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Association of Doctoral Programs in Criminology & Criminal Justice (ADPCCJ)  
2015 Survey Report

Purpose

The Association of Doctoral Programs in Criminology and Criminal Justice (ADPCCJ) is comprised of universities and colleges offering the doctorate in criminal justice, criminology, and related areas of study. The ADPCCJ was developed in the late 1970s, and has become more formally organized in the last decade. Membership is open to all institutions that currently have or are developing a doctoral program in criminology, criminal justice, or a closely related discipline. The members meet twice per year (in conjunction with the American Society of Criminology and Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences conference), conduct an annual survey of doctoral program activities, and work to advance the study of crime and justice. As outlined in the Association’s charter (see www.adpccj.com/charter.html), the primary purpose of the ADPCCJ is to “promote doctoral education with a primary focus on crime and justice.”

A key function of the ADPCCJ is to collect and disseminate information that will aid in the advancement of doctoral education in crime and justice. Since 1998, the ADPCCJ has fielded an annual survey of doctoral programs and publicly disseminated the results (reports are available at www.adpccj.com). In addition, Frost and Clear (2007, *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18: 35-52) describe of the history of CCJ doctoral programs and summarize ADPCCJ survey results from the late 1990s through the mid-2000s. During the spring of 2015, the ADPCCJ Executive Board distributed a survey to all active member programs. The current report outlines the aggregated results from the 2015 ADPCCJ survey.

This report begins with a brief overview of the programs that reported data to ADPCCJ, followed by details regarding their faculty, graduate programs, enrollment, and financial data. In response to requests for information on “top” Criminology and Criminal Justice programs, this report includes an appendix that summarizes data for the top 6 programs according to the 2009 U.S. News & World Report including University of Maryland, University at Albany-SUNY, University of Cincinnati, University of Missouri-St. Louis, Pennsylvania State University, and University of California, Irvine (for a listing of all 2009 rankings for Criminology and Criminal Justice programs, see https://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-criminologyschools/rankings).

Overview of ADPCCJ Criminology and Criminal Justice Programs

The thirty-eight programs that participated in the 2015 ADPCCJ survey are listed in Table 1. Programs are located in both Canada and the United States. In the U.S., programs span 24 states, 16 of which are located in the Southern region, 3 in the Western part, 9 in the Midwest, and 9 in the Northeast. Only four members of the ADPCCJ are not included in these results, yielding a 90 percent participation rate. Only one program was not able to participate in the survey this year (Georgia State University). Other programs did not respond to the survey because their Ph.D. program just began (University of Central Florida), it was is located outside the United States (University of Maribor), or it did not admit new students this year affecting the survey findings (University of Arkansas, Little Rock).
In 2015, the survey respondents (n = 38 programs) collectively employed 685 full-time faculty members and reported serving over 28,000 criminology and criminal justice undergraduate majors and almost 4,200 graduate students’ actively pursuing advanced degrees (i.e., Master’s degrees and Doctoral degrees). Relevant timeframes are indicated throughout the report but typically faculty data reference status at the time of the survey (Spring 2015). Other items (i.e., courses taught, student data) refer to the 2013-2014 academic year. We begin by presenting results for key attributes of the faculties represented in the participating programs, followed by a summary of programs and their graduate students. Sample sizes vary across the items subsequently discussed due either to relevance (e.g., programs with only M.A. programs did not provide responses to questions about doctoral programs) or non-response. Sample sizes are noted.

**CCJ Faculty Related Information Reported in the 2015 ADPCCJ Survey**

**Demographic Composition**

The median full-time faculty size in 2015 for the 38 programs was 18 faculty members (this includes full professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, and other full time faculty). The smallest CCJ doctoral program, as measured by the number of full-time faculty members, included 4 faculty members, while the largest program employed 75 full-time faculty members. As Figure 1 shows, over 83 percent of faculty members from responding institutions are non-Latino white, approximately 6 percent were identified as non-Latino black, with the remaining approximately 11 percent identified as belonging to another racial or ethnic group. Sixty percent of the full-time faculty members of the ADPCCJ reporting programs are male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American University</th>
<th>Texas State University, San Marcos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>University at Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay College, CUNY</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts, Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>University of Missouri, St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>University of Nebraska at Omaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M University</td>
<td>University of New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Frasier University</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University, Carbondale</td>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>University of Texas at Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern University</td>
<td>Washington State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tenure and Rank

The median length of time in service prior to review for tenure and promotion to associate professor in the reporting programs is six years. Over 78 percent of the reporting programs indicated that tenure was considered in the sixth year of employment, but the effective period varied from three years to seven years across programs.

