disproportionately female at public universities for the next decade.

Criminal Justice students also are quite diverse in terms of race. Data suggest that the Criminal Justice Program has good representation of minority students at both the undergraduate and graduate level. At the undergraduate level, 63% of the students in the Program are Caucasian, 35% are African-American, 1% are Hispanic, and .5% are Asian/Pacific Islander. These figures indicate that African-American students are over-represented in the Program when compared to university figures (18% African-American). They also demonstrate that Asian/Pacific Islander students are slightly under-represented when compared to university-wide figures (3%). Hispanic students in the Program are proportionately represented when compared to university-wide data. Asian/Pacific Islander students are somewhat better represented at the Graduate level but African-American students are under-represented at that level. Eighty-seven percent of graduate students in the Program are Caucasian, 11% are African-American and 2% are of Asian/Pacific Islander decent. Specific data could not be located which provided data on ethnicity and race of graduate students for the university as a whole to use for comparisons.

2. ENROLLMENT AND RETENTION OF MINORITY STUDENTS

Data could not be located which described enrollment or retention figures for the Program when broken down by race and/or ethnicity.

3/4. EXPOSURE TO DIVERSITY

Students are exposed to diversity issues through specific coursework at both the undergraduate and graduate level. At the undergraduate level, students are required to take one of three classes as a diversity component to the curriculum. Students must take CRMJ 303: Comparative Criminal Justice (dealing with crime in various countries), CRMJ 317: Minorities and Criminal Justice, or CRMJ 425: Gender, Crime and Criminal Justice. At the graduate level, all students must take CRMJ 513: Cross Cultural
Diversity and Crime. All of these courses deal with structural differences and examine the ways in which race, gender, class, and other elements of diversity interact with one another. In addition, many other (“mainstream”) courses have sections that examine diversity issues. It is virtually impossible to teach criminal justice courses without discussing race and gender issues given the nature of criminality.

Program faculty are also diverse which helps ensure that a multiplicity of perspectives are presented in the classroom. Likewise, several faculty in the Program have expertise in diversity related issues; i.e., they have published and done research in the area.

The School has had one faculty development session which discussed transformation of the curriculum and explored ways to integrate diversity into coursework. The College Multi-cultural Committee also has held two focus group meetings and intends to offer curriculum development workshops on diversity in the future. The Director of the School is also devoting funds to purchase a variety of films that specifically address race and ethnicity issues.

Student outcome data from the 2001 Student Enrolled Survey suggests that the program is achieving its goals related to diversity (see Figure 32). Students in the Program are more apt to report that their education added to their skills in getting along with people of difference races and ethnic groups than are students at the College or University level. Students in the Program also are more apt to indicate that UTC added to their appreciation of different cultures when compared to other college or university students. Finally, students in the Program are equally likely than other College majors and more likely than other students university-wide to rate their cultural experience at UTC as favorable.

5. OVERALL CONCLUSION REGARDING EXPOSURE TO DIVERSITY

In general, the faculty is doing a good job dealing with diversity issues. Program faculty are diverse and all faculty own these issues recognizing that Caucasians can teach about race and that men can teach about gender issues. As such faculty avoid the token mentality which leaves “minority issues” to be taught by “minority faculty”. Students are required to take courses that specifically examine diversity issues and these ideas also are integrated into core and elective courses throughout the curriculum.
PART VI. RESOURCES

1. EQUIPMENT/LABS/ AND FACILITIES

The School has been fortunate to have access to good equipment and technology in the past five years. CECA funds, Student Tech Fee monies, indirect funds, and Lupton monies all have been accessed to fund these needs.

The School established a computer lab in Davenport Hall (which houses the School faculty) in 1997 with approximately 15 workstations. In 1999, the School formed a partnership with the Physical Therapy Program (also housed in Davenport Hall) and the lab has been a joint endeavor since that time. In 2002, all computers in the lab were replaced with brand new ones so they continue to be up to current standards. Computers have basic Microsoft products, SPSS, and Lexus-Nexus software programs.

The School also established a computer classroom in Davenport 111 in 1999 with 28 workstations. The classroom is equipped with a projection system, VCR, DVD, and Elmo. Davenport 133 also has a projection system, VCR, DVD, and Elmo. These are the only two dedicated classrooms for the School and the only rooms that the Director has control with respect to scheduling. Faculty who use the systems, especially for PowerPoint lectures, are given priority when these rooms are assigned. The School also has two portable projectors and laptops so that faculty can take the equipment to other classrooms that are not similarly equipped.

Just recently, the School has bought equipment to assist in the development of a Crime Analysis Unit. Metro 116 has been dedicated for this purpose and there are two state of the art, new computers; crime mapping software; a crime mapping printer; and a lcd projector. The Program is working on trying to establish relationships with state and local law enforcement agencies to provide data analysis on their behalf.

