



Academic Advisory Program Review Committee

Criminal Justice Program Review Feedback

October 23, 2022

Dear Kimberly Bellamy-Thompson:

Thank you for your Program Review Report submitted in Summer 2022.

We, as your colleagues, deeply appreciate your effort in preparing these materials so that we can fully understand your program goals, successes and challenges. As you know, this is a peer-review support process to ensure that all Heritage University academic programs and departments engage in continuous improvement. Our shared goals are “transformational student-centered” learning and achieving our NWCCU accreditation requirements.

The Program Review Committee members each reviewed and commented on your report. The committee as a whole assessed, analyzed, and discussed your report.

In the attached document, we provide a Consensus Summary Report with detailed criterion scores and narrative feedback. Your overall score was **3.5** (out of 4.0).

According to our protocol, your next Program Review Report is due **July 1, 2025**.

Please see the attached Program Review Feedback Summary/Rubric, provided to assist with ongoing program development.

If you have questions or need support or resources please contact ProgramReview@heritage.edu or CILT@heritage.edu.

We, the members of the Committee on Program Review, appreciate your commitment to continuous improvement,

David Laman, Co-Chair
Melissa Hill, Co-Chair
Matt Kincaid
Blake Slonecker
Gloria Jones-Dance
Miguel Juarez
SaraBecca Martin
Mary James, guest
Jim Dugan, guest

Program Review Consensus Feedback Summary

Rubric Level 4 (Highly Developed) Descriptor	Focused Summary of Feedback (A score of 3 or above indicates meeting the standard)
<p>1. Program Mission and Purpose. Program mission and purpose are explicitly aligned with University mission and includes an explanation of the source and/or process used to develop program outcomes</p>	<p>Score: 3.8 out of 4 Program's mission and purpose are aligned with University mission. The program clearly mentions Student-Centered Education, and A More Just Society.</p>
<p>2. Curriculum Map. A clear curriculum map that identifies courses in which student performance data (key assignments/ assessments) linked to program outcomes will be collected for review by program faculty. Data collection for each PLO occurs in more than one course, but not in so many courses as to be unsustainable.</p>	<p>Score: 3.8 out of 4 Courses are clearly linked to program outcomes. Data collected from key assignments occurs at three program learning outcomes.</p>
<p>3. Assessment of Student Learning. Completed assessment system presented, highlighting collection of a variety of types of student performance data, including collection of other relevant data using multiple assessment instrument(s) including rubrics and surveys. Robust implementation of the system is evident.</p>	<p>Score: 2.6 out of 4 Assessment of student learning only indicates assessments in Anthology Portfolio (key assignments). Assessment of program learning outcomes 4 and 5 were not indicated. What is there is good, but assignments active in Anthology is currently limited (4). Multiple modalities for assessing student learning that do occur, such as end of course surveys and exit survey, should be described here in the future.</p>
<p>4. Assessment Schedule. A completed assessment schedule presented. A timeline of analysis/review of PLO data is clearly articulated in this section of the report, including narrative describing when review occurred(s) and who among the faculty were involved.</p>	<p>Score: 2.6 out of 4 A schedule of program learning assessment review is presented, but narrative describing when review occurred, and by whom, is missing from this section. Program will benefit from being more specific on dates and types of data collected and to what purpose.</p>
<p>5. Change Informed by Data. Analysis of data, disaggregated in categories relevant to equity, by faculty, Chair, and/or other stakeholders leads to documented change in curriculum, instructional methods, or assessment. In addition, evidence of impact of the changes are evaluated.</p>	<p>Score: 3.6 out of 4 Description of changes was thorough. Several changes were made based on primarily qualitative data, such as student feedback to faculty. Data analysis has been identified by categories. The program will benefit from indicating who is responsible for collection and analysis of data.</p>
<p>6. Faculty Effectiveness. A completed table of faculty qualifications and load presented. Excessive or variable faculty loads are explained. Clear evidence presented of faculty effectiveness in teaching and advising.</p>	<p>Score: 3.6 out of 4 The program shared course evaluation data and exit survey data as evidence of faculty effectiveness. Specifically, the Committee found the student exit survey to be a super-helpful data set. The data clearly indicate that the advising load for the department chair is excessive. A summary of items of interest with analysis within the report with the full survey included as an appendix would be helpful and aid evaluators in their review.</p>
<p>7. Enrollment and Completion. Report includes thorough, but succinct responses to narrative prompts, shares rich data and narrative explanations, and data disaggregated in categories relevant to equity, to provide a clear profile of enrollment and retention or completion rates.</p>	<p>Score: 3.6 out of 4 This program is an exemplar of how to ensure students have adequate opportunities for advising, mentoring, and collaboration. The department did a good job presenting enrollment; however, the report was lacking analysis related to retention/completion.</p>
<p>8. Institutional Resources: Learning Environment. Report includes thorough, but succinct response to narrative prompt, and identifies specific program</p>	<p>Score: 3.8 out of 4 The Committee notes the department responded very well to this section of the report.</p>

Rubric Level 4 (Highly Developed) Descriptor	Focused Summary of Feedback (A score of 3 or above indicates meeting the standard)
related assets and needs in terms of institutional support for the learning environment.	
9. Institutional Resources: Faculty Support. Report includes thorough, but succinct response to narrative prompt, and identifies specific program related assets and needs in terms of institutional support for the faculty.	Score: 3.6 out of 4 The department indicated that additional faculty support comes from the recently hired full-time faculty. This faculty member will provide help with advising, marketing, and teaching.
10. Reflection and Plan. Presents reflection on strengths and emphasizes opportunities for continuous improvement, with specific goals and a systematic plan for implementation over the coming year(s). Includes plan of student learning outcome review in between formal program review reports.	Score: 3.6 out of 4 Clear reflection os strenghts, opportunities, and future goals/plans addressed. Systemic plan for implementation of goals integrated with student learning outcome review would improve the score in this area.

Overall feedback

Another excellent, well-rounded report. Already strong; but also improved. Bravo. The Committee encourages Administration to look more deeply into program request for additional institutional supports referenced in the report.

Program Review Trend Data

Due to the change in template and rubric, the committee, some criteria only have trend data from 2020 forward.

Year	1. Program Mission and Purpose	2. Curriculum Map	3. Assessment Plan	4. Assessment Schedule	5. Faculty Effectiveness	6. Change Informed by Data	7. Enrollment and Enrollment	8. Institutional Resources: Learning Environment	9. Institutional Resources: Faculty Support	10. Reflection and Plan
2018	2.60	2.90	2.70	/	/	2.00	2.60	3.60	2.00	3.10
2020	3.70	3.00	2.70	1.70	3.20	1.50	3.50	3.50	3.70	3.30
2022	3.8	3.8	2.6	2.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.6

Year	Overall
2018	2.80
2020	3.00
2022	3.5