





2022 Report on Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Initiatives

Department of Criminal Justice, Criminology &
Forensics



Report Background

In early June of 2020, the criminal justice, criminology, and forensics faculty held listening sessions to provide a space for students to share their thoughts, feelings, and concerns about the murder of George Floyd, the subsequent protests, and the larger issues of implicit bias, systematic prejudice, and institutional racism within the criminal justice system. Students who participated also provided their thoughts about the department and curriculum.

One outcome of the listening session was a decision by the faculty to develop and administer a survey that focused specifically on students' educational experiences specific to several topics that fall under the broad umbrella of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Specifically, the survey asked about the ways in which they had been taught, or not, about disparities in the criminal justice system that disproportionately impact individuals and communities that are underrepresented and/or marginalized because of their race and/or ethnicity, and/or because of their gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation. The survey was developed by students and faculty and shared with the College of Arts & Science's Dean's Office and the Seattle University Office of Diversity and Inclusion for review. The survey was first administered during the Spring Quarter of 2021 to current students and alumni. In Spring quarter of 2022, the survey was administered for a second time to current students and alumni.

Throughout the 2021-2022 academic year, the Department of Criminal Justice, Criminology & Forensics Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) committee met to discuss opportunities for growth within the department that would ensure all criminal justice, criminology, and forensics students would be exposed to a wide variation of perspectives about the criminal justice system, its history, and its impact on individuals and communities within the United States. This work was utilized to inform a faculty discussion on how to create a more diverse and inclusive department and curriculum. By the end of the academic year, faculty voted on changes to the curriculum and the department's bylaws to establish the Department's Mission, Vision, and Values statement which were then posted on the Department's website. During Fall and Winter quarters, the DEI Committee was led by Professor William Parkin. The DEI Committee members included an undergraduate (Flora Mellana-Edison) and graduate student (Sienna Miller) representative from the department, a staff member from the department (Nicole Moses), a former undergraduate student from the Criminal Justice, Criminology and Forensics Department (Ezra Alem), and an outside member from the Criminal Justice Advisory Board Committee (Mac Pevey). Due to Professor Parkin's departure from Seattle University, Professor Elaine Gunnison stepped in to lead the committee during Spring quarter. For the 2022-2023 academic year, Professor Brooke Gialopsos will be leading the committee henceforth.

This 2022 report contains a list of the approved initiatives (page 3), a list of initiatives that will be further developed starting in the fall with the intention of enacting sometime during the 2022-2023 academic year (page 5). Finally, the results of the survey administered to current students and alumni are described (page 6) and presented in table form (page 9).

Any questions or comments about this report, specifically, or department level diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives, generally, may be directed to Elaine Gunnison at gunnison@seattleu.edu. All feedback will be compiled and provided to the department's Diversity, Equity & Inclusion committee at the start of the fall quarter.

Policies or Procedures Changed or Updated During the 2021-2022 Academic Year to Increase Diversity, Equity and Inclusion within the Department



The department submitted paperwork to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in the College of Arts and Sciences to require Gender, Race and Crime, currently an elective, for all undergraduate majors starting Fall 2022

Course Description: Study of gender and race/ethnicity disparities and discriminatory practices in criminal justice with attention to the ways in which gender and race/ethnicity has been historically addressed in criminological theory. Exploration of feminist and cultural perspectives in understanding crime and its response. Comparisons in offending, police contact, case processing, correctional supervision and confinement, capital punishment, and social response and control of criminal behavior. Topics include: Racial profiling, race and gender disparity versus discrimination at different stages of the criminal justice process, female offending, and male violence against women.



The department submitted paperwork to the Graduate Curriculum Committee in the College of Arts and Sciences to require Critical Criminology, currently an elective, for all graduate students starting Fall 2022

Course Description: Examination of postmodern alternative theoretical frameworks and methodologies that deconstruct scientific thinking, language, and theoretical perspectives that have perpetuated oppression and have shaped construction of crime and power relations of justice and injustice. Focus on Marxist, feminist, radical, and cultural perspectives that critically challenge traditional theories and perspectives on crime and justice with attention to the ways in which the politics of meaning around race, class, gender, age, sexual identity, and marginalized groups make their way into definitions of crime and the administration of justice.



