DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

The Department of Human Services prepared a self study following program review guidelines. A two-person external review team visited the campus; reviewed the self study; interviewed unit personnel, university administrators, undergraduate, and graduate students; and submitted an external report. The Program Review Committee (PRC) studied all written materials. The PRC liaison for the Department discussed the self study with the department chair and faculty. The PRC discussed its preliminary findings with the Dean of Health and Human Services. This document reflects the PRC’s findings and recommendations.

SUMMARY OF THE SELF STUDY

Introduction

The Department of Human Services is the largest of three departments in the College of Health and Human Services. It offers three undergraduate degrees, the Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice, the B. S. in Gerontology, and the B. S. in Social Work. At the graduate level, the Department offers a graduate certificate in Gerontology (currently suspended) and the Master of Science in Criminal Justice.

Mission. The Department has a mission statement, as does each of its undergraduate programs and its graduate program in Criminal Justice. “The emphasis in all of these statements is the preparation of students to work with diverse clientele in a variety of human services arenas” (self study, p. 2). Emphasis is placed on providing graduates with the tools to find and be successful in their jobs, as well as to become leaders in their chosen professions. To prepare their students to face the changing demands of their professions, the faculty aim to provide a strong liberal arts foundation infused throughout general education courses and courses in the majors and “to instill in them a desire to be life-long learners and to recognize the value of diversity in society” (p. 2). The Department’s mission is congruent with the mission of the College in that the Department seeks to “contribute to the improvement of ... human services in Northwest Ohio, the state of Ohio and the nation through instructional programming, research and community service” and to “prepare individuals for professional and scholarly roles in ... service fields” (p. 3). In addition, the Department’s mission statement is congruent with the University vision statement in that it “emphasizes the interdependence of ‘teaching, learning, scholarship and service’ which creates ‘an academic environment grounded in intellectual discovery and guided by rational discourse and civility’” (p. 4).

History. The Department was created in 1999 by combining three previously free-standing units – the Criminal Justice Program, the Gerontology Program, and the Department of Social Work. The Criminal Justice Program began in 1973 as “one of the
original programs in the newly established College of Health and Community Services” (p. 4). The Gerontology Program was created in 1974 and the Department of Social Work was located in the College of Health and Human Services in 1975. The Graduate Certificate in Gerontology was implemented in 1988, but was suspended in 2005 due to the loss of a faculty line. The Master of Science in Criminal Justice was approved in 2001.

Each of the formerly separate units has its unique history of faculty staffing (pp. 4-5). The general trends in Criminal Justice and Social Work have been growth in keeping with enrollment demands, while Gerontology’s has been more irregular.

The three units were merged to “address the unnecessary duplication of administrative functions across three very small programs while increasing the critical mass of faculty” (p. 5). To maintain degree program integrity the names of each have remained unchanged, and the faculty in each of the three areas have retained primary responsibility for the curriculum, student advising, and field supervision. In addition, the faculty retained their named scholarly affiliation (e.g., Professor of Gerontology) and each area has retained a program director who leads disciplinary discussions.

Operating as a single unit since August 1999, the Department of Human Services has developed a single set of promotion, tenure, and merit guidelines. Curricular decisions are proposed by faculty in each program and reviewed at the departmental level only for availability of resources. Faculty meetings take place at both the program and the departmental levels. “The Department Chair works closely with the Program Directors on all departmental matters” (p. 6).

Since the creation of the Department “there has been a great deal of growth and turnover in the department faculty” (p. 6). Criminal Justice has grown to its current complement of six full-time tenure-track faculty. Gerontology and Social Work “have experienced relatively constant turnover in faculty” and have had to use “a number of full-time, temporary instructors” (p. 6). Gerontology’s three faculty lines have all turned over since 1999 and one was lost in recent budget cuts. Social Work was able to fill two open lines in 2003-2004, bringing it to its current complement of four full-time faculty.

Since 1999 DHS has seen two major curricular changes. It added a complete list of new courses for the new M.S. in Criminal Justice and it instituted two courses – Research Methods and Interview and Observation – common to its three undergraduate programs.

The self study reports that four of five recommendations stemming from the 1998 college-wide program review have been successfully addressed:

1. The recommendation to investigate consolidation of the three units led to the establishment of the Department in 1999.
2. The recommendation to fill open faculty lines has been addressed with relatively successful recruitment, but “there is a continuing issue with under funded lines which make [sic] recruitment and retention of faculty difficult” (p 11).
3. The recommendation to develop assessment activities was met with the creation of “a clearly articulated assessment process that is completed at the end of each academic year” (p. 11).