The vast majority of full-time faculty members in the reporting programs are tenured or on the tenure-track, approximately two-thirds of full-time faculty members are tenured, and in only a few programs are more than 30 percent of full-time faculty members in non-tenured or non-tenure track positions. As Figure 2 shows, significant variation across programs exists in the percentage of full-time faculty who are tenured and untenured.¹

A similar trend emerges with faculty rank. As Figure 3 reveals, the most prevalent rank among the reporting programs is full professor, followed by associate professor, assistant professor, and finally others and instructors. Variation exists across programs. In some programs only 6 percent of faculty are full professors, whereas in other programs over 70 percent of faculty are full professors. The wide range is similar for the ranks of associate (4% to 75%) and assistant (0% to 42%) professors.

¹ Programs are identified only with a number that cannot be linked in any direct way to specific programs.
Faculty Compensation

The ADPCCJ survey also gathered data on faculty salaries by rank. Table 2 shows the median nine-month salaries for all full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors as well as for recently hired assistant professors across the 24 programs that provided such data. Within each of these categories,
the minimum and maximum salaries also are displayed. Table 2 indicates substantial variability in faculty salaries both between and within ranks.

Table 2. Faculty Salaries (N=24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Salary</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Minimum Salary</th>
<th>Maximum Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Full Professors</td>
<td>$129,000</td>
<td>$127,452</td>
<td>$74,102</td>
<td>$383,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Associate Professors</td>
<td>$82,474</td>
<td>$79,642</td>
<td>$54,075</td>
<td>$193,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Assistant Professors</td>
<td>$69,780</td>
<td>$70,030</td>
<td>$54,449</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Recently Hired Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$67,533</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advising, mentoring, and directing graduate students is a time consuming and important role for graduate programs. Table 3 demonstrates that an overwhelming majority of graduate directors (89%) are compensated in some way for their oversight of graduate students and programs. On average, faculty receive at least one course release (average is 1.89), stipend during the academic year (average $3,364), and summer salary or stipend (average $1,533). Some graduate directors (n=18) are provided additional conference travel funding with an average additional allocation of $789.

Table 3. Graduate Director Compensation (N=38).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Release (N=33)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Stipend-Academic Year (N=33)</td>
<td>$3,363.64</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Stipend- Summer (N=26)</td>
<td>$1,532.69</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel support (N=18)</td>
<td>$788.89</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ADPCCJ survey also assessed the typical course-loads and overall distribution of duties across teaching, service, and research. The majority (84%) of programs (N=38) indicated that full-time faculty were typically assigned four courses per academic year; a small handful reported higher teaching loads, ranging from 4 to 8 courses per year. The median number of courses assigned per academic year across these programs was four. Considering work-load more broadly, Table 4 indicates most of the programs expected time distribution for faculty equating to 41% teaching, 42% research, and 17% service. The table also shows that the expected time allocated to each of the three major dimensions of professional scholarship differs significantly across programs.

Table 4. Faculty Time Distribution (N=38).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Time on Research</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Time on Teaching</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Time on Service</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of faculty teaching responsibility, substantial variation was found in the number of course
sections offered and the manner in which classes are staffed. As indicated in Table 5, the median number of undergraduate class sections offered in the preceding academic year (2013-2014) was 105, ranging from 10 to 513 across programs. The mean number of Master’s classes was 20, ranging from 0 to 85 various classes. Also, on average 13 doctoral classes were offered at institutions, ranging from 2 to 37.

Considering the number of full-time faculty members in the reporting programs, these data translate into a ratio of undergrad sections offered (including online sections) to faculty members that ranges from approximately 0 to 17 across programs and which is, on average, 6.97 for 36 programs. Responding programs also indicated the number of online class sections offered with the number of online undergraduate class sections ranging from 0 to 85. Fewer master’s classes are offered online, with a mean number of 6, which ranged from 0 to 32; although doctoral classes online was more limited with a mean of less than 1, ranging from 0 to only 1 class. Table 5 reveals also that graduate students frequently teach undergraduate courses (percent includes online courses) in ADPCCJ reporting programs. In a few institutions, only a few undergraduate courses are taught by graduate students, but in several programs more than two-thirds of the undergraduate sections are covered by graduate students and in one instance this figure surpasses 80 percent. Across all programs, the median percentage of undergraduate sections taught by graduate students is 54.87 percent.