The department voted to change its bylaws to create a mission, vision, and values statement that were posted on the department's website.

- The revised mission statement: The Seattle University Department of Criminal Justice, Criminology, and Forensics is dedicated to professional formation that prepares our graduates for the challenges of working and advocating for reform both from within and without the criminal justice system; empowering our graduates to lead their communities and organizations for the furtherance of justice, fairness and equality; and to educate through community engagement, service learning, rigorous coursework, and theoretical and empirical literacy.
- The revised vision statement: The Seattle University Department of Criminal Justice, Criminology and Forensics will be the top program in the West educating students to lead, reform, and advocate for justice and humanity.
- The revised values statement:
 - **Academic Excellence**: We strive for excellence in learning through coursework, real world experiences, and research.

- **Anti-Racism & Anti-Discrimination:** We unequivocally support all marginalized and underrepresented students and communities including those, but not excluding others, who are Asian, Black, with disabilities, immigrant, Indigenous, Jewish, Latinx, LGBTQ+, Muslim, and/or veterans.
- **Critical Inquiry:** We train our students to challenge the status quo through the exploration of pragmatic and theoretical frameworks that are supported by science.
- **Diversity:** We value diversity of perspectives and people represented within our student body, faculty, staff, advisory board, and curriculum. Such diversity strengthens our minds, experiences, and humanity.
- **Inclusion:** We require the development and use of pedagogy that supports a learning environment in which all students feel comfortable and supported sharing their perspectives, values, and life experiences.
- **Justice:** We educate and advocate through our teaching and research for a fair, equitable and just criminal justice system.
- **Leadership:** We empower responsible and educated leaders committed to fairness, equity and justice.

Policies and Procedures to be Developed and Updated During the 2022-2023 Academic Year to Increase Diversity, Equity and Inclusion within the Department



The department had previously voted in AY2021/2022 to support the development of an undergraduate specialization and graduate concentration that focuses on advocacy and reform.

The continued development of these new educational pathways will occur during the 2022-2023 academic years and will include recommendations put forth by the department's Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Committee and Curriculum Committee. Specifically, these committees will determine what current courses would fit within the proposed specialization/concentration and what classes will need to be developed to cover new content.



The department previously voted to support the development of multiple 1-course practicums of which undergraduate students will be required to take five and graduate students will be required to take three.

Further development of these practicums will take place during the 2022-2023 academic year which will include a focus specifically on identifying a diverse set of topics, community organizations, speakers, and/or practitioners that will present varying perspectives about the criminal justice system and its impact on different communities. Following the development, the process for submitting the necessary paperwork to the respective curriculum committee will be initiated.



A self-assessment tool will be developed that allows all faculty to examine their courses through a diversity and inclusion lens. Specifically, it will allow faculty to assess the depth and breadth of the perspectives and materials they are providing their students in the course.



Department level training that focuses on facilitating difficult discussions related to diversity, equity and inclusion will be identified and offered to all criminal justice, criminology, and forensics faculty. This training, or another training, will also focus on identifying and addressing microaggressions within a classroom setting.



The further refinement of the DEI student and alumni survey to help foster meaningful and concrete action items and to ensure that survey takers better feel that the survey is relevant to them and that they feel a stake in taking the survey.



A report will be completed to update students, alumni, faculty, and advisory board members on completed and new action items from the 2022-2023 academic year.

