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MISSION, GOALS AND STAFF

MISSION
UC San Diego (UCSD) is dedicated to learning, teaching, and serving society through education, research, and public service. To foster the best possible working and learning environment, UCSD strives to maintain a climate of fairness, cooperation, and professionalism.

Supporting the University’s mission and UCSD’s distinctive college system, the Office of Student Conduct provides leadership for the student conduct process through its central coordinating, training, and advising role. The Office adheres to UCSD’s Principles of Community and works to administer a thorough, transparent, and fair student conduct process that encourages participation of the campus community while holding students accountable for their actions. These principles are enhanced by partnering with the undergraduate Colleges, the graduate and professionals schools, students, and the greater University community to promote learning opportunities for students found responsible for Student Conduct Code violations that help them become responsible and community-minded individuals.

GOALS
- Provide central leadership for UCSD’s campus-wide non-academic student conduct process in conjunction with the undergraduate Colleges, graduate and professional schools, and greater University community.
- Collaborate with the undergraduate Colleges, graduate and professional schools, and greater University community with regard to student disciplinary and welfare matters.
- Facilitate ongoing comprehensive student conduct-related training for staff, students, and faculty.
- Oversee the administration of a thorough, transparent, and fair student conduct process that encourages the participation of the campus community in the resolution of allegations of student and student organization misconduct.
- Educate the campus community about student rights and responsibilities.
- Develop and maintain comprehensive statistical and narrative data regarding all aspects of the student conduct process and engage in regular assessment of student conduct processes.
- Maintain a comprehensive central database of confidential non-academic student disciplinary records.

PROFESSIONAL STAFF
- Ben White, Director of Student Conduct (third year at UC San Diego)
- Natania Trapp, Administrative Coordinator (sixth year at UC San Diego, third in position)

STUDENT STAFF
- Terra Dominguez, Student Assistant
- Asma Eweida, Student Intern
- Kristin Galligan, Graduate Assistant
- Karla Reyes, Student Intern (summer 2013)
- Tania Romero, Student Assistant
TRAININGS, OUTREACH, AND EDUCATION

- "Alcohol Awareness & Risk Management" discussion – Director of Student Conduct Ben White and Greek Advisor Lindsay McKinney discussed key topics around alcohol awareness and chapter risk management with Sigma Phi Epsilon fraternity in October. Topics of discussion included responsible use of alcohol, bystander behavior, the student conduct process, and the impact of poor decision making on the public perception of the chapter.

- All-Campus Resident Advisor training – Resident Advisors participated in a one hour fifteen minute training session in September with Director of Student Conduct Ben White and Administrative Coordinator Natania Trapp. The training focused on roles and expectations, report writing basics, and developing a greater understanding of the student conduct process. The training also featured a mock incident with participation by several Student Affairs professionals.

- “Only My Friends Could See – Legal and Practical Implications of Online Social Networking” presentation – Director of Student Conduct, Ben White, conducted presentations targeted toward students and staff regarding the legal and practical implications of using online social networking sites. He presented to the California State University, San Marcos Student Affairs staff in August and to students through the Center for Student Involvement’s “I-Lead” program in January.

- Quarterly Workshops – The Office of Student Conduct held three quarterly workshops during the academic year to provide professional development opportunities for Student Conduct Officers and communicate updates on changes/reminder as to policy, procedures, techniques, and approaches. This year’s topics included:
  - “Sanctioning” (October) – This workshop focused on our sanctioning philosophy and sanction baselines & guidelines. We discussed sanctioning baselines for alcohol, drug, and other case types, including theft, failure to comply, and unwanted personal contact.
  - “Administrative Resolutions” (January) – This interactive workshop focused on the administrative resolution process. We discussed the specifics of the process, including how to prepare for meetings, explaining the process to students, and discussing responsibility and sanctions. A key component with this workshop was to have participants discuss their strategies and experience with various parts of the administrative resolution process.
  - “Sanction Follow-Up” (May) – This workshop, led by Administrative Coordinator Natania Trapp and Revelle College Program Assistant Dan Velasquez focused on following up with sanctions after they have been assigned by Student Conduct Officers.