4. The recommendation to develop formal research teams led to increased faculty collaboration. The creation of the department greatly enhanced this collaboration. The review team’s recommendation that a track in gerontology be developed for the Master’s program in Public Health was not successfully addressed due to the lack of interest on the part of the MPH program.

Description of the Unit

Program identification and curricular offerings. The Department offers three undergraduate (B.S.) degrees (Criminal Justice, Gerontology, and Social Work), one undergraduate minor (Gerontology), and one graduate (M.S.) degree (Criminal Justice). In addition, the Department intermittently offered a 15-credit hour graduate certificate in Gerontology from the early 1990s until 2005, when it was suspended due to the loss of a faculty member. “The future of the Certificate is uncertain” (p. 14). The Social Work Program is accredited; the other programs “are not subject to accreditation” (p. 12).

All of the programs are “selective entry.” To be admitted, students must pass the program’s introductory course and have a minimum 2.5 GPA on at least one year of course work. This process permits control of class sizes; most classes have a maximum of 30 students.

The Department also houses the Crime & Justice Research Laboratory, established in AY 2004-2005; the lab was expected to be fully operational in Fall, 2005. “The laboratory will serve as the center for research in criminal justice. A primary role of the laboratory is to work [for and with] criminal justice and social service agencies on research and evaluation topics that are important for understanding the impact of crime, criminal justice agencies and practitioners, and policies on social control in society” (p.14).

Faculty resources. The Department has 12 full-time faculty lines, all currently filled (six in Criminal Justice, four in Social Work, two in Gerontology). But in only two years since 1997 has the Department had a full complement of faculty, and the Department has experienced considerable turnover. “The Department has added five new faculty lines; had a total of five resignations; denied tenure to one individual; filled four lines with one-year appointments; and lost one line due to budget cuts” (p. 15). The Department typically uses two to three part-time instructors. Of the 12 full-time faculty, six are tenured, seven are women, and one is a person of color. The standard workload is 12 semester hours per term with five classes per AY and one course equivalent for research. The standard allocation of effort is 60% teaching, 30% research, and 10% service. All full-time faculty are required to advise students who have been admitted to their program or have reached sophomore status.

Graduate assistant resources. Over the period 2001-2004 the M.S. program in Criminal Justice has had from two to five graduate assistantships per AY funded by the
Graduate College. The assistantships are half-time (20 hrs/wk) and the funding covers all tuition and provides a stipend. GAs work with faculty on research projects; they are not assigned teaching responsibilities.

**Staff resources.** The Department “shares a pooled secretarial staff with two other programs, as well as the Dean’s office [one person half-time]” (p. 20). Three European American women, all classified Secretary II, comprise the pool. One work-study student per year assists with copying, filing, etc.

**Description of students.** The number of the Department’s undergraduate students, including majors and pre-majors, “steadily increased…from 439 in 1998 to 595 in 2004 (a 36% increase)” (p. 21). This growth was mainly in Criminal Justice; the number of Gerontology and Social Work majors “remained relatively stable.” The ratios of women to men were (in 2004) 3:2 in the Department, 9:1 in Gerontology and Social Work, and 2:3 in Criminal Justice. The students were roughly 85% European American “with the balance comprised mainly of African American and Hispanic students” (p. 21). Roughly 95% are Ohio residents. The number of students in the Master’s program in Criminal Justice “is modest but is showing signs of growth” (p. 23); it had 11 students in Fall, 2004.

**Student credit hour production.** This has “remained relatively stable in the undergraduate data” (p. 25) with 5573 SCH in 1998-99 and 5687 SCH in 2003-04. The Instructor FTE was 26.58 in 1998-99 and 25.58 in 2003-04. The Department’s SCH ratio has been consistently higher than that of the College and slightly lower than that of the University. The MSCJ program has shown a steady increase in SCH production.

**Recruitment and retention efforts.** The three undergraduate programs engage in several recruitment activities. All take part in the two university-wide Preview Days and the Presidents’ Day Open House; actively correspond with prospective students; make courses open for visitation; and have student organizations that do programs and projects about their majors. Gerontology (most actively) and Social Work participate in Major Mania; “Criminal Justice does not participate given the already increasing number of students in the program” (p. 26). Gerontology, most in need of students, (1) changed the name of its introductory course, taking out “gerontology . . . since many people do not know what [the word] is” (p. 26), (2) offers additional sections of the intro course “whenever possible,” (3) has gotten two courses approved as meeting Arts and Sciences Group requirements, and (4) has two courses in the general education curriculum.