Survey Results

Eight-one respondents completed the survey which was less than those completed in the administration of the survey the previous year (Table 1). Approximately 2/3 of respondents were current students and 1/4 were alumni. The completion of the survey by current students was a 1/3 increase from the previous year, however, less alumni completed the survey this year. This may be due to the fact that the alumni pool for this survey dissemination only went back five years. Of the current students who completed the survey, it was about evenly split between undergraduate (35%) and graduate students (24%). Of the alumni who completed the survey, slightly more took classes in the undergraduate program (14%) than the graduate program (12%). Approximately 20% of the current students and 6% of the alumni identified as a member of the LGBTQ+ community and 26% of the current students and 10% of the alumni identified as a member of a racial and/or ethnic group that is underrepresented and/or marginalized. Although not a direct demographic comparison, 78% of our current students are female, and 50% of our students identify as members of a racial and/or ethnic group that is underrepresented and/or marginalized. With an eye toward identifying areas of improvement for the department, portions of the results are reported below and fully reported in Tables 1 through 8.

In almost all categories, most students stated that all or some of their classes included materials that focused on the disparate impact the criminal justice system has on individuals and groups based on their race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation (Table 2). Taken as a whole, undergraduate classes were most likely to not include materials that focused on empirical research and were most likely to offer theoretical perspectives, effective policy solutions, and concrete examples related to these topics. At the graduate level, classes were most likely to not include materials that focused effective policy solutions and were most likely to offer theoretical perspectives, empirical research, and concrete examples related to these topics. Also, courses were more likely to focus on the disparate impact the criminal justice system has on individuals and groups based on their race and/or ethnicity, when compared to topics specific to gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation. Thus, there are distinct policy recommendations that could be suggested for both undergraduate and graduate courses.

Respondents were also asked to identify the types of class materials that focused on the disparate impact the criminal justice system has on individuals and groups based on their race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation (Table 3). Current students and alumni reported the highest rates, on average, of materials connected to discussions on race and/or ethnicity were course readings, lectures, and general class discussions. Consistently, however, material types covering race and/or ethnicity were used more often than those covering gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation. Also, respondents who identified as a member of the LGBTQ+ community or of a racial or ethnic group that is underrepresented and/or marginalized more often reported having these material types in their classes. One possible explanation for this could be that students identifying as members of these group may be more likely to take courses that specifically focus on these topics or these topics are more salient in their lives or they are more likely to remember whether or not a course used these materials.

When asked what types of materials respondents would like to be more integrated into their coursework and extracurricular activities that focus on the disparate impact the criminal justice system has on individuals and groups based on their race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation (Table 4), respondents were most interested in the department inviting speakers both into the classroom and for extracurricular events. Specific to classroom integration, interest in additional materials somewhat mirrored materials that respondents said they were not receiving, such as a service-learning component and general discussion in some coursework area. Across the board, demand for the inclusion of extra-curricular materials, specifically guest speakers, suggests that the department continue to bring in experts from the field to speak on topics that will enhance and broaden student perspectives. Additionally, survey respondents expressed wanting guest speakers with opposing viewpoints.

Respondents were also asked how well they believed criminal justice education is preparing or did prepare them understand the disparate impact the criminal justice system has on individuals and groups, engage others in meaningful discussions about these issues, and provide them the confidence to advocate for or implement change that addresses these disparate impacts (Table 5). Among the current and alumni respondents, the majority reported that they were educated about the disparate impact of the system, but they felt less prepared to advocate for change or being able to engage with others about the topic. In addition, both current students and alumni are more comfortable with their knowledge about race and/or ethnic disparities within the criminal justice system, then with disparities specific to gender, gender identity, gender expression, or sexual orientation. These findings were consistent with findings from the previous year survey.

Based on their experiences to date, respondents were asked to identify if, and how often, faculty in their criminal justice classes have successfully facilitated equitable discussions when discussing inequities related to race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation (Table 6). Specific to race and/or ethnicity, 68% of all respondents reported faculty successfully facilitated equitable discussions often and 4% reported never. Compared to the report from last year, this was an increased in success and decreased in the never category. These percentages were somewhat similar for respondents who identified as members from underrepresented and/or marginalized groups, while 70% of respondents who identified as members of the LGBTQ+ community reported faculty often facilitated equitable discussions and 15% reported that they never did. The higher percentage in the never category was inflated, however, by the small reporting size in this category (n=2). Next, 13% of all respondents, 23% of respondents who identified as members of the LGBTQ+ community, and 0% of respondents who identified as members of underrepresented and/or marginalized groups reported that faculty had never successfully facilitated equitable discussions about gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation within a course's subject areas.

