

Criminal Justice PhD

Develop the Next Generation of Scholars in Criminal Justice and Criminology

Goal Description:

Provide students with the research skills needed to develop into the next generation of scholars in criminal justice and criminology

Providing Department: Criminal Justice PhD

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Doctoral Students Will Be Able To Conduct Original Criminal Justice And Criminology Research

Learning Objective Description:

Students completing the Ph.D. program will demonstrate the ability to produce original research by integrating knowledge, skills, and abilities learned throughout the program.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Successful Completion Of The Dissertation

Indicator Description:

Successful completion of an original research study as demonstrated by the defense of a Dissertation using a faculty-developed rubric. The rubric uses a 1 (insignificant) to 5 (critically significant) rating of specific criteria each dissertation should address. These criteria include: choice of problem, theoretical framework, mode of inquiry, execution of study, interpretation of results, analysis, written presentation, originality of idea and/or approach, and contribution to the field.

Attached Files

 [Dissertation Rubric.docx](#)

Criterion Description:

Students will demonstrate their ability to engage in an original research study within the field of criminal justice and criminology. At minimum, a dissertation prospectus will include a literature review of relevant empirical literature and a well-defined and defensible methodology. The final dissertation will include the statistical analysis appropriate to the methodology described, and the contextualization of the study results within the existing literature. Students defending their final dissertation will receive a score of 80% or above on each of the 9 elements outlined in the dissertation rubric.

Findings Description:

In AY 2023-2024 a total of 8 PhD students defended their final dissertation. Of these 8 students, 6 students received a score of 80% or above on each of the 9 elements outlined in the dissertation rubric and 2 students received scores below 80% on at least 1 element. Specifically, one student received a score of 60% on 1 element of the dissertation rubric (theoretical framework) but received a score of 80% or higher on all other elements of the dissertation rubric. The other student received a score of 60% on 4 elements of the dissertation rubric (theoretical framework, mode of inquiry, interpretation of results, analysis) and received a score of 80% or higher on the remaining 5 elements. As such, this criterion was partially met.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Successful Completion Of The Dissertation

Action Description:

The program will continue to review disaggregated data from the dissertation rubric to identify trends among the rubric categories. This data will be used to identify areas of improvements for doctoral students so that the program can better address these areas. Students will also continue to be provided a "Dissertation Step by Step Guide" to help them navigate the dissertation process.

Attached Files

 [Dissertation Evaluation Rubric.docx](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Successful Defense Of A Research Portfolio

Indicator Description:

Doctoral students are required to submit and orally defend a portfolio of selected written research products that were developed during their tenure in the doctoral program to a panel of faculty members. The current policy states that the portfolio must contain at least two research articles that are deemed by the committee members as acceptable for submission for publication to a peer reviewed journal.

Criterion Description:

While the current policy states that the minimum requirement for a portfolio defense is two publishable articles, the Graduate Standards and Admissions Committee would like to start seeing Ph.D. students who are defending their portfolio have at least one paper either published or under review at a peer-reviewed journal at the time of the defense.

Findings Description:

In AY 2023-2024 a total of 6 PhD students defended their portfolios. All 6 of these students had at least one paper either published or under review at a peer-reviewed journal at the time of the defense. As such, this criterion was met.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Successful Defense Of A Research Portfolio

Action Description:

The program will continue to review disaggregated data from portfolio submissions to identify trends across portfolio dossiers. This data will be used to identify areas of improvements for doctoral students so that the program can better address these areas. Students will also continue to be provided a "Portfolio Step by Step Guide" to help them navigate the portfolio process.

Doctoral Teaching Fellows Provide Quality Classroom Teaching

Goal Description:

Enhance and develop student's ability to demonstrate high levels of teaching effectiveness.

Providing Department: Criminal Justice PhD

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Provide Effective Undergraduate Classroom Instruction

Learning Objective Description:

Advanced doctoral students will develop and demonstrate their aptitude for providing high quality classroom instruction for undergraduate students.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Faculty Observations

Indicator Description:

Doctoral Teaching Fellows teaching face-to-face will be observed in the classroom by a faculty member using a faculty-developed rubric. Elements being evaluated include Preparation for Lecture, such as organization, content, subject knowledge, and use of Powerpoint as well as Delivery of Lecture, such as professionalism, eye contact, enthusiasm, vocal properties, classroom management, body language, and length of presentation.