Table 5. Class Sections Offered by Degree, Relative to Faculty Size and Graduate Student Involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 Undergraduate Class Sections (N=36)</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>513.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Undergraduate Class Sections (N=33)</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Sections to Faculty (N=36)</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>16.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Taught by Graduate Students (N=35)</td>
<td>51.45%</td>
<td>54.87%</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
<td>84.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 Masters Class Sections (N=34)</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Masters Class Sections (N=32)</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Sections to Faculty (N=35)</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Taught by Graduate Students (N=28)</td>
<td>8.97%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 Doctoral Class Sections (N=37)</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Doctoral Class Sections (N=29)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Sections to Faculty (N=37)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Taught by Graduate Students (N=36)</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final piece of information gathered on CCJ faculty members in the ADPCCJ survey concerns faculty scholarly productivity (i.e., publications and grants). Thirty-four program representatives reported on the number of articles published in peer-reviewed journals and thirty-five reported on the number of books published during the previous academic year. The information provided is summarized in Table 6. It is important to note that these estimates make no adjustments for the prestige of the journals in which the articles appear or the quality of the book publisher, but they provide an indication of the overall quantity of publications across programs during the period. The data indicate that the median number of journal articles published per faculty members in these programs was 2, a figure that varied from 0.30 to more than 7 across programs.
### Table 6. Faculty Productivity in Past Year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles and Books</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journal Articles Published (N=34)</td>
<td>41.82</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>138.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles Per Faculty Member</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books Published (N=35)</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books Per Faculty Member</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Applications and Awards</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive National Grants Submitted (N=30)</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive National Grants Received (N=32)</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Dollars Received</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Dollars Received Last Fiscal Year (N=32)</td>
<td>$1,888,580</td>
<td>$1,117,621</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,738,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grant Dollars Received (N=30)</td>
<td>$1,450,229</td>
<td>$644,305</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,550,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Grant Dollars Received (N=27)</td>
<td>$370,657</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,419,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Grant Dollars Received (N=24)</td>
<td>$275,539</td>
<td>$47,349</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,869,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Grant Dollars Received (N=20)</td>
<td>$15,350</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Book publications were much less common, with an average of 4 books published per program, but there was substantial variability between programs. With respect to grants, the ADPCCJ survey reveals that the median number of “competitive national grants” submitted across the 30 reporting programs was 10, and the median number of such grants that were funded was 4. Some programs did not receive any of these grants, while others had a very large number of submissions (e.g., as many as 33) and awards (e.g., as many as 21). Not surprisingly, this translated into substantial variation in the amount of grant funds received by CCJ programs surveyed, as illustrated in the bottom of Table 6.

### CCJ Student Information Reported in the 2015 ADPCCJ Survey

#### Active Students

The ADPCCJ survey elicits a wide array of information on the students who apply for, enroll in, and pursue studies at the responding programs. As noted above, the thirty-eight programs that participated in the 2015 ADPCCJ collectively serve over 28,000 criminology and criminal justice undergraduate majors, over 2,800 students actively pursuing master’s degrees, and over 1,200 students actively pursuing doctoral degrees.

The median number of undergraduate majors across the 36 programs that provided the relevant data is 782, but this varies across programs from 235 to 2,697. Programs differ significantly in the number of full-time faculty employed, so data on the number of undergraduate majors are standardized by faculty size. Figure 4 shows the ratio of undergraduate majors to full-time faculty for the 36 programs that provided data. As noted in the figure, the median student-to-faculty ratio for the reporting programs during the reference period (spring, 2015) was 47.90, but the ratio ranged from 13 to 117 across programs.
The ADPCCJ survey collected much more detailed information about active and new graduate students, including the overall number of students currently enrolled but also a variety of other details. Table 7 displays information about the average graduate student-body size across programs as well as the range across programs. As the table shows, the median number of total graduate students (Master’s and Doctoral) in the reporting programs in spring 2015 was 109, ranging from 11 to 645.

Table 7. Graduate Program Size, by Degree Type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Active Graduate Students (N=38 Programs)</td>
<td>109.88</td>
<td>69.50</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>645.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Grad. Students/FT Faculty Members</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>33.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=4,175 Active Grad)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Doctoral Students (N=38 Programs)</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>101.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Doctoral Students/FT Faculty Members</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=1,297 Active Doctoral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Masters Students (N=34 Programs)</td>
<td>84.65</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Masters Students/FT Faculty Members</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>29.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=2,878 Active Masters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By degree type, we see that the average program had 34 active doctoral students; however, at the extremes, one program had just 4 doctoral students while another had 101. The average number of doctoral students per full-time faculty member was 2.12, though this also varied widely across programs (from 0.25 to 5.45). A similar picture emerges from the data on size of Master’s programs, also shown in Table 7.

Some of the ADPCCJ programs do not have stand-alone CCJ Master’s Degree programs, and thus all of their graduate students are pursuing doctoral degrees. Most programs contain a mix of doctoral and masters students, and overall the average mix is roughly even between the two groups, with master’s students more represented (69%) than doctoral students (31%) among those pursuing graduate studies. Both groups exhibit similar demographic attributes, as illustrated in Figures 5 and 6. Similar to faculty data presented earlier, the vast majority of graduate students in CCJ (as reported by programs that participated in the ADPCCJ survey) are non-Latino white. Unlike the pattern observed for full-time faculty, a majority of graduate students in the programs that reported to ADPCCJ are female.