The M.S. in Criminal Justice program “actively engages in a range of strategies for recruiting candidates” (p. 27). The self study lists the following:

1. The Graduate Coordinator responds to requests for information and applications, often with tailored cover letters. The program also mails brochures to local criminal justice agencies.
2. Faculty network with colleagues around the country who make referrals.
3. “[F]aculty identify and recruit promising undergraduate criminal justice majors” (p. 28).
4. The program participates in ProjectSEARCH, a university-wide program to recruit students of color.
5. The Graduate Coordinator visits local colleges and universities and attends job fairs to meet with prospects.
6. The program encourages prospects to visit BGSU and meet with students and faculty. Visitors are offered financial support for lodging and transportation.

The Department’s self study (pp. 26-27) cites the following means of enhancing undergraduate student retention:

- “[T]imely and meaningful [academic] advising” by the College Advising Office for freshmen and pre-majors, and by all faculty for “professional” students.
- Using Blackboard to make available current information; e.g., course check sheets, manuals, guidelines, forms, and deadlines.
- “Faculty work closely with…sources of support, such as Disability Services, . . . the Writers Lab and the Math Lab, to assist students.”
- “[T]he aforementioned student organizations provide opportunities for professional growth, social interaction and academic support among students in the programs.”

With respect to student retention in the MSCJ program, three strategies are employed.
1. New students are admitted only for the fall term, thereby creating a cohort that bonds and fosters engagement.
2. The program advocates for and partially funds student attendance and presentation at professional conferences.
3. Students are matched with a faculty advisor/major professor by the end of their first semester. The advisor works closely with the student on her/his major project, coaching and mentoring to ensure personalized guidance.

**Facilities and equipment.** The Department is housed in the University Health Center, where every faculty member has an individual office “outfitted with a basic office set-up” (p. 29). The Crime & Justice Research Laboratory is housed in three rooms in the basement of 315 Thurston. It has all new furniture and equipment and was wired to the university computer system in August 2005. MSCJ graduate students are housed in a work room in the basement of the Health Center. They share this space with graduate students in Communication Disorders. They have three “old computers in need of replacement...[and they] must send any print jobs to the networked printer two floors above” (p. 29). The Department shares use of a high-technology classroom and a conference room, and faculty may use Communication Disorders’ therapy/observation rooms.

**Information resources and services.** “Library services and support for both students and faculty are found primarily in the Jerome Library...[which] has extensive holdings of relevance to [the programs in DHS]” (p. 29). Additional information resources are available through OhioLINK.
“The Department faculty rely heavily on web-based teaching and learning resources. The web-portal, Blackboard, is used in all classes in the department. ... [E]ssential course materials are all made available through either individual course portals or on the individual program ‘web-communities’. Indeed, faculty are not permitted to copy and distribute any course materials (with the exception of quizzes and tests). ... This was largely prompted by budgetary considerations, and it has proven to work very well. Faculty also utilize the support of and materials available from the Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology” (p. 30).

**Financial resources.** From AY 1998-99 to 2003-04 personnel expenses increased significantly due to (1) the addition of faculty lines, (2) the filling of positions with full-time, continuing faculty, and (3) modest pay increases. “The apparent growth in the operating expenses is attributable to allocations not under the control of the department (such as costs allocated to Information Technology Services)” (p. 31). Personnel and operating expenditures per student credit hour have increased commensurately.

**Self Evaluation**

**Faculty quality and productivity.** The faculty is comprised of one full professor, five associate professors (one whose primary appointment is in the College office), six assistant professors, and one instructor. Their highest degrees are ten Ph.D.s, two MSWs and one DSW. They “have made almost 200 research/scholarly presentations over the six year period” (p. 33). The production of scholarly publications varies across the three programs:

- **Criminal Justice** – 40 journal articles, 5 books, 20 book chapters, a six-year average of roughly 9 publications per faculty member.
- **Gerontology** – 8 journal articles, one book chapter, a six-year average of roughly 3 per faculty member.
- **Social Work** – 7 articles, 1 book chapter, a six-year average of under 2 per faculty member.

“The level of publication productivity between the three programs is uneven and an area that needs to be addressed” (p. 35).