Respondents were also asked to identify if, and how often, they witnessed faculty or students in criminal justice classes engage in microaggressions against individuals and groups based on race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, and/or other groups that are underrepresented and/or marginalized (Table 7). In virtually all categories, the majority of respondents stated that they never witnessed microaggressions by faculty or students. However, a slight majority of all respondents did report witnessing microaggressions by faculty or students in regards to race and/or ethnicity and by other groups that are underrepresented and/or marginalized. Finally, respondents were asked whether, based on their experiences, they felt safe speaking with a criminal justice professor about issues related to race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation (Table 8). Of

those completing this question, approximately 40% of respondents stated that a criminal justice professor had provided a safe space to speak about such issues or, although they had not needed to, they would be comfortable speaking with a faculty member about such issues. This percentage was higher for respondents who identified as members of the LGBTQ+ community (53%) and for respondents who identified as members of underrepresented and/or marginalized racial and/or ethnic groups (42%).

The DEI Committee reviewed and discussed both the quantitative and qualitative findings and offered several comments and insights. First, the DEI Committee suggested further refinement of the survey. Specifically, the members wanted questions that further explore exactly what is exactly going on in the classroom. Besides asking respondents if DEI topics and concepts are being covered in the classroom, the members would like specific responses. Otherwise, the members felt the survey was just “checking the boxes” and not getting to the heart of what is actually occurring in the classroom. Additionally, the committee members recommend that department work with the Center for Faculty Development on the survey to leverage their expertise to ensure that the questions are worded in an intentional manner to assist the department in obtaining meaningful responses. Second, the DEI Committee suggested additional training for professors to ensure that microaggressions in the classroom do not occur as well as helping them to understand the differences between sex and gender which was a comment noted by one of the survey respondents. Some committee members recommended that experts in DEI principles from outside the university community be brought in to educate the faculty and others suggested that the Center for Faculty Development be utilized to assist in faculty training perhaps through a workshop or classroom observations. Finally, the committee noted the limitations of the survey in terms of sample size and demographics. The committee members suggested several methods for increasing survey responses for next year such as: 1) Getting students to help recruit others to complete the survey; 2) Plugging the survey in classes via communication with a flyer that could be distributed during class that contains a QR code which links to the survey and also communicating with email with the QR code; and 3) Continue to offer a raffle for survey completion.

Table 1. Respondent Information

		All Respondents (N=81)		LGBTQ+ Respondents (N=23)		Respondents from Underrepresented/Marginalized Racial/Ethnic Groups (N=28)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n
Current students	Undergraduate	35.8	29	52.2	12	46.4	13
	Graduate	34.6	28	17.4	4	28.6	8
Alumni	Undergraduate alumni	14.8	12	8.7	2	14.3	4
	Graduate alumni	12.3	10	13.0	3	14.3	4
Undergraduate specialization	Administration of justice	7.4	6	4.3	1	7.1	2
	Criminology & criminal justice theory	9.9	8	21.7	5	10.7	3
	Forensic psychology (BA)	13.6	11	13.0	3	25.0	7
	Forensic psychology (BS)	8.6	7	13.0	3	21.4	6
	Forensic science (BS)	13.6	11	21.7	5	7.1	2
	Criminal justice (minor)	1.2	1	0.0	0	3.6	1
MACJ concentration	No Concentration	9.9	8	4.3	1	7.1	2
	Investigative Criminology	16.0	13	21.7	5	14.3	4
	Victimology	3.7	3	0.0	0	0.0	0
	Research & Evaluation	13.6	11	0.0	0	17.9	5
	Crime Analysis Certificate Program	2.5	2	8.7	2	0.0	0
Number of completed classes for current students	1-5 Classes	17.3	14	21.7	5	25.0	7
	6-10 Classes	16.0	13	13.0	3	17.9	5
	More than 10 classes	43.2	35	43.5	10	39.3	11
Identify as a member of...	the LGBTQ+ community	28.4	23	100.0	23	28.6	8
	a group that is underrepresented and/or marginalized because of their race and/or ethnicity	34.6	28	34.8	8	29.6	28
Currently working in...	Criminal justice system part time	11.1	9	0.0	0	28.6	8
	Criminal justice system full time	23.5	19	21.7	5	25.0	7