The ADPCCJ survey also elicited information on the status of doctoral students and recent graduation patterns. One dimension of the former is whether doctoral students active in the year preceding the survey were still enrolled and, if not, the reasons for the ‘disappearance’ of those no longer enrolled. The 2015 ADPCCJ data indicate that this form of student attrition is relatively rare. The median response to the question of how many students had been enrolled in 2013-2014 but were no longer enrolled in 2014-2015 was 1 student, and in the majority of cases in which students dropped out (N=62) they did so prior to comprehensive exams (N=34). Additionally, some left the university all but dissertation (N=3), or left on their own record (N=35), with only 13 students failing to pass examinations.

Figure 5. Gender (N=2,902)\(^6\) and Race/Ethnicity (N=2,763)\(^7\) of Active Masters Students.

\(^6\) Data provided by 33 programs.
\(^7\) Data provided by 31 programs.
With respect to graduation patterns, the ADPCCJ data indicate that the reporting programs combined to confer master’s degrees (N=33) to 1,180 graduate students and doctoral degrees (N=37) to 171 graduate students in 2013-2014. Over half (62.57%) of the doctoral graduates during this period first enrolled in the fall of 2009 or after, completing the degree in five years or less. Overall, approximately 82 percent of these recent graduates completed their degrees in six years; the remainder took slightly longer to complete their degrees. Enrollment semesters for doctoral graduates range from fall of 2000 to fall of 2013.

Figure 7 shows that not only is the employment rate among recent graduates very high – 94 percent are known to be employed in a tenure-track academic position, a local, state, or federal research agency, or a private research firm – but also that academic positions are by far the most prevalent mode of employment for 60 percent of graduates.
Incoming Students

The 2015 ADPCCJ survey gathered information on new graduate students who enrolled in the 2014-2015 academic year. The thirty-four participating programs that provided data on master’s students received an aggregate total of 2,592 applications from prospective students, with application counts ranging from 3 to 360 across programs. Data on new master’s students were separated by traditional master’s students (i.e., those who attend class in person) and distance learning (DL) master’s students (i.e., those who take classes online). The 32 programs that provided data on traditional master’s students received an aggregate total of 1,349 applications from prospective students, with application counts ranging from 3 to 97. Programs that provided data on DL master’s students (N=13) reported receiving 1,243 applications, with counts ranging from 0 to 326. The 37 programs that responded to similar questions about doctoral programs took in 1,393 applications for doctoral study, ranging from a low of 6 to a high of 104. Only one program reported receiving 10 doctoral DL applications.

Figures 8 through 11 summarize the program-specific (non-identified) acceptance rates (i.e. the percentage of applications received that resulted in a decision to admit) and enrollment rates (i.e., the percentage of admitted students who subsequently enrolled) for master’s (traditional and DL) and doctoral programs, respectively.

Overall, for the 32 programs that provided data on applications and admissions decisions for traditional master’s programs, the median acceptance rate was 58.94%. Figure 8 shows that such acceptance rates varied widely across programs, ranging from 7.14% to 100%. Figure 9 also reveals substantial variation in enrollment rates for those accepted into traditional master’s programs; the median enrollment rate was 70.50%, ranging from 16.67 to 100%. The average acceptance and enrollment rates for DL master’s programs were higher than for traditional master’s programs.
Figure 8. Acceptance Rate (N=793) for Applications Submitted (N=1,349) to Master's Programs (Traditional).\textsuperscript{10}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig8}
\caption{Acceptance Rate (N=793) for Applications Submitted (N=1,349) to Master's Programs (Traditional).\textsuperscript{10}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{10} Data provided by 32 programs.

Figure 9. Enrollment Rate (N=528) for Persons Accepted (N=793) to Master's Programs (Traditional).\textsuperscript{11}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig9}
\caption{Enrollment Rate (N=528) for Persons Accepted (N=793) to Master's Programs (Traditional).\textsuperscript{11}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{11} Data provided by 32 programs.
Figure 10. Acceptance Rate (N=918) for Applications Submitted (N=1,243) to Master's Programs (Distance Learning).\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure10}
\caption{Acceptance Rate (N=918) for Applications Submitted (N=1,243) to Master's Programs (Distance Learning).\textsuperscript{12}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{12} Data provided by 13 programs.