“The department has been successful at securing external funding [$339,079 in extramural funds since 1999], despite the junior standing of most of the faculty. ... Many DHS faculty have established reputations at the national and international level” (p. 36) through their scholarship and leadership in professional organizations.

In answer to the questions “Are faculty competitive on a national basis? On a regional basis?” the self study reports the answers differ for the three programs. The Criminal Justice faculty “is well respected and recognized as very strong in comparison to faculties at other institutions” (p. 38). The sole continuing Gerontology faculty member “is quickly becoming a recognized scholar in her field” and “[h]er research is appearing in many leading aging forums” (p. 39). The new (as of Fall 2005) faculty member came to BGSU “with impressive graduate credentials and past teaching experience ... [and] has the potential to significantly advance the stature of the Gerontology Program” (p. 39).“[T]he
Social Work staff are not nationally or regionally competitive at the present time. The level of scholarly productivity is modest, at best. A single individual accounts for most of the productivity, and that level has been slowing as the individual is nearing retirement” (p. 39). Thus, the answers to those questions appear to be (1) an unqualified yes for the Criminal Justice program, (2) a qualified yes for the Gerontology program, and (3) an unqualified no for the Social Work program.

The self study reports the Department’s promotion and tenure document is adequate and appropriate for the unit.

**Student entry attributes.** “Undergraduates in all three programs have good high school GPAs (see Table 19). The average GPA for entering students is 3.0 or above, and roughly 55% or more of the entering students in each program hold a 3.0 GPA or better. Slightly greater variability in student entry attributes appears in the ACT scores, where both CRJU and SOWK students tend to have average ACT scores of 21 or better, while GERO students average near a 20 ACT” (p. 40).

For the MSCJ program, “the average undergraduate GPA of students has been steadily increasing as the program has matured. Similar improvements have appeared in average GRE scores over the first four years of operation” (p. 41). The average GPA for the Fall 04 entering class was 3.41. “The program does not require GRE scores for admission, although the University requires students to complete the GRE and the program requires these scores before the end of the student’s first term of enrollment. GRE scores are required before any funding can be received” (p. 41). GRE scores have improved over the first four years of the program. The average of scores in Fall 04 were Verbal = 436.67, Math = 496.67, Total = 933.33. No Analytical or Analytical Writing scores are given in the self study.

**Assessment of student learning outcomes.** “Student Learning Outcomes have been identified by each [undergraduate] program and are assessed on a yearly basis” (p. 42). “A variety of measures are used to assess how well the unit is achieving these objectives” (p. 42), and appropriate modifications have followed. The MSCJ program first identified learning outcomes in May 05. It will complete its first assessment in AY 05-06.

The self study includes, by program, an enumeration of student learning outcomes, outcomes measures, and assessment methods. Appendix A adds “inferences from assessment” and “actions/improvements.” No data or data analyses are reported.

**Curriculum, instruction, and support services.** “The curriculum of all the programs is reviewed annually and revised as needed” (p. 48). Two courses common to all programs have been introduced: 1) research methods and 2) interviewing and observation. Common to all undergraduate classes is the departmental course evaluation form. Average scores are given in the self study. “[T]he student assessments are uniformly very positive. Students in Gerontology and Social Work pass licensure tests at a rate close to 100% ever year. (There is no similar test in Criminal Justice.)
“Since admitting its first cohort of students in the fall of 2001, the MSCJ program at BGSU has established a respectable record of quality” (p. 50). The academic rigor of the program and the success of its graduates are cited to support this conclusion.

“The Graduate Certificate Program in Gerontology in recent years has experienced a level of uncertainty and unevenness making assessment of its quality difficult. Several factors suggest that the quality of the Program is weak” (p. 50).

Service. “The service activities of the department are part and parcel of the teaching and research activities of the faculty and staff. As indicated in Table 5, the faculty are involved in a wide range of internal and external service functions. . . . Of particular note is the fact that a great deal of the scholarly activity undertaken by departmental faculty is done in cooperation with and on behalf of various government and social service agencies. This activity falls squarely within BGSU’s recent emphasis on ‘Scholarship of Engagement’” (p. 51).