The School is in the process of purchasing two additional resources: an interactive smartboard for Davenport 111 and a satellite for Davenport Hall that will allow faculty to download a variety of programming. Funds are also being targeted to purchase two portable receivers for the satellite so that any room on campus can download programs.

In addition, the School has a dedicated computer room which is restricted for faculty use. There are two new computers in this area, as well as both a color and a black and white laser printer. There is a Scantron for faculty to use to grade exams, but it also is used to download data to ASCII files to facilitate research productivity. There is a relatively new scanner and a wide variety of specialized software programs including Criminal Justice Abstracts, Adobe, Photoshop, Authorware, and video editing software. The School also owns two digital cameras, an analog and digital camcorder, and several laptops, all of which may be checked out for use. All faculty have a computer and printer in their office and anyone who wants it has SPSS installed. Faculty computers are all
less than 3 years old and all faculty have recently or will shortly receive a replacement computer thanks to the Lupton faculty computer replacement fund.

2. LIBRARY SUPPORT

The School of Social and Community Services has an annual $5,000 allotment for book purchases. The School also has approximately 60 journal subscriptions in the field and closely related fields. These journals have an annual cost of $15,902 (see Figure 33); however, the Library is currently experiencing a major budget cut and departments have been asked to suggest substantial cuts in the number of journal subscriptions. This situation results from the overall increases in journal fees without any subsequent increases in library funding.

Library support could be better. The selection of books and journals is less than ideal, especially for graduate students. There are good interlibrary loan services and electronic indexes make it possible to identify sources to order. The School has not fared any better or any worse than most programs on campus as the university struggles to provide adequate library funding.

3. OFFICE SPACE

All faculty have their own offices in Davenport, although the faculty member on phased out retirement (Hall) is located nearby in Metro Building. Currently, there is no office space available for adjuncts or graduate students. The biggest need for the Program is access to additional and larger dedicated classrooms.

4. ADEQUACY OF TECH SUPPORT

The College and the School have outstanding technological support services provided by Bill Johnson. Mr. Johnson is employed by Computer Services, but is assigned to serve the College of Health and Human Services. As such, he installs hardware and software, assists in developing priorities for purchases, trouble shoots when problems occur, and generally assists faculty with all their technology related needs. The hundreds of thousands of dollars that have been used to purchase technology in the past five years would not be used effectively without his expertise and assistance. Faculty also can use the services of the University Help Desk on the rare occasions when Bill is unavailable.

5. PROGRAM RESOURCES USED IN CONTINUING ED AND DISTANCE LEARNING
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The University has state of the art distance learning classrooms and faculty have no complaints about the quality of these facilities. There is, however, an esoteric policy enforced by continuing education that provides barriers when the Program attempts to engage in outreach or community partnerships. Continuing Education has, in the past, charged departmental budgets when programs host activates with off campus guest on site. These charges are not linked to any real costs incurred by the Continuing Education Program but are a way for them to generate funds for their division. It is in direct conflict with a metropolitan mission. This policy has restricted faculty from bring speakers in from off campus and from hosting satellite conferences. It needs to be abolished.

6. SEEKING INTERNAL FUNDING SOURCES

The School, overall, has had a good record with respect to seeking funding from the UC Foundation, CECA, and student technology fees. Dr. Rush is a UC Foundation Professor (which provides a modest salary supplement). The College has secured approximately $180,000 in CECA funds to purchase computer related equipment and the School has secured approximately one-third of these funds (which is a proportionate share based on the number of units in the School). In fact, no other funding source has been as critical as CECA funds in terms of advancing the School’s technological capacity. The School generally gets little funding from student technology fees as these funds are used to fund Bill Johnson’s position. In 2002, the School did secure technology fee funds to replace computers in the lab and to install switches and other needed hardware in the computer classroom. Criminal Justice faculty have not applied for other UC Foundation funds to pursue special projects because these funds are highly competitive and other programs in the School have had more pressing priorities that were submitted instead.

7. SEEKING EXTERNAL FUNDING SOURCES

The Program does not have its own budget. The School has a central budget and Social Work (due to accreditation requirements) has a small separate budget of its own. The Program generally benefits from this arrangement as resources are distributed to programs based on needs and overall availability of funds.

Overall operating budgets at UTC are inadequate. Departments have not had an increase in operating budgets in over a decade. In fact, departmental budgets repeatedly have been cut when the university has experienced budget crises. In addition, departmental budgets have been tapped by other units on campus who are forced to find ways to pass costs on to other units. As a result, departments are paying higher phone bills, copying costs, and facility service costs so that these units can maintain fiscal viability. The School would be in dire straights were it not for indirect funds. For the past five years, at least one faculty member in the School (and usually two) have had rather substantial grants that generated crucial indirect costs that were used for all
programs in the School. (Indirect costs are not distributed based on program affiliation). One of these faculty members, Dr. Shela Van Ness was previously a member of the Criminal Justice faculty. (She has since transferred to Sociology). Dr. Eigenberg also has just secured a $200,000 grant that will begin in February 2003.