Figure 11. Enrollment Rate (N=727) for Persons Accepted (N=918) to Master's Programs (Distance Learning).\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure11}
\caption{Enrollment Rate (N=727) for Persons Accepted (N=918) to Master's Programs (Distance Learning).\textsuperscript{13}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{13} Data provided by 13 programs.
For the 13 programs that provided data on admission decisions for DL master’s programs, the median acceptance rate was 75.26%. Figure 10 shows that acceptance rates varied from 37% to 100% across reporting programs. Figure 11 shows that the median enrollment rate for DL master’s programs was 76.73% and ranged from 16.67% to 100%. Average acceptance rates were lower for doctoral programs than traditional master’s programs (37% vs. 59%), with considerable variation across programs, (see Figure 12). While more than one-third of applicants in the 37 participating programs were accepted, in some programs less than 20 percent of applicants were admitted, while in others more than 70 percent were admitted.

Figure 12. Admission Rate (N=469) for Applications Submitted (N=1393) to Doctoral Programs.14

As shown in Figure 13, the median enrollment rate for the 37 programs that provided the data was 54.55%, but this figure ranged from 20 to 100 percent (all of the accepted Ph.D. students enrolled).

14 Data provided by 37 programs.
The average undergraduate grade point average (GPA) for newly admitted doctoral students in ADPCCJ reporting programs was 3.6, varying from 3.20 to 4.31 across programs \((N=30)\). Graduate GPAs ranged from 3.4 to 4.0 with an average of 3.79. ADPCCJ respondents provided the information summarized in Table 8 in response to questions about the average GRE scores among recently admitted doctoral students. As illustrated in Table 8, the median "average GRE combined" score across programs was 308, ranging from 286 to 325.

Additional degree background information was provided for incoming master’s and doctoral students in both traditional and distance learning programs. The majority of new master’s (90%) and master’s DL students (80%) had previously received either a Bachelor’s of Science or Arts at their previous institutions. Furthermore, the majority of newly admitted doctoral students had mainly been granted Master’s of Art or Science degrees (82%) with all distance learning doctoral students within these two categories. As further illustrated by Table 9, some variation did exist in background degree type for all students.
Table 9. Degree Background Percentages for Newly Admitted Masters and Doctoral Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>LLM</th>
<th>MPH</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Master’s Students (N=32)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Master’s DL (N=12)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Doctoral Students (N=35)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Doctoral DL Students (N=6)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: BS= Bachelors of Science; BA= Bachelors of Arts; MA= Masters of Science; MS= Masters of Arts; JD= Juris Doctor; LLM=Masters of Laws; MPH= Master’s in Public Health (includes Master’s in Public Administration); PhD= Doctor of Philosophy.

The ADPCCJ survey indicated that 528 new students enrolled in traditional master’s programs across the 32 programs that provided such data (727 DL master’s students enrolled across the 15 reporting programs). In total, 245 new doctoral students enrolled across the 38 programs that reported such data (only 2 DL doctoral students enrolled in the one reporting program). Approximately 86 percent of new doctoral and 83 percent of new traditional master’s enrollments are studying full-time, while only approximately 40% of new DL master’s students are studying full-time.

The gender, race, and ethnic composition of these incoming cohorts of graduate students were similar to the patterns shown above for all active students (see Figures 5 & 6). The reporting programs indicated that for master’s degree programs, the majority of incoming students were female (the median was 59% female for traditional master’s programs and 59% female for DL master’s programs) and non-Latino white (the median was 65% non-Latino white). Incoming cohorts of Ph.D. students also exhibited quite a bit of variability across programs in race, ethnic, and gender composition; overall the medians were 61% female and 68% non-Latino white.

A large majority of newly admitted doctoral students in the 2015 ADPCCJ reporting programs received tuition remission and were funded as either a research or teaching assistant (or both). Overall, almost 75% of active doctoral students in the 36 programs that reported data on funding sources were funded through a teaching or research assistantship. While some programs relied exclusively on teaching assistantships and others relied exclusively on research assistantships, these forms of funding contribute about equally to those supported by non-grant financial resources across all programs. About 20% of active doctoral students were supported primarily through external grants.

The 2015 ADPCCJ data indicate that the amount of the stipend given to students by programs varied. Figure 14 shows the median “basic stipend” for doctoral students was $16,000, with a range from $7,200 to $26,000. In terms of “most lucrative” awards, the average award across programs is $20,000, though as Figure 15 shows there is again substantial variability across programs from $13,000 to $40,000.
Similarly, Figures 16 and 17 present the awards for master’s students. As Figure 16 shows the median basic stipend was $9,500 for master’s students across the 21 programs that reported data. Six programs that offer CCJ master’s degrees do not provide funding on a regular basis. At the other extreme, some programs provide funding for master’s students that is comparable to typical funding levels for doctoral students. Additionally, as Figure 17 shows, a few programs reserve some significant awards (e.g., $35,000) for especially promising master’s students although the average most lucrative master’s funding was $13,665.
Conclusion