Table 2. Based on your criminal justice coursework to date, please identify how many of your undergraduate and/or graduate classes included materials that focused on the disparate impact the criminal justice system has on individuals and groups based on their race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation.

			All Respondents								LGBTQ+ Respondents								Respondents from Underrepresented/ Marginalized Racial/Ethnic Groups							
			All Classes (1)		Some Classes (2)		No Classes(3)		Total		All Classes		Some Classes		No Classes		Total		All Classes		Some Classes		No Classes		Total	
			%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Undergraduate	Race and/or Ethnicity	Theoretical Perspectives	50.0	18	50.0	18	0.0	0	100.0	36	50.0	6	50.0	6	0.0	0	100.0	12	41.2	7	58.8	10	0.0	0	100.0	17
		Empirical Research	19.4	7	77.8	28	2.8	1	100.0	36	16.7	2	83.3	10	0.0	0	100.0	12	12.5	2	87.5	14	0.0	0	100.0	16
		Concrete Examples	37.1	13	54.3	19	8.6	3	100.0	35	50.0	6	41.7	5	8.3	1	100.0	12	25.0	4	62.5	10	12.5	2	100.0	16
		Effective Policy Solutions	22.9	8	62.9	22	14.3	5	100.0	35	50.0	6	25.0	3	25.0	3	100.0	12	20.0	3	60.0	9	20.0	3	100.0	15
	Gender, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, and/or Sexual Orientation	Theoretical Perspectives	9.4	3	71.9	23	18.8	6	100.0	32	20.0	2	50.0	5	30.0	3	100.0	10	7.7	1	84.6	11	7.7	1	100.0	13
		Empirical Research	6.5	2	67.7	21	25.8	8	100.0	31	10.0	1	60.0	6	30.0	3	100.0	10	0.0	0	75.0	9	25.0	3	100.0	12
		Concrete Examples	9.7	3	61.3	19	29.0	9	100.0	31	20.0	2	60.0	6	20.0	2	100.0	10	8.3	1	58.3	7	33.3	4	100.0	12
		Effective Policy Solutions	12.9	4	45.2	14	41.9	13	100.0	31	20.0	2	30.0	3	50.0	5	100.0	10	18.2	2	27.3	3	54.5	6	100.0	11
Graduate	Race and/or Ethnicity	Theoretical Perspectives	52.9	18	44.1	15	2.9	1	100.0	34	50.0	3	50.0	3	0.0	0	100.0	6	58.3	7	41.7	5	0.0	0	100.0	12
		Empirical Research	51.6	16	45.2	14	3.2	1	100.0	31	50.0	3	33.3	2	16.7	1	100.0	6	63.6	7	27.3	3	9.1	1	100.0	11
		Concrete Examples	46.9	15	46.9	15	6.3	2	100.0	32	50.0	3	33.3	2	16.7	1	100.0	6	63.6	7	27.3	3	9.1	1	100.0	11
		Effective Policy Solutions	29.0	9	48.4	15	22.6	7	100.0	31	16.7	1	33.3	2	50.0	3	100.0	6	27.3	3	45.5	5	27.3	3	100.0	11
	Gender, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, and/or Sexual Orientation	Theoretical Perspectives	33.3	10	56.7	17	10.0	3	100.0	30	33.3	2	50.0	3	16.7	1	100.0	6	22.2	2	66.7	6	11.1	1	100.0	9
		Empirical Research	45.0	9	95.0	19	10.0	2	100.0	20	50.0	3	33.3	2	183.3	11	100.0	6	36.4	4	45.5	5	18.2	2	100.0	11
		Concrete Examples	35.5	11	54.8	17	9.7	3	100.0	31	50.0	3	33.3	2	16.7	1	100.0	6	36.4	4	45.5	5	18.2	2	100.0	11
		Effective Policy Solutions	16.7	5	56.7	17	26.7	8	100.0	30	16.7	1	33.3	2	50.0	3	100.0	6	18.2	2	54.5	6	27.3	3	100.0	11