- Revised Student Conduct Code training – In preparation for the implementation of the Revised Student Conduct Code, Director of Student Conduct Ben White delivered training on the new Code to several key constituencies during Fall Quarter. Topics for the training included: roles and responsibilities, conduct in violation of community standards, the administrative resolution process, and sanctions and follow-up. Groups participating in the training included:
  - A.S. Student Advocates (co-presented with Jon Carlos Senour) (November)
  - Center for Student Involvement (September)
  - Council of Provosts (September)
  - Resident Deans and Assistant Resident Deans (September)
  - Student Affairs Deans Assistants and Residential Life Assistants (August)
  - Student Affairs Deans and Assistant Deans (August)
  - Student Affairs Unit Heads (with Andy Ceperley) (September)
• **Student Conduct Education Sessions** – As part of our goal to educate our campus community about the student conduct process and student rights and responsibilities, we delivered several presentations to staff groups who interact with the student conduct process. These half-hour presentations included:
  o Deans of Academic Advising (February)
  o Programs Abroad Office (April)
  o University Academic Advisors Committee (UAAC) (May)
  o Coordinators of Student Activities (May)

• **Student Conduct Review Training** – In mid-October, Director of Student Conduct Ben White, Marshall College Assistant Dean Vicki Kerba Miller, and Director of Student Legal Services Jon Carlos Senour organized and delivered a two-day, five hour training to the six college judicial boards and their advisors. The training was broken into two sessions. New members attended an initial introductory session focusing on the review process, conduct in violation of community standards, and questioning skills and were joined by returning members at the second session where all members participated in a mock student conduct review. We also conducted make up trainings for members who could not attend these sessions and similar training in January for staff and student members of the Community Standards Board.
CAMPUS INVOLVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- UC San Diego Committee Involvement
  - Alcohol Issues and Trends Committee (Ben White, member)
  - Behavioral Threat Assessment Team (Ben White, member)
  - Bingham Scholarship Committee (Ben White, member)
  - Case Management Group (Ben White, member)
  - Clery Act Workgroup (Natania Trapp, member)
  - Coordinated Community Response Team (CCRT) (Ben White, member)
  - Demonstrations and Sensitive Issues Committee (Ben White, member)
  - Greek Awards Selection Committee (Ben White, member)
  - Medical Amnesty Committee (Ben White, member)
  - Revelle College Assistant Resident Dean Search Committee (Natania Trapp, member)
  - Sixth College Assistant Resident Dean Search Committee (Natania Trapp, member)
  - Student Conduct Standards Group (Ben White, chair)

- Other Campus Involvement
  - Director of Student Conduct Ben White and Administrative Coordinator Natania Trapp served as facilitators for the annual Equity Minded Education training for Resident Advisors in September.
  - The Office of Student Conduct, in collaboration with the Sexual Assault Resource Center, Student Legal Services, and Student Health Center, helped organize and operate the annual Sun God Detox Center in May.
  - Director of Student Conduct Ben White and Administrative Coordinator Natania Trapp served as judges for the annual UnOlympics competition held in September.

- Professional Development and Involvement
  - The Office of Student Conduct is a regular participant with the University of California Student Conduct Officers group.
    - Director of Student Conduct Ben White attended the Fall Student Conduct Officers meeting held in November at UC Davis.
    - The Spring Student Conduct Officers was held in April at UC Riverside. Attendees from UC San Diego included Ben White, Administrative Coordinator Natania Trapp, Graduate Assistant Kristin Galligan, Sixth College Assistant Resident Dean Tony Jakubisin, and Extension Student Affairs Manager Susan Kelly.
    - The student conduct directors of each campus also participate in monthly conference calls to discuss issues impacting campuses. Director of Student Conduct Ben White represents UC San Diego at these calls.
  - Director of Student Conduct Ben White attended the NASPA Law and Policy Conference, in December at Charlotte, NC.
  - Director of Student Conduct Ben White attended the Judicial Affairs Institute program at the Office of Violence against Women Campus Technical Training in February at Birmingham, AL.
  - Administrative Coordinator Natania Trapp attended Clery Act Training in December at Pasadena, CA.
  - The staff of the Office of Student Conduct are members of the following professional associations:
    - Association for Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA)
    - NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education
    - Education Law Association (ELA)
POLICY DEVELOPMENT

The Office of Student Conduct proposed a set of revisions to the UC San Diego Student Conduct Code to go into effect for Fall 2013. These changes were approved by Chancellor Khosla and will be officially implemented for the 2013-14 academic year on September 15th, 2013.