This report provides a snapshot of graduate programs as they looked in 2015. We hope the information summarized above is useful to current ADPCCJ members, others in the CCJ scholarly community, and prospective students and faculty members. Placed in the recent historical context (see, e.g., Frost and Clear, 2007, *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*), the two dominant themes that emerge from the results described herein are continued growth in the number and size of CCJ doctoral programs and an impressive stability in
many of the features highlighted above. Some of the data elements summarized in this report (e.g., funding sources and details for graduate students, class sections offered, tenure time-lines) only recently were added to the ADPCCJ survey, so we do not have a good indication of how the reported figures compare with previous eras, but by and large the snap-shot of CCJ doctoral programs provided above is highly similar to what we have seen in the survey over the past several years. For additional information, please visit the ADPCCJ website (www.adpccj.com).
Appendix A. Summary Data from 2015 ADPCCJ Survey for Programs Ranked in Top 5 by U.S. News & World Report.²

According to U.S. News & World Report, the ranking of doctoral programs in Criminology and Criminal Justice were based on the result of peer assessment surveys. Schools offering doctoral programs in Criminology and Criminal Justice were sent surveys in which department heads, directors of graduate studies, or senior faculty members were asked to rate the academic quality of other institution’s doctoral programs. ADPCCJ provided the list of schools to be surveyed (N=39). Questionnaires were based on a 5-point scale: outstanding (5), strong (4), good (3), adequate (2), and marginal (1). Once surveys were returned, a trimmed mean was computed to determine the scores for each school, and schools were then ranked in descending order. There was an overall response rate of 90 percent for the Criminology programs surveyed (for a complete description of the methodology used, see http://www.usnews.com/education/best-graduate-schools/articles/2011/03/14/social-sciences-and-humanities-rankings-methodology-2012).

Appendix Table 1. ADPCCJ Programs with Top 5 Rankings in 2009 U.S. News & World Report (N=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University at Albany, SUNY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Missouri-St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² The table and figure numbers listed below parallel those for all reporting programs in full report.
Appendix Figure 1. CCJ Faculty Members by Gender (N=106) and Race/Ethnicity, Top Ranked ADPCCJ Programs.16

16 Data provided by 6 programs.

Appendix Figure 2. Tenure Status of Full-Time Faculty (N=106), Top Ranked ADPCCJ Programs.17

17 Data provided by 6 programs.
Appendix Table 2. Faculty Productivity in Past Year for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Salary</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Minimum Salary</th>
<th>Maximum Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Full Professors</td>
<td>$116,400</td>
<td>$108,200</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$226,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Associate Professors</td>
<td>$80,900</td>
<td>$79,642</td>
<td>$84,200</td>
<td>$128,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Assistant Professors</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$71,600</td>
<td>$81,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Recently Hired Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$65,700</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix Table 3. Faculty Time Distribution for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Reporting Programs (N=6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Time on Research</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Time on Teaching</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Time on Service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix Table 4. Graduate Director Compensation for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Reporting Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Release (N=6)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Stipend-Academic Year (N=6)</td>
<td>$4,083.33</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Stipend- Summer (N=6)</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel support (N=6)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix Table 5. Class Sections Offered by Degree, Relative to Faculty Size and Graduate Student Involvement for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Reporting Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 Undergraduate Class Sections (N=6)</td>
<td>75.83</td>
<td>71.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>107.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Undergraduate Class Sections (N=5)</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Sections to Faculty (N=6)</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Taught by Graduate Students (N=6)</td>
<td>48.99%</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>10.17%</td>
<td>67.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 Masters Class Sections (N=5)</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Masters Class Sections (N=4)</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Sections to Faculty (N=5)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Taught by Graduate Students (N=5)</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 Doctoral Class Sections (N=6)</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Doctoral Class Sections (N=4)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Sections to Faculty (N=6)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Taught by Graduate Students (N=6)</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Table 6. Faculty Productivity in Past Year for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles and Books (N=6)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journal Articles Published</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>88.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles Per Faculty Member</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books Published</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books Per Faculty Member</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant Applications and Awards (N=5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive National Grants Submitted</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive National Grants Received</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant Dollars Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Dollars Received Last Fiscal Year</td>
<td>$1,986,308</td>
<td>$2,267,665</td>
<td>$1,085,657</td>
<td>$2,957,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grant Dollars Received (N=5)</td>
<td>$1,347,740</td>
<td>$1,084,353</td>
<td>$949,377</td>
<td>$2,363,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Grant Dollars Received (N=4)</td>
<td>$530,337</td>
<td>$469,018</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,183,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Grant Dollars Received (N=5)</td>
<td>$194,299</td>
<td>$136,280</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$594,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Grant Dollars Received (N=4)</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix Figure 4. Undergraduate Majors (N=3731) Standardized by Full-Time Faculty Size (N=104), Top Ranked ADPCCJ Reporting Programs.19