Table 3. Based on your criminal justice undergraduate and/or graduate coursework to date, please identify the types of class materials that focused on the disparate impact the criminal justice system has on individuals and groups based on their race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation.

			All Respondents		LGBTQ+ Respondents		Respondents from Underrepresented/Marginalized Racial/Ethnic Groups	
			%	n	%	n	%	n
Undergraduate	Race and/or Ethnicity	Readings	86.7	26	81.8	9	100.0	6
		Speakers	30.0	9	27.3	3	33.3	2
		Multimedia	70.0	21	54.5	6	66.7	4
		Lectures	83.3	25	90.9	10	100.0	6
		Service Learning	10.0	3	0.0	0	16.7	1
		General Discussion	86.7	26	81.8	9	100.0	6
		Total Respondents	100.0	30	100.0	11	100.0	6
	Gender, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, and/or Sexual Orientation	Readings	91.7	22	77.8	7	83.3	5
		Speakers	33.3	8	22.2	2	16.7	1
		Multimedia	33.3	8	55.6	5	83.3	4
		Lectures	70.8	17	55.6	5	66.7	4
		Service Learning	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
		General Discussion	79.2	19	77.8	7	100.0	6
		Total Respondents	100.0	24	100.0	9	100.0	6
Graduate	Race and/or Ethnicity	Readings	92.9	26	100.0	5	100.0	2
		Speakers	46.4	13	60.0	3	50.0	1
		Multimedia	53.6	15	60.0	3	50.0	1
		Lectures	85.7	24	80.0	4	100.0	2
		Service Learning	14.3	4	20.0	1	0.0	0
		General Discussion	89.3	25	60.0	3	50.0	1
		Total Respondents	100.0	28	100.0	5	100.0	2
	Gender, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, and/or Sexual Orientation	Readings	77.8	21	100.0	5	100.0	2
		Speakers	25.9	7	20.0	1	0.0	0
		Multimedia	37.0	10	40.0	2	50.0	1
		Lectures	70.4	19	60.0	3	50.0	1
		Service Learning	3.7	1	0.0	0	0.0	0
		General Discussion	81.48	22	40.00	2	100.00	2
		Total Respondents	100.0	27	100.0	5	100.0	2

Table 4. Based on your experiences to date, please identify the types of materials that you would like to be more integrated into your coursework and extracurricular activities that focus on the disparate impact the criminal justice system has on individuals and groups based on their race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation.