Criterion Description:

Faculty observations of a DTF led lecture will be conducted using the faculty developed rubric. Students will obtain an average score of 80% or above on the overall rubric and on each of the elements.

Findings Description:

In AY 2023-2024 6 Doctoral Teaching Fellows were observed by faculty. All 6 of these Doctoral Teaching Fellows obtained an average score of 80% or above on the overall rubric and 3 obtained an average score of 80% or above on each element of the rubric. Of the 3 students that did not score above an 80% on all elements of the rubric: 1) one student scored a 60% on 1 element of the rubric (length of presentation) but scored 80% or above on the remaining elements; 2) another student scored a 70% on 1 element of the rubric (enthusiasm), a 60% on 1 element of the rubric (length of presentation) and 80% or above on the remaining elements; 3) the last student scored a 60% on 2 elements of the rubric (eye contact and length of presentation) but scored 80% or above on the remaining elements. As such, this criterion was partially met.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Faculty Observations

Action Description:

Doctoral Teaching Assistants teaching face-to-face will continue to be observed in the classroom by a faculty member from GDAC using a faculty-developed rubric. Elements being evaluated include Preparation for Lecture, such as organization, content, subject knowledge, and use of PowerPoint as well as Delivery of Lecture, such as professionalism, eye contact, enthusiasm, vocal properties, classroom management, body language, and length of presentation. Additionally, prior to teaching their own face-to-face courses, doctoral teaching assistants are required to take CRIJ7333 (Proseminar in Criminal Justice) which is designed to further doctoral student's professional development in the areas of teaching, research, and career preparation. During this course doctoral students will develop all aspects of an undergraduate research methods course and conduct a guest lecture to help them prepare for teaching their own course.

Attached Files

 [Teaching Eval \(Blank\).docx](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

IDEA Evaluation Forms

Indicator Description:

Student ratings of Doctoral Teaching Fellows using the Individual Developmental Education Assessment (IDEA) Evaluation forms.

Criterion Description:

Doctoral Teaching Fellows will perform at or above the similar/middle 40% box on the IDEA evaluation form. Summary Evaluation will be 4.0 or above for teaching evaluations on the following criteria 1. Progress on Relevant Objectives, 2. Excellent Teacher, and 3. Excellent Course.

Findings Description:

In AY 2023-2024 a total of 10 Doctoral Teaching Fellows taught undergraduate courses. All of the Doctoral Teaching Fellows received a rating of 4.0 or above for teaching evaluations on the following criteria: Excellent Teacher and Excellent Course (based on the adjusted IDEA scores). Note, in AY 2023-2024 the Department of Criminal Justice & Criminology switched to the IDEA Teaching Essentials instrument which no longer includes the Progress of Relevant Objectives criteria. As such, this criterion was met.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

IDEA Evaluation Forms

Action Description:

The program will continue to review IDEA Evaluation forms for doctoral teaching assistants. If doctoral teaching assistants score below a 3.5 on their overall rating scores (excellent teacher and excellent course), the Graduate Program Director will meet with them and discuss strategies for improving their teaching performance.

Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement Item

Previous Cycle's Plan For Continuous Improvement (Do Not Modify):

Closing Summary

- 1. DTF teaching will continue to be evaluated through Faculty Observation and IDEA ratings review.
- 2. Dissertation data will continue to be collected.
- 3. Portfolio outcome data will continue to be collected
- 4. Data from self-report surveys of former PhD students who have retained jobs will continue to be collected. Information about what they were not prepared for and what they would have liked to have had more experience with will also be collected and used to improve the curriculum and graduate student opportunities.
- 5. Assessment recommendations derived from the external program review being conducted this AY will be incorporated into the assessment plan.

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

The program has continued to collect data from PhD student teaching observations, student IDEA scores, portfolio dossiers, and dissertation completion rubrics. Starting AY 2023-2024 PhD students were provided with a "Portfolio Step by Step Guide" and "Dissertation Step by Step Guide" to help them navigate the portfolio and dissertation processes. Additionally, students were provided with teaching related resources from both the department via internal workshops and the Proseminar course and from the Graduate and Professional School.