Data provided by 6 reporting programs.
### Appendix Table 7. Degree Background Percentages for Newly Admitted Masters and Doctoral Students for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>LLM</th>
<th>MPH</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Masters Students (N=7)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Masters DL (N=2)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Doctoral Students (N=6)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Doctoral DL Students (N=0)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: BS= Bachelors of Science; BA= Bachelors of Arts; MA= Masters of Science; MS= Masters of Arts; JD= Juris Doctor; LLM=Masters of Laws; MPH= Master’s in Public Health (includes Master’s in Public Administration); PhD= Doctor of Philosophy.

### Appendix Table 8. Graduate Program Size, by Degree Type for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Active Graduate Students (N=6)</td>
<td>175.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Grad. Students/FT Faculty Members (N=1,053 Active Grad)</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>33.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Doctoral Students (N=6)</td>
<td>47.17</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Doctoral Students/FT Faculty Members (N=283 Active Doctoral)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Masters Students (N=5)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Masters Students/FT Faculty Members (N=770 Active Masters)</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>29.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Figure 5. Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Active Masters Students (N=770) for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Program Respondents.\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure5}
\caption{Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Active Masters Students (N=770) for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Program Respondents.\textsuperscript{20}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{20} Data provided by 5 programs.

Appendix Figure 6. Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Active Doctoral Students (N=283) for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Program Respondents.\textsuperscript{21}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure6}
\caption{Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Active Doctoral Students (N=283) for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Program Respondents.\textsuperscript{21}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{21} Data provided by 6 programs.
Appendix Figure 7. Employment of Recent CCJ Graduates for Top Ranked ADPCCJ Programs (N=6 Programs, 40 Graduates).

Appendix Figure 8. Acceptance Rate (N=117) for Applications Submitted (N=259) to Master's Programs (Traditional) at Top Ranked ADPCCJ Doctoral Programs.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{22} Data provided by 4 programs.
Appendix Figure 9. Enrollment Rate (N=81) for Persons Accepted (N=117) to Master’s Programs (Traditional) at Top Ranked ADPCCJ Doctoral Programs.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{enrollment_rate.png}
\caption{Percentage of Admitted Students who Enrolled}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{23} Data provided by 4 programs.

Appendix Figure 10. Acceptance Rate (N=227) for Applications Submitted (N=325) to Master’s Programs (Distance Learning) at Top Ranked ADPCCJ Doctoral Programs.\textsuperscript{24}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{acceptance_rate.png}
\caption{Percentage of Applicants Admitted}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{24} Data provided by 2 programs.
Appendix Figure 11. Enrollment Rate (N=180) for Persons Accepted (N=227) to Master’s Programs (Distance Learning) at Top Ranked ADPCCJ Ph.D. Programs. Data provided by 2 programs.
Appendix Figure 12. Acceptance Rate (N=99) for Applications Submitted (N=320) to Top Ranked Doctoral Programs.\textsuperscript{26}

\[\text{Percentage of Applicants Admitted}\]

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{Non-Linked Program IDs} & 0 & 5 & 10 & 15 & 20 \\
\hline
1 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 \\
2 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 \\
3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\
4 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
5 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{array}\]

\text{Mean} = 17.00\% 
\text{Median} = 16.50\% 

\textsuperscript{26} Data provided by 5 programs.

Appendix Table 9. GRE Scores for Newly Admitted Doctoral Students, Top Ranked ADPCCJ Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Scoring Method (N=6)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average GRE Verbal</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GRE Quantitative</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GRE Combined</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentiles (N=5)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average GRE Percentile Verbal</td>
<td>66.10%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>61.00%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GRE Percentile Quantitative</td>
<td>56.47%</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>46.00%</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GRE Percentile Analytic Writing</td>
<td>51.90%</td>
<td>66.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>74.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Figure 13. Enrollment Rate (N=49) for Applications Submitted (N=99) to Top Ranked ADPCCJ Doctoral Programs.\textsuperscript{27}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{enrollment_rate.png}
\caption{Percentage of Admitted Students Subsequently Enrolled}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{27} Data provided by 6 programs.

Appendix Figure 14. Basic Doctoral Stipends at Top Ranked ADPCCJ Reporting Programs (N=6).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{stipends.png}
\caption{Non-Linked Program IDs}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{36} Median = 41.05\%
Mean = 45.35\%

\textsuperscript{37} Median = $18,383
Mean = $19,338
Appendix Figure 15. Most Lucrative Doctoral Awards at Top Ranked ADPCCJ Programs (N=6).