The Program also generates external funds through solicitation of gifts and each program has its own gift fund. In addition, Command College provides $5,000 a year to the Criminal Justice Program in exchange for our administration of the program. Much of these funds, however, go to pay for a graduate assistant and release time for the Faculty Liaison.

8. NEED FOR ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

The following list summarizes the Program’s need for additional resources:

A. There is a need for more adequate funding of the library. The Criminal Justice Program is not alone in this respect. There is a need to identify ways to better fund the library at the university level.

B. There is a need to increase funding for departmental budgets. The university currently gives 45% of indirect costs back to the department. It would be nice to receive a bigger proportion of these funds given the lack of other funds to supplement operational budgets.

C. There is a need for more space. There is no student lounge in Davenport Hall and no outside areas for students to gather. There is no space for adjunct or graduate student offices. The Program needs more dedicated space for classroom use. The School has approximately 400 majors and only two classrooms compared to Physical Therapy which as approximately 100 majors and five classrooms (that are not available for use by the School).

D. The most pressing need involves faculty positions. The Criminal Justice Program has been understaffed for years and all prior program reviews have indicated a need for increased positions. None have been made available, and in fact, the Program has on occasion lost positions when they were vacant at the end of the year and the university was facing budget cuts. In the end, the Program has held its own and the number of positions has actually increased by one due to internal reallocation (e.g., the School elected to take a vacant position from another position and allocate it to Criminal Justice). This faculty shortage is magnified now that the Consortium has been abolished and the Program must now teach those courses as well. Ironically, the School and the University are managing to fund many priorities in tough budgetary times; however, these funds are not permanent and thus cannot be used for positions. All the stuff in the world will not do any good if there is no one to use it.
PART VII. GOALS/OBJECTIVES

1. INDICATORS/MEASURES OF THE PROGRAM

Generally speaking, the Program has adequate program indicators and available data are used to prepare annual outcome measures for Program use and to meet SACS requirements; although, there is a need for additional data at the graduate level.

Most of the data used are collected and maintained at the University level. The Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Institutional Research Office provides data on undergraduate items including student satisfaction with UTC and the Program, enrollment growth, diversity of student body, credit hour production, and student evaluations of faculty. These data and other relevant information are easily accessible on the UTC website. The Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Institutional Research Office also assists us in funding student performance exams. Unfortunately, budget constraints keep that office from offering all items as often as the Program (or most likely the office) would like. For example, only a sample of the majors take the assessment exam and neither the Alumni survey or the Enrolled Student Survey are offered every year.

The Program also maintains certain data for use in assessment and planning. For example, data pertaining to faculty productivity are available in Personnel files kept in the Office. All faculty, at all levels (regardless of tenure status and rank) participate in the EDO process where they identify goals for each year and receive an annual evaluation from the Director based on their accomplishments for any given year. In addition, un-tenured faculty are reviewed annually by the School Rank and Tenure Committee and the Director. These evaluations are reviewed at the Dean and Provost level as well. Tenured faculty also complete a Cumulative Performance Review every six years.

Likewise, files maintained by the School contain all syllabi for the past five years. This data allows assessment of course content, level of difficulty and types of research assignments. Student exit exams and alumni survey data administered at the Program level also are maintained by the School.

There are a couple of areas where more or different data would be useful. First, more data is needed on performance at the graduate level and the Program needs this data to be collected by the University. Second, much of the data from the University, especially data on student credit hours by full time faculty is calculated at the School level. Doing so greatly under-estimates the workload of the Criminal Justice faculty as the other programs in the School have lower enrollments. There is a need to ensure that all data sources prepared by the University calculate measures by the Program rather than the School. It is much easier to aggregate data at the School level than to disaggregate it. Third, the Program would benefit from data reflecting the employment patterns of our alumni; however, there is no feasible way for the Program to secure and maintain such a large data base for so many majors.
2. MOST SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENTS IN RECENT YEARS