Some of the key proposed changes include:

- Reintroducing university representatives to the Student Conduct Review (e.g. formal hearing) process.
- Adding clarifying language to the grounds of interim suspensions and referencing the university's policy on Free Speech and Advocacy (PPM 510-IX).
- Clarifying the definition of hazing.
- Adding language allowing for multiple student respondents to participate in a Student Conduct Review when the alleged violations result from the same underlying incident.
- Adding language that all information to be presented at a Student Conduct Review must be submitted by the student respondent and the university representative within three days of the review.

The proposed changes were initially provided to the Student Conduct Standards Group for review and feedback was received from the greater campus community during Spring 2013 in an open campus comment period. The full summary of approved revisions is available on the Office of Student Conduct website.

Additionally, the Office of Student Conduct administered pilot program for the Responsible Action Protocol, originally launched during Sun God 2012. The Protocol provides “amnesty” for students who self-refer and are referred for assistance due to an alcohol-related medical emergency. Nearly 30 students qualified for the Protocol this past year, which keeps their incident out of the normal student conduct process. Instead, the student meets with his/her Dean, discusses the incident, and agrees to complete an alcohol related educational program in lieu of formal sanctions. If the student is not involved in further alcohol-related incidents, the incident will not become part of his/her student conduct record.

- Appointments to the Community Standards Board
  - Appointments made by College Judicial Board chair for Community Standards Board appointments are done in consultation with the Dean of Student Affairs or his/her designee (e.g. Conduct Board Coordinator/Assistant Dean). This change reflects the Dean’s ability to delegate their authority to a designee.
  - GSA asked to clarify that graduate student members of the Community Standards board are appointed by GSA in consultation with the Dean of Graduate Studies or his/her designee. The current version of the Code describes this as a joint appointment process. Additionally, Campus Counsel Dan Park noted that the same change should be made for medical and pharmacy student appointments.

- Assigning sanctions vs. imposing sanctions
  - Sanctions are assigned by Student Conduct Officers rather than imposed. There are numerous places where the term “imposed” is used rather than “assigned” and the approved changes help to make the term consistent throughout the document.

- Documents to be presented at the Review
  - In reviewing the Code, we noticed there is no language requiring that documents presented at the Student Conduct Review be submitted prior to the Review. In order to allow the Respondent, University Representative, and Board/Review Officer proper time to prepare, all documents should be submitted prior to the Review. The Conduct Board Coordinator or Director of Student Conduct would then ensure that all parties receive copies of submitted documents. With the latest revisions, note that the word “documents” replaces “information” as suggested by the Council of Provosts and Campus Counsel.
• **Hazing definition**
  o Director of Student Legal Services Jon Carlos Senour pointed out that the current standard of “hazing” is too narrow. While it covers registered student organizations and college student organizations, it does not appear to apply to intercollegiate athletics teams. The approved language is similar to the previous version of the Code and closes this potential loophole.

• **Interim suspensions**
  o The Associated Students Council and Office of Student Advocacy expressed concern about the potential applicability and use of Section XVI, Letter (A)(4) for interim suspensions in relation to expressive activity on campus. After including an initial proposal to link this section to PPM 510-IX, we received a suggestion from Associated Students AVP for Student Advocacy Alex Noronha to add language further defining the scope of this provision. We worked with Noronha to further revise the language to cover the types of situations envisioned by the provision while retaining the PPM 510-IX reference. Additionally, based on public feedback, we added language used in the previous version of the Code stating that students should be restricted only to the minimum extent necessary by interim actions.

• **Multiple students participating in a Review**
  o We saw at least three situations this past year where more than one student requested a Review in the same case. The Code is silent on how to handle such situations. In order to expedite such situations, we consulted with UCLA and UC Irvine as to how they handle such situations. We received feedback from several reviewers asking for more detailed procedures with these situations. The expanded language allows us to handle such situations and informs students that these types of Reviews may occur.

• **Student advocates for graduate students**
  o The Graduate Student Association requested to have graduate-level Student Advocates to assist graduate students with their cases.