In AY 2023-2024, an external program review of the PhD program was conducted. The program received excellent feedback from 2 external reviewers. Additionally, a student satisfaction survey was conducted in Fall 2023 among current PhD students. Below are the results of the PhD student poll. Program administration and GSAC has begun discussing how to implement the feedback received from the external reviewers and current students in order to improve the PhD program.

Overall Program Satisfaction						
	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Total
How satisfied are you with your overall experience in this doctoral program?	0% 0	11% 3	4% 1	39% 11	46% 13	100% 28
How satisfied are you with the performance of the current Graduate Director?	0% 0	0% 0	4% 1	4% 1	93% 26	100% 28

Curriculum

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A	Total
Required courses are available in a manner that allows students to complete their education on time.	0% 0	7% 2	18% 5	75% 21	0% 0	100% 28
Courses offered are reasonably rigorous.	0% 0	0% 0	14% 4	86% 24	0% 0	100% 28
There are enough elective courses that interest me.	11% 3	25% 7	43% 12	14% 4	7% 2	100% 28
My coursework has laid a good foundation for doing independent research.	0% 0	3% 1	29% 8	68% 19	0% 0	100% 28
My coursework has laid a good foundation for becoming a good teacher.	0% 0	11% 3	57% 16	32% 9	0% 0	100% 28
I understand the requirements to complete this degree program.	0% 0	0% 0	18% 5	82% 23	0% 0	100% 28

Research/Publication

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A	Total
Ample opportunities exist to work with faculty members on research projects.	0% 0	3% 1	18% 5	79% 22	0% 0	100% 28
Faculty members encourage students to publish in journals and similar outlets.	0% 0	0% 0	14% 4	86% 24	0% 0	100% 28
Faculty members mentor students on publication opportunities.	0% 0	4% 1	14% 4	82% 23	0% 0	100% 28
On-going faculty member research endeavors at SHSU provide students opportunities for thesis topics/material.	0% 0	11% 3	21% 6	64% 18	4% 1	100% 28
On-going institutional research and development endeavors at SHSU provide students opportunities for thesis topics/material.	0% 0	14% 4	25% 7	57% 16	4% 1	100% 28

Funding Package

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A	Total
The funding package provided to me is adequate.	15% 4	22% 6	30% 8	33% 9	0% 0	100% 27
The funding package is comparable to offers from other universities.	7% 2	19% 5	30% 8	37% 10	7% 2	100% 27
The funding package is distributed fairly among students.	0% 0	4% 1	26% 7	70% 19	0% 0	100% 27
Additional scholarship opportunities available to me are adequate.	7% 2	7% 2	37% 10	45% 12	4% 1	100% 27

Academic Conferences

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A	Total
I am strongly encouraged to attend and present at regional and/or national academic conferences (SWACJ, ASC, ACJS, etc.)	0% 0	7% 2	0% 0	93% 26	0% 0	100% 28
I am strongly encouraged to attend academic conferences to network with others in the field and make possible contacts for job opportunities.	0% 0	3% 1	18% 5	79% 22	0% 0	100% 28
I have been made aware of what academic conferences have to offer.	0% 0	7% 2	14% 4	79% 22	0% 0	100% 28
Adequate funding resources are available to travel to academic conferences.	11% 3	21% 6	21% 6	43% 12	4% 1	100% 28

I am satisfied with the reimbursement process for travel expenses incurred while attending academic conferences.	7%	25%	32%	22%	14%	100%
	2	7	9	6	4	28

Doctoral Teaching Experience

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A	Total
The Proseminar course adequately prepared me to teach undergraduate courses.	7%	19%	15%	11%	48%	100%
	2	5	4	3	13	27
I am assigned to teach courses that I am interested in.	7%	11%	26%	7%	48%	100%
	2	3	7	2	13	27
The size of undergraduate class(es) I taught was/were reasonable.	0%	4%	11%	37%	48%	100%
	0	1	3	10	13	27
Overall, being a doctoral teaching assistant was an excellent learning experience.	0%	0%	7%	41%	52%	100%
	0	0	2	11	14	27