			All Respondents		LGBTQ+ Respondents		Respondents from Underrepresented/Marginalized Racial/Ethnic Groups	
			%	n	%	n	%	n
Race and/or Ethnicity	Coursework	Readings	45.9	17	41.7	5	33.3	5
		Speakers	81.1	30	75.0	9	66.7	10
		Multimedia	59.5	22	66.7	8	60.0	9
		Lectures	51.4	19	33.3	4	46.7	7
		Service Learning	62.2	23	58.3	7	60.0	9
		General Discussion	59.5	22	58.3	7	46.7	7
		Total Respondents	100.0	37	100.0	12	100.0	15
	Extracurricular Activities	Readings	34.5	10	62.5	5	40.0	4
		Speakers	75.9	22	75.0	6	90.0	9
		Multimedia	44.8	13	75.0	6	60.0	6
		Lectures	41.4	12	37.5	3	50.0	5
		Service Learning	58.6	17	50.0	4	60.0	6
		General Discussion	48.3	14	50.0	4	50.0	5
		Total Respondents	100.0	29	100.0	8	100.0	10
Gender, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, and/or Sexual Orientation	Coursework	Readings	59.0	23	75.0	9	35.7	5
		Speakers	82.1	32	91.7	11	78.6	11
		Multimedia	61.5	24	75.0	9	57.1	8
		Lectures	59.0	23	50.0	6	50.0	7
		Service Learning	53.8	21	50.0	6	50.0	7
		General Discussion	69.2	27	75.0	9	57.1	8
		Total Respondents	100.0	39	100.0	12	100.0	14
	Extracurricular Activities	Readings	41.4	12	71.4	5	30.0	3
		Speakers	75.9	22	85.7	6	80.0	8
		Multimedia	48.3	14	85.7	6	60.0	6
		Lectures	51.7	15	42.9	3	70.0	7
		Service Learning	58.6	17	57.1	4	50.0	5
		General Discussion	55.2	16	57.1	4	70.0	7
		Total Respondents	100.0	29	100.0	7	100.0	10

Table 5. How well do you believe your criminal justice education is preparing/did prepare you to understand the disparate impact the criminal justice system has on individuals and groups, engage others in meaningful discussions about these issues, and provide you the confidence to advocate for or implement change that addresses these disparate impacts?

			All Respondents								LGBTQ+ Respondents								Respondents from Underrepresented and/or Marginalized Racial/Ethnic Groups							
			Extremely Well		Moderately Well		Not Well at All		Total		Extremely Well		Moderately Well		Not Well at All		Total		Extremely Well		Moderately Well		Not Well at All		Total	
			%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Current Students	Race and/or Ethnicity	Knowledge of disparate impact	60.0	24	32.5	13	7.5	3	100.0	40	70.0	7	20.0	2	10.0	1	100.0	10	80.0	4	20.0	1	0.0	0	100.0	5
		Engage others about disparate impact	55.3	21	34.2	13	10.5	4	100.0	38	70.0	7	20.0	2	10.0	1	100.0	10	60.0	3	40.0	2	0.0	0	100.0	5
		Advocate for change	52.6	20	28.9	11	18.4	7	100.0	38	90.0	9	0.0	0	10.0	1	100.0	10	80.0	4	0.0	0	20.0	1	100.0	5
	Gender, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, and/or Sexual Orientation	Knowledge of disparate impact	32.5	13	40.0	16	27.5	11	100.0	40	40.0	4	30.0	3	30.0	3	100.0	10	60.0	3	20.0	1	20.0	1	100.0	5
		Engage others about disparate impact	31.6	12	39.5	15	28.9	11	100.0	38	40.0	4	30.0	3	30.0	3	100.0	10	40.0	2	40.0	2	20.0	1	100.0	5
		Advocate for change	34.2	13	36.8	14	28.9	11	100.0	38	50.0	5	40.0	4	10.0	1	100.0	10	60.0	3	20.0	1	20.0	1	100.0	5
Alumni	Race and/or Ethnicity	Knowledge of disparate impact	87.5	7	0.0	0	12.5	1	100.0	8	100.0	3	0.0	0	0.0	0	100.0	3	100.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	100.0	1
		Engage others about disparate impact	50.0	4	37.5	3	12.5	1	100.0	8	33.3	1	66.7	2	0.0	0	100.0	3	100.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	100.0	1
		Advocate for/implement change	50.0	4	25.0	2	25.0	2	100.0	8	66.7	2	33.3	1	0.0	0	100.0	3	100.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	100.0	1
	Gender, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, and/or Sexual Orientation	Knowledge of disparate impact	37.5	3	50.0	4	12.5	1	100.0	8	66.7	2	33.3	1	0.0	0	100.0	3	100.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	100.0	1
		Engage others about disparate impact	37.5	3	37.5	3	25.0	2	100.0	8	66.7	2	0.0	0	33.3	1	100.0	3	100.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	100.0	1
		Advocate for/implement change	37.5	3	25.0	2	37.5	3	100.0	8	66.7	2	0.0	0	33.3	1	100.0	3	100.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	100.0	1

Table 6. Based on your experiences to date, please identify if, and how often, faculty in your criminal justice classes have successfully facilitated equitable discussions (i.e. centering experiences of marginalized people) when discussing inequities related to race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation.