As stated previously, the Criminal Justice Program has accomplished most of the goals set five years ago. The Program has reduced its reliance on part time faculty, although there is reason to worry that this success will be short-lived given the end of the Consortium Agreement. The Program has a more diverse faculty than it had five years ago. It has developed specific program outcomes and devised strategies to measure these outcomes annually at both the undergraduate and graduate level. The Program has developed and administered a survey of graduate alumni. It has attempted to address low scores by criminal justice majors on standard measures and the scores on the senior major assessment test have increased. The School has established a workload policy that considers the extra effort involved in distance learning courses. It has ended a rather unproductive undergraduate distance learning initiative but continues to deliver graduate courses to Knoxville using alternative delivery methods. Faculty have increased their multimedia skills and a system has been developed which prioritizes the assignment of graduate assistants to faculty who are actively engaged in research. Efforts have been taken to improve communication among faculty in the Program and the School. The undergraduate curriculum has undergone two significant revisions and the graduate curriculum is under review. Comprehensive exams were initiated and have been administered every semester since Spring 1999. The new oral, written, and computer literacy skills components of general education were addressed and the undergraduate curriculum was modified accordingly. The undergraduate program proposed and passed its first general education course (Violence Against Women). Finally, and most importantly, the Consortium Agreement was dissolved. It had long outlived its use and was hampering program development.

GOALS FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS

Most of the goals of the Program are evident in our strategic plan. These include:

1) Expand our use of technology.

- Continue to make effective use of CECA funds to ensure that we have the hardware and software needed to maintain our productivity.
- Continue to utilize the computer classroom to ensure that students have hands on experiences in using technology.
- Continue to cross train each other in the department on various technological skills.
2) Improve the inclusiveness of our course materials (i.e., gender, race, ethnicity, national origin, age, sexual orientation, class, physical and mental challenges).

- Continue efforts to ensure that we interview and hire applicants with a diverse background for all vacant faculty and staff positions.
- Continue to conduct in-house training sessions to continue to sensitize us to issues surrounding diversity and to think about ways to continue to integrate more material on diversity into our curriculum.
- Create a film library that deals with diversity issues to use in various classes in the School.
- Use the School second method of teaching evaluation (STEM) to evaluate the inclusiveness of courses evaluated.

3) Build upon our partnerships with community agencies.

- Continue to have faculty demonstrate high participation in partnerships by serving on community boards in ways that relate to our mission and programs.
- Continue to identify ways to parlay community relationships into research opportunities for faculty and students.
- Continue to develop the crime lab as a means to partner with local criminal justice agencies to ensure the availability of quality data to the community.
- Build stronger alumni connections that provide more systematic information that will allow us to build additional partnerships and/or strengthen existing ones.

4) Continue to improve our assessment instruments and practices.

- Continue to refine our SACS measures annually so that they become more comprehensive and reflective of our stated outcomes.
- Participate in Program Review (CRMJ and HSRV) and Accreditation Reviews (LAS and SOCW), and use the data and the process to made needed adjustments.

5) Increase our scholarly productivity.

- Continue to identify ways to parlay community relationships into research opportunities for faculty and students.
- Continue to develop the crime lab as a means to provide quality data for students and faculty for publication opportunities.
- Explore internal funding opportunities and apply for this support more frequently.
• Continue to encourage intra and interdisciplinary collaborative efforts.
• Reward scholarly productivity via the EDO process.

6) Participate in student recruitment and retention efforts to help increase enrollments.

• Update our web pages as needed.
• Identify specific strategies for each major/minor program.
• Attend and participate in university related recruitment efforts.

7) Enhance the classroom environment.

• Continue to secure resources to optimize our ability to provide multi-media instruction.

8) Monitor the efficacy and adequacy of our curriculum in all five programs.

• Seek and use input from the Program Review and accreditation processes relevant to curriculum design.
• Monitor our general education courses in CRMJ, SOCW, and HSRV to ensure they continue to meet general education guidelines as originally proposed.
• Revise the CRMJ graduate curriculum to update course offerings and overall structure of the program.

9) Continue to pursue efforts to promote inter and cross disciplinary cooperation and to solidify the School as a unified entity.

• Examine ways to cross list courses.
• Maintain program autonomy while we continue to use governance processes that ensure School-wide participation.
• Continue to hire and recruit faculty who support cross and inter disciplinary connections.

There is, however, one important addition to this list. The Program will continue to advocate for additional faculty lines although there is little optimism surrounding this issue. The Program is extremely productive in terms of student enrollments and manages its resources well. Past program reviews note the need for additional faculty. In fact, the last review stressed the need for five additional positions. The absence of University funding has not produced any new lines. Actually, the Program did receive on additional line when it successfully accessed university wide funds for new positions for African-American faculty; however, the Program had lost a position the year before due to a late vacancy and budget crises. Thus, there has been no net gain in faculty lines in over a
decade despite steadily increasing enrollments. With the end of the Consortium, the Program has likely met its threshold. There will be limited opportunities for upper division elective course offerings and the percentage of adjunct faculty will rise, probably to unacceptably high levels (once again). Graduate course offerings will remain limited. It is impossible to stretch this faculty and further. Continuing increases in enrollments may result in a situation where majors will need five years to access all the coursework needed to finish their major. Obviously, this is unacceptable.