Portfolio Process

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A	Total
The portfolio policy process was easy to understand.	0%	11%	43%	32%	14%	100%
	0	3	12	9	4	28
The location of the portfolio forms was easily accessible, and the forms were clear.	0%	18%	36%	28%	18%	100%
	0	5	10	8	5	28
Faculty members are willing to serve on a portfolio committee.	0%	0%	11%	68%	21%	100%
	0	0	3	19	6	28
Portfolio expectations and the initial committee meeting were clear.	0%	4%	28%	36%	32%	100%
	0	1	8	10	9	28
The portfolio checklist was helpful.	0%	0%	14%	64%	22%	100%
	0	0	4	18	6	28
The portfolio process is beneficial to students.	0%	0%	7%	79%	14%	100%
	0	0	2	22	4	28
The portfolio process prepares students for the job market.	0%	0%	14%	64%	22%	100%
	0	0	4	18	6	28
The portfolio process demonstrates a student's breadth of criminological knowledge.	0%	0%	39%	43%	18%	100%
	0	0	11	12	5	28
The portfolio process demonstrates a student's depth of knowledge in their research area.	0%	0%	18%	64%	18%	100%
	0	0	5	18	5	28

	Portfolio	Comprehensive Exam	Hybrid	Other	Total
In your opinion, what do you think is the best process for admitting students to candidacy?	93%	0%	7%	0%	100%
	26	0	2	0	28

Dissertation Process

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A	Total
The dissertation process is easy to understand.	0%	3%	36%	36%	25%	100%
	0	1	10	10	7	28
The location of the dissertation forms is easily accessible, and the forms were clear.	0%	18%	14%	39%	29%	100%
	0	5	4	11	8	28
Faculty members are willing to serve on a dissertation committee.	0%	0%	11%	43%	46%	100%
	0	0	3	12	13	28
The expectations for my dissertation prospectus are clear.	0%	3%	18%	29%	50%	100%
	0	1	5	8	14	28
The expectations for my dissertation final defense are clear.	3%	3%	14%	25%	54%	100%
	1	1	4	7	15	28

College of Criminal Justice Resources

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A	Total
--	-------------------	-------------------	----------------	----------------	-----	-------

I am satisfied with my office.	4% 1	0% 0	21% 6	71% 20	4% 1	100% 28
Graduate student offices are well equipped.	0% 0	18% 5	43% 12	39% 11	0% 0	100% 28
I am satisfied with the common spaces available in the CJ building.	3% 1	3% 1	50% 14	43% 12	0% 0	100% 28

Professional Development Opportunities

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A	Total
Professional Development opportunities (Beto Lectures, Grant Writing, Brown Bags) that have been offered are of interest to me.	0% 0	7% 2	43% 12	43% 12	7% 2	100% 28
I would like to see more Professional Development Workshops/Trainings offered.	0% 0	18% 5	43% 12	32% 9	7% 2	100% 28
Professional Development Workshops are offered at a time that is convenient for me.	4% 1	14% 4	25% 7	50% 14	7% 2	100% 28

Additionally, students were asked to provide qualitative feedback on the types of professional development workshops that they were interested in, the strengths of the doctoral program, the weaknesses of the doctoral program, specific suggestions to strength the program overall, and policies or practices that should be changed or terminated.

New Plan for Continuous Improvement Item

Closing Summary:

1. Doctoral Teaching Assistants will continue to be evaluated through faculty observations and IDEA ratings. Faculty will use the Doctoral Teaching Assistants Observation Rubric when evaluating the Doctoral Teaching Assistants. The Graduate Program Director will review the IDEA scores of the Doctoral Teaching Assistants after each semester. If a student scores below a 3.5 on their overall rating scores (excellent teacher and excellent course), the Graduate Program Director will meet with them to discuss strategies for improving their teaching performance.
2. Dissertation data will continue to be collected. This will be executed via the dissertation evaluation rubric that dissertation committees complete after a PhD students' final dissertation defense.
3. Portfolio outcome data will continue to be collected. Specifically, we will be recording the outcome of the portfolio defense (high pass, pass, needs to be revised and resubmitted, fail) and whether students who are defending their portfolio have at least one paper either published or under review at a peer-reviewed journal at the time of the defense.
4. The program will use the feedback received from our recent external program review to improve the PhD program. GSAC will review the external reviewer report and create a plan of proposed changes to the PhD program. Faculty will also have an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed changes.