Comparative advantage and program distinctiveness. The self study addresses each program separately and cites the following advantages and distinctive features:

- **Criminal Justice**
  - Avoids “how to” approach of teaching specific skills in favor of a more academic, liberal arts-based, broad-based approach to entire criminal justice system
  - Multi-disciplinary
  - Limits enrollment in courses to majors (perhaps first in U.S. to do this)
  - Class sizes roughly 30 or fewer – much smaller than comparable programs
  - 12-credit hour (480 clock hours) practicums/internships – over four times more than most

- **Gerontology**
  - Only program in northwest Ohio
  - Separate degree program; not connected to sociology or psychology
  - Long-term care option; graduates eligible to take test to become a nursing home administrator

- **Social Work** (no comparative advantages or distinctive features given; conforms to accreditation standards)
- **Graduate Certificate in Gerontology** (no comparative advantages or distinctive features given; program is suspended; replacement program (see Unit Plan) is being considered

- **MSCJ Program**
  - Regional mission; serves unmet need for graduate education in northwest Ohio
  - Crime & Justice Research Laboratory

Demand. “Student demand for both Criminal Justice and Social Work is strong, while in Gerontology the demand has been steady but low” (p. 53). “The number of [Criminal Justice] majors has grown from 90 to well over 200 in six years, and the number of pre-majors continues to hover around 200” (p. 55). “The demand in Social Work has rebounded to levels seen in the 1990s. Based on incoming freshmen numbers, the Program expects to reach its maximum complement of 100 majors by the 2005-2006
Enrollment in Gerontology has remained relatively stable over the past six years, averaging 20-25 majors per term. This number is showing some signs of increasing, with the number of majors in 2004-05 reaching approximately 35” (p. 55). The MSCJ Program, in only its fifth year at the time of the self study, has grown slowly but steadily. It has not yet filled all available space.

“The demand for graduates of all programs is very strong. . . . Employment projections for each field is [sic] very good” (p. 56).

**Connection to the mission.** The self study states that the “departmental Programs all contribute to the BGSU Academic Plan and its component themes” (p. 58), and the faculty “are intimately involved in efforts that reflect BGSU’s Scholarship of Engagement initiative” (p. 60). The interdisciplinary nature of programs in the Department means they are well connected to other programs at BGSU. All faculty evaluation processes (i.e., promotion and tenure, merit, annual review) in the Department are based on the mission of the University. The faculty’s teaching, research, and service are “intimately tied together. . . . This interconnection is also evident in the degree to which departmental faculty activities fit into the ‘Scholarship of Engagement’ initiative” (p. 62).

**Financial considerations and adequacy of resources.** The operating budget of $22,000 allocated from the college has not changed since 1999. “[It] is insufficient to carry out the normal operations of the department and typically the department budget is in the red at the end of the academic year, which means it starts out with a negative balance for the following year. The department has instituted a number of policies to try and address the budget shortfall…” (p. 63). “The Department operates on a shoestring budget that poses major problems for the faculty each year. These limited resources make it difficult to recruit and retain faculty, and have an impact on the way faculty can teach classes, as well as carry out their research” (p. 64).

All faculty lines are presently filled. A position in Gerontology was lost in AY 04-05. This resulted in the suspension of the Graduate Certificate Program and the elimination of a section of its introductory course. Other possible implications of this loss include suspending the proposal to make the GERO intro course a general education course, difficulty staffing the two department-wide courses, and serious problems of operation for the Program and the Department.

“Faculty salaries are low compared to those at similar institutions and to new hires” (p. 64), making it difficult to retain current faculty and recruit new faculty.

Faculty and staff have adequate space on the second floor of the Health Center. “[S]everal courses could be significantly enhanced by additional/new space; e.g., a room configured like a court room for mock trials/hearings and “space to more appropriately teach interviewing and observation techniques” (p. 65). The space for graduate assistants in the basement of the Health Center is too small and very noisy. The Crime & Justice
Research Laboratory, while well-appointed, is on the other side of the campus and should be moved closer to the faculty, “preferably in the same building” (p. 66).

**Unit planning (next seven years)**

*The planning process.* Planning is done at the program level and the department level, with the bulk of it occurring within individual programs. Program faculty as a committee of the whole address curricular matters. Plans that have implications for resources of other programs, and hence the Department, are handled at the department level. The department faculty meet periodically to discuss issues and identify emerging concerns. Subcommittees address special topics (e.g., the common research methods course and interviewing courses) as necessary. Social Work has an Advisory Committee that is required by accreditation standards and that meets regularly.

The process for developing the following goals, etc. is not addressed in the self study.