Median = $24,338
Mean = $24,695

Appendix Figure 16. Basic Master’s Stipends at Top Ranked ADPCCJ Programs (N=2).

Median = $250
Mean = $3,083
Appendix Figure 17. Most Lucrative Master's Stipends at Top Ranked ADPCCJ Programs (N=3).

Median = $9,000
Mean = $8,892
## Appendix B. List of ADPCCJ Members, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year of PhD program establishment</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American University</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><a href="http://www.american.edu/spa/jlc/index.cfm">http://www.american.edu/spa/jlc/index.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td><a href="http://ccj.asu.edu/">http://ccj.asu.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>Tallahassee, FL</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td><a href="http://www.criminology.fsu.edu/">www.criminology.fsu.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>Manassas, VA</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><a href="http://cls.gmu.edu/">http://cls.gmu.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cigsu.net">www.cigsu.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Bloomington, IN</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td><a href="http://www.indiana.edu/~crimjust/">www.indiana.edu/~crimjust/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Indiana, PA</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iup.edu/criminology/default.aspx">www.iup.edu/criminology/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>East Lansing, MI</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cj.msu.edu/">www.cj.msu.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td>Fargo, ND</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ndsu.edu/cjps/">http://www.ndsu.edu/cjps/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td><a href="http://www.northeastern.edu/scj/">www.northeastern.edu/scj/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>Norfolk, VA</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td><a href="http://al.odu.edu/sociology/">http://al.odu.edu/sociology/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Prairie View, TX</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pvamu.edu/cojjp/graduate/academics/doctor-of-philosophy-in-juvenile-justice/">http://www.pvamu.edu/cojjp/graduate/academics/doctor-of-philosophy-in-juvenile-justice/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td><a href="http://rscj.newark.rutgers.edu/prospective-students/phd/">http://rscj.newark.rutgers.edu/prospective-students/phd/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
<td>Huntsville, TX</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cjcenter.org/">www.cjcenter.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Frasier University</td>
<td>Burnaby, B.C.</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sfu.ca/criminology/">www.sfu.ca/criminology/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University</td>
<td>Carbondale, IL</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td><a href="http://cola.siu.edu/ccj/">http://cola.siu.edu/ccj/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern University</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University</td>
<td>San Marcos, TX</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cj.txstate.edu/">www.cj.txstate.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Albany, SUNY</td>
<td>Albany, NY</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td><a href="http://www.albany.edu/scj/">www.albany.edu/scj/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas, Little Rock</td>
<td>Little Rock, AR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><a href="http://ualr.edu/criminaljustice/">http://ualr.edu/criminaljustice/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>Irvine, CA</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td><a href="http://cls.soceco.uci.edu/">http://cls.soceco.uci.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cohpa.ucf.edu/crim.jus/">www.cohpa.ucf.edu/crim.jus/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cech.uc.edu/criminaljustice/">www.cech.uc.edu/criminaljustice/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>Newark, DE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><a href="http://www.udel.edu/soc/">http://www.udel.edu/soc/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Gainesville, FL</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td><a href="http://socrim.clas.ufl.edu/">http://socrim.clas.ufl.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td><a href="http://clj.las.uic.edu/index.html">http://clj.las.uic.edu/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><a href="https://louisville.edu/justiceadministration">https://louisville.edu/justiceadministration</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maribor</td>
<td>Ljubljana, Slovenia</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fvv.uni-mb.si/en/index.aspx">www.fvv.uni-mb.si/en/index.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>College Park, MD</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccj.umd.edu/">www.ccj.umd.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
<td>Lowell, MA</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uml.edu/FAHSS/Criminal-Justice/default.aspx">http://www.uml.edu/FAHSS/Criminal-Justice/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri, St. Louis</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td><a href="http://www.umsl.edu/~ccj/">http://www.umsl.edu/~ccj/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska, Omaha</td>
<td>Omaha, NE</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unomaha.edu/criminaljustice">www.unomaha.edu/criminaljustice</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Haven</td>
<td>West Haven, CT</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><a href="http://www.newhaven.edu/36182">www.newhaven.edu/36182</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td>Grand Forks, ND</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td><a href="http://arts-sciences.und.edu/criminal-justice/">http://arts-sciences.und.edu/criminal-justice/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>Columbia, SC</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cas.sc.edu/crju/">www.cas.sc.edu/crju/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td><a href="http://criminology.cbc.usf.edu/">http://criminology.cbc.usf.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>Hattiesburg, MS</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cj.usm.edu/">www.cj.usm.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas-Dallas</td>
<td>Richardson, TX</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td><a href="http://www.utdallas.edu/epps/crim/">www.utdallas.edu/epps/crim/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>