	All Respondents								LGBTQ+ Respondents								Respondents from Underrepresented/Marginalized Racial/Ethnic Groups							
	Often		Rarely		Never		Total		Often		Rarely		Never		Total		Often		Rarely		Never		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
How successfully had faculty facilitated equitable discussions on race and/or ethnicity	68.6	35	27.5	14	3.9	2	100.0	51	69.2	9	15.4	2	15.4	2	100.0	13	61.9	13	33.3	7	4.8	1	100.0	21
How successfully had faculty facilitated equitable discussions on gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation	43.1	22	43.1	22	13.7	7	100.0	51	46.2	6	30.8	4	23.1	3	100.0	13	47.6	10	35.5	11	0.0	0	100.0	21

Table 7. Based on your experiences to date, please identify if, and how often, you have witnessed faculty or students in your criminal justice classes engage in microaggressions against individuals and groups based on race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, and/or other groups that are underrepresented and/or marginalized.

	All Respondents								LGBTQ+ Respondents								Respondents from Underrepresented/Marginalized Racial/Ethnic Groups								
	Often		Rarely		Never		Total		Often		Rarely		Never		Total		Often		Rarely		Never		Total		
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
Faculty	Race and/or Ethnicity	10.0	5	32.0	16	58.0	29	100.0	50	7.7	1	46.2	6	46.2	6	100.0	13	15.0	3	25.0	5	60.0	12	100.0	20
	Gender, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, and/or Sexual Orientation	12.0	6	38.0	19	50.0	25	100.0	50	7.7	1	61.5	8	30.8	4	100.0	13	15.0	3	30.0	6	55.0	11	100.0	20
	Other Groups that are Underrepresented and/or Marginalized	10.0	5	38.0	19	52.0	26	100.0	50	7.7	1	46.2	6	46.2	6	100.0	13	5.0	1	35.0	7	60.0	12	100.0	20
Students	Race and/or Ethnicity	16.3	8	42.9	21	40.8	20	100.0	49	8.3	1	58.3	7	33.3	4	100.0	12	25.0	5	35.0	7	40.0	8	100.0	20
	Gender, Gender Identity, Gender Expression, and/or Sexual Orientation	14.3	7	34.7	17	51.0	25	100.0	49	8.3	1	41.7	5	50.0	6	100.0	12	15.0	3	30.0	6	55.0	11	100.0	20
	Other Groups that are Underrepresented and/or Marginalized	20.4	10	40.8	20	38.8	19	100.0	49	8.3	1	58.3	7	33.3	4	100.0	12	20.0	4	40.0	8	40.0	8	100.0	20

Table 8. Based on your experiences to date, have you felt safe speaking with a criminal justice professor about issues related to race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, gender expression, and/or sexual orientation?

	All Respondents		LGBTQ+ Respondents		Respondents from Underrepresented/ Marginalized Racial/Ethnic Groups	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Yes, a criminal justice professor has provided a safe space for me to speak about these issues.	39.22	20	53.8	7	42.9	9
No, a criminal justice professor has not provided a safe space for me to speak about these issues.	1.961	1	0.0	0	4.8	1
I have not needed to speak with a criminal justice professor about these issues, but would feel comfortable doing so.	49.02	25	38.5	5	47.6	10
I have not needed to speak with a criminal justice professor about these issues and would not feel comfortable doing so.	9.804	5	7.7	1	4.8	1
	total: 51		Total: 13		total: 21	