*Goals, strategies, timelines, and implementation plans.* The self study (pp. 67-73) delineates a detailed set of goals, strategies, timelines, and implementation plans through AY 2010-11. The primary goals, in rough priority order, are:

1. Review and evaluate Gerontology  
2. Restore lost faculty line  
3. Attract and retain quality faculty  
4. Student enrollments  
   a. Student recruitment in Gerontology and Social Work  
   b. Address growth in undergraduate Criminal Justice Program  
   c. Graduate student enrollment in CRJU  
5. Increase departmental research activity and productivity  
6. Acquire additional/new space for the DHS  
7. Maintain continuing education mission  
8. Other planning initiatives  

*Relationship to the Academic Plan.* “The Department plan outlined above is directly responsive to the goal of ‘transforming BGSU into a premier learning community . . . by emphasizing inquiry, engagement, and achievement’ as outlined in the BGSU Academic Plan. . . . The successful execution of this plan will continue the Department’s contributions to the Academic Plan’s themes of *Leadership in Learning, Critical Thinking about Values, Understanding Cultures and Nations, and New Media and Emerging Technologies*” (p. 73).

*Questions for the external team.* The Department posed the following questions for the External Review Team (p. 73):

1. What strategies would be effective at addressing the low salary levels in the Department and retaining faculty in light of the current salaries?  
2. Given past inability to hire research-oriented faculty in Social Work, what can the Department do to ensure tenurability? Should the Department consider different tenuring criteria for Social Work that includes minimal research?
3. What strategies would be effective in building enrollment in Gerontology?
4. Are there successful models/strategies for developing cooperative standing agreements that will help grow and sustain the new research laboratory?
5. How do you recruit and retain new students and faculty with minimal “marketing” resources?
6. What steps should be taken to grow Gerontology and sustain its student body?

RESULTS OF PREVIOUS REVIEWS

This is the first review of the Department of Human Services since its inception in 1999.

SUMMARY OF THE EXTERNAL REPORT

The external review team, consisting of Drs. Angela Brenton and David Hartman, visited the Department on October 30–November 1. Drs. Brenton and Hartman interviewed students, internship providers, all faculty in small group meetings, the Chair, Graduate Coordinator, Dean, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, and the Provost. They toured all of the facilities, including the Crime & Justice Research Lab, and they extensively reviewed written materials.

The external review team noted, in its report (pp. 1-4), the following strengths of the Department:

- The Department is comprised of a committed and caring faculty.
  1. Productive and nationally recognized in Criminal Justice
  2. One regionally prominent scholar in Gerontology
  3. Very good teachers who are locally respected in Social Work
  4. Collegial
  5. Committed to teaching and learning
  6. Accessible to students
  7. Engaged

- The departmental merger has been successful.
  1. Effective use of resources
  2. Strong departmental leadership
  3. Effective organization of faculty in curriculum development, promotion and tenure decisions, and merit increases
  4. Larger critical mass of faculty members
  5. Interdisciplinary research, including research teams

- The curriculum is current and creative.
  1. Syllabi are recent and show creative effort in pedagogy
  2. Internships are unique as a culminating experience in all three areas
  3. Faculty assign significant writing assignments in almost all classes and the use of Blackboard for class materials is working well
  4. Common methods classes use faculty resources wisely and introduce interdisciplinary perspectives to students
  5. Senior seminars in CJ function as capstone experience

- Facilities and equipment are adequate, with a few exceptions.
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1. Faculty offices comfortable and functional
2. Access to classrooms and labs with instructional media
3. New Crime and Justice Research Lab promises new possibilities
4. Faculty computers replaced every three years
5. Adequate funds for start-up for new faculty

- The self study was effective and helpful.
  1. Balanced look at strengths and weaknesses
  2. Excellent data on enrollment trends, curriculum changes, history of personnel changes, financial data, and planning
  3. Departmental planning process targets significant goals with realistic strategies
  4. Additional materials (syllabi, Social Work re-accreditation self study, alumni survey in CJ, and degree worksheets) provided on arrival

The External Review Team made the following recommendations (pp. 4-12):

- Personnel
  1. Enhance faculty productivity in Social Work
  2. Attempt to raise salaries of productive faculty members and promising new hires to meet CUPA salary averages in their disciplines
  3. Increase travel support for faculty members with high research productivity
  4. Criminal Justice will probably require an additional faculty line in the near future to accommodate growth in the program
  5. Develop mentoring processes for new faculty members
  6. Explore more use of qualified adjuncts\(^1\) from the region to supplement faculty expertise and to develop stronger ties with community professionals
  7. Increase minority faculty recruitment and development

- Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
  1. Strengthen assessment of student learning, particularly in Criminal Justice and Gerontology
  2. Promote undergraduate research\(^2\) with more class research projects and with internships at sites such as the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Criminal Justice Services in the Governor’s Office, and federal and regional research agencies
  3. Strengthen internships in Criminal Justice and Gerontology with more contact between faculty members and on-site supervisors and by more careful matching of students and sites
  4. Integrate more service-learning strategies into existing courses to develop applied skills in students before they begin internships and fieldwork
  5. Consider adjustments to curriculum and scheduling to allow part-time and working students to complete degree programs on a more timely basis\(^3\)

\(^1\) (The essence of this and the following footnotes is taken from a memo to the PRC liaison from the Department Chair.) DHS prides itself on using high-quality adjuncts only when necessary, and that this is a selling point to prospective students.

\(^2\) Department response: The Department already does this; it is just not evident in course syllabi.

\(^3\) Department response: Part-time and working students do “graduate in a timely fashion” because the programs “have a set rotation of classes whereby all required courses… are offered at least one night every other year.”
6. Strengthen ethics components of the curricula of all three programs, perhaps with a common ethics course
7. Consider sequencing of Gerontology course, with specified pre-requisites
8. Be sure that all syllabi include accommodation strategies for disabled students
9. Consider whether the number of hours required for each degree is necessary, or whether some hours could be reduced to make room for electives
10. Develop cognate areas in Criminal Justice to replace the Elective Core and to provide guidance to students in choosing electives

• Strengthen the Gerontology Program
  1. Fill the frozen position in Gerontology
  2. Cultivate contacts across campus for multidisciplinary coursework for the Gerontology degree
  3. Emphasize and modify the long-term care track for Gerontology
  4. Develop the “Core of Knowledge” post-baccalaureate program as an alternative to the graduate certificate program which has been discontinued
  5. Attempt to get GERO 101 approved as a BG Perspectives general education course
  6. Recruit at two-year colleges for transfer students
  • Develop Additional Revenue Streams
    1. Apply for more federal grants
    2. Consider offering the Gerontology “Core of Knowledge” as a fee-based continuing education offering
    3. Develop regional and federal research contracts for the Crime and Justice Research Lab which will support graduate students and faculty development
    4. Offer more continuing education programs for professionals in law enforcement, corrections, social work, and gerontology
    5. Consider student fees to cover the costs of internship supervision
    6. Consider creating Development Councils in each program to assist with fund-raising for departmental priorities
• Miscellaneous
  1. Increase community college recruitment
  2. Strengthen placement activities for graduates
  3. Strengthen academic advising for undergraduate majors

---

4 Department response: The Department believes its students have a fair degree of flexibility in this regard, and notes that some required courses are dictated by licensure or accreditation.
5 Department response: This “is not now and probably never can be a meaningful revenue stream,” due to free alternatives, lack of demand, and what the market will bear (in fees). Further, the Department believes that continuing education should be undertaken for its value to the field and not for the money.
6 Department response: The university already collects full tuition for these course hours, but does not pay for course coverage. “The department would welcome university funds to hire ‘internship coordinators’ in the department.”
7 Department response: This would put the department in competition with the college and should be incorporated into the larger college development activities.
8 Department response: This is a priority for GERO, and that CRJU and SOWK have good articulation with their major feeders, including community colleges.
9 Department response: DHS believes its student advising is already strong, and it would like to strengthen it further by requiring advising of new students before classes in the fall, but it has been told this would conflict with activities being held by the Division of Student Affairs.
4. Provide better facilities for graduate students and a site for the Crime and Justice Research Lab with more accessibility for faculty and students
5. Enhance departmental Web sites with more information on program requirements, internships, successful alumni, and faculty achievements
6. Maintain more systematic contact with alumni

The external report ended with a closing that included the statement, “Overall, we found the Department of Human Services to be an outstanding department” (p. 13).

**PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Program Review Committee commends the Department of Human Services on its comprehensive self study and the excellent work done in following the program review guidelines and process. We concur with the external reviewers’ conclusion that Human Services is an outstanding department with excellent leadership. We note that the external report delineates 26 strengths of the Department. It is clear that the Department benefits greatly from a committed, caring, and collegial faculty. They are dedicated to teaching and learning, they are accessible to students, and they are engaged in the university and their professions. They have been creative in the classroom, in the design of their curricula, and in their interdisciplinary research. The emphasis they place on student writing is evidence that they are willing to work hard to produce professionals who can communicate clearly. This effort is no doubt reflected in the high rate of placement of the graduates of the programs.

The Department works so well that it is easy to forget it is only six years old. Its chair and faculty have been exceptionally effective in the use of limited resources. Personnel and curricular decision-making processes are likewise effective. Courses common to the three programs have been developed. Faculty appear to be content with merit, tenure, promotion, and annual review processes. A master’s program and a research laboratory have been established. A reasonable and realistic set of goals has been developed. As both reports noted, the merger of the three programs into this department has met its intended results. The faculty are to be commended for their commitment and efforts to make the new department work.

The external report included 35 recommendations. The Committee cannot address all of them, but suggests that the Department consider all and act on those it deems appropriate and useful. The major findings and recommendations of the Committee follow.

**1. Student Recruitment and Enrollment Management**

*Findings.* Gerontology and Social Work are undersubscribed. Continued growth in the MSCJ program is needed. The undergraduate Criminal Justice Program has grown substantially since the entering GPA requirement was lowered, and it could continue to grow. Any replacement program for the suspended Graduate Certificate Program will need a steady supply of students. Since the Gerontology faculty line has been restored
(per Dean Linda Petrosino), it is critical that future Gerontology enrollments grow to support the Social Work program and the university retirement village presently under study.

**Recommendations.** The Committee concurs with the external reviewers’ and the Department’s stated goal (p. 69-70) that student recruitment needs more emphasis. Criminal Justice, which appears to have lowered its admissions standards to increase the number of its majors, should consider recruiting more and reinstating its (previously) higher admissions standards to improve the quality of its students. These efforts should be in place by Spring 2007.

2. Revenue Streams

**Finding.** The external reviewers made six recommendations aimed at developing additional revenue streams for the Department, while the self study makes no mention of it (except perhaps as an indirect outcome of successful grant writing). The self study addresses the significant struggle with and impact of the inadequate operating budget of the Department, yet this problem is not addressed in the goals for the unit.

**Recommendations.** The Committee encourages the Department to consider including alternate revenue streams in its goals/priorities, developing a plan for new revenue streams, and working with the Dean to rectify this continuing operational shortfall. A plan should be developed by Spring 2007.

3. Scholarly Productivity and Faculty Loads

**Finding.** The scholarly productivity of faculty members ranges from strong to weak. Many of the faculty member’s research efforts align with the scholarship of engagement.

**Recommendations.** A plan to strengthen the scholarly productivity of the faculty should be developed. The plan might include such things as asking established researchers to mentor faculty with developing research programs; funding research-skill development activities (e.g., travel to professional conferences) for those faculty with interest in developing stronger research agenda; and, as much as possible, hire those with demonstrated or strong potential research productivity including, as appropriate, the scholarship of engagement. The plan should be presented to the Dean of the College and to the Graduate Dean for their review and approval by Fall 2007.

4. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

**Finding.** The programs in the Department have enumerated student learning outcomes, outcomes measures, and assessment methods, and have developed inferences and actions/improvements, but no data or data analyses were reported in the self study.
Recommendation. Assessment-driven program improvements should be made clear and explicit. If assessment data and their analyses exist, they should be used to inform the process of curriculum revision. If they do not, the Committee recommends that the Department take seriously the recommendations of the external reviewers in this regard, i.e., that a systematic analysis of student outcomes data be developed and the results be used to inform curricular revisions. In either case, the assessment process and its outcomes should be reported annually to the Student Achievement Assessment Committee.

5. Faculty Salaries

Finding. Faculty salaries are well below those at similar institutions, making faculty recruitment and retention difficult. Improving salaries is especially important for recruiting faculty of color.

Recommendation. Recognizing that these are difficult fiscal times, every effort should be made to increase faculty salaries to make them competitive with salaries in similar programs at similar institutions. New-hire salaries and junior-faculty salaries should be the priority. This issue should be taken up with the Dean and the Provost at the earliest possible date.

6. Physical Space Needs

Findings. As the external reviewers observed, “the graduate student office in the basement of the Health building is inaccessible, noisy, and grim” (p. 12). The Crime & Justice Research Laboratory location does not facilitate faculty or student use of it. Specialized classroom/instructional space is lacking.

Recommendations. In the plans for the renovation and addition to the Health Center, include adequate space for (a) graduate assistant office(s) and specialized instructional space. Relocate the C&JR Lab to a more convenient location at the earliest feasible time.

The Department of Human Services should report annually to the Dean of Health and Human Services with a copy to the Provost, on the implementation of these recommendations.