• **Student conduct records relating to suspensions and dismissals**
  o Warren College Dean of Student Affairs Paul DeWine suggested clarifying that records of suspensions and dismissals are retained permanently. This language was already in Section XVII(D) of the current Code.

• **Student Conduct Reviews vs. Conduct Board Reviews**
  o Our process refers to “formal hearings” as “Student Conduct Reviews”, which are conducted by a Board or Review Officer. There is one section in the Code where the term is referenced as a “Conduct Board Review” rather than “Student Conduct Review”.

• **University Representatives**
  o Most institutions have a University staff member present information and witnesses supporting the alleged violations at a formal hearing or review. However, the Student Conduct Work Group decided to eliminate University Representatives under the new Code. Part of the reason for this change was to make the formal review process less adversarial and more educational.

  o However, Section XIII(A) and UCOP Student Conduct Policies state that the University has the burden of proof and that the University is responsible for presenting evidence and witnesses at the Review. Without a University Representative, the Conduct Board Coordinator has a greater responsibility to coordinate witnesses and collect information for the Board to consider at the Review. With this, there is no actual presentation of the University’s information and witnesses, which is not in alignment with Section XIII(A) and the UCOP policies.

  o In the past, University Representatives at UC San Diego are typically student affairs staff members and trained by the Office of Student Conduct. Their purpose is to present the information and witnesses supporting the allegations at the Review. They help to provide context for the alleged violations while allowing the Board or Review Officer to focus on the facts of the case.
Witness statements
  o We have had some issues with the validity of witness statements in past academic years. Due to that, we made it extremely difficult to introduce witness statements if the witnesses were not available at the Review. However, we have also seen that due to scheduling conflicts some witnesses are not able to participate and their information would be helpful to the Board or Review Officer. The below language allows witness statements but provides that the statement must be signed by the witness in the presence of an Office of Student Conduct staff member or a certified notary public.
STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- Overall Incident Statistics
  - During the 2012-13 academic year, we processed 1301 incident reports, a 16 percent increase from 2011-12 and a 37 percent increase from 2010-11. Thirty-five percent of all reports came from Resident Advisors or House Advisors, which is consistent with last year’s numbers.
  - Nearly 87 percent of all cases involved students from the same residential area or college. This has been consistent over the past three years. These cases are typically assigned to the student’s Dean’s Office or Residential Life Office.
    - The remaining 13 percent of cases were considered “multi-area” involving students from multiple residential areas or colleges. These cases are assigned by the Office of Student Conduct and most of these cases are resolved by the Director of Student Conduct or the Residential Life Office where the incident occurred.
  - During the course of the academic year, 2934 individual undergraduate students (2973 total including graduate and Extension students) were processed through the student conduct process. These students represent about 13 percent of the entire undergraduate population.
  - Similar to 2011-12, about 74 percent of all students referred to the student conduct process were involved in only one incident, equating to a repeat incident rate of 25 percent.
  - The overall recidivism rate decreased by a percentage point this past year (16.6% to 15.7%) but alcohol recidivism increased by about a half of a percentage point (10.9% to 11.5%).

Cases, students, and individuals (2010-11 to 2012-13)
College and Residential Populations
  
  For each of the six undergraduate colleges, we saw about 12 percent of their student populations.
  
  The six undergraduate colleges have seen increased numbers of students involved with student conduct incidents. For example, the percent of Marshall students documented for alleged Student Conduct Code violations increased from around six percent in 2010-11 to 12 percent in 2012-13.

  However, we saw 19 percent of students from Revelle, which is partly explained by a high number of documentations for potential Housing and Residential Life Policy violations at the end of Fall and Winter quarters.

We saw about 30 percent of all on-campus residential students, a five percent increase from 2011-12 and a 10 percent increase from 2010-11.
Gender

- During the 2012-13 academic year, about 62 percent of students referred to the student conduct process were male. This was a four percent decrease from 2011-12 and a six percent decrease from 2010-11. Similarly, the percentage of female students referred to the process rose from 31.9 percent in 2010-11 to 37.6 percent in 2012-13.

- Interestingly, the percentage of male and female undergraduate students is about even each year. However, the split through the student conduct process is two males for every female.

- Additionally, we saw nearly 17 percent of the male undergraduate population and about nine and a half percent of female undergraduate population. Both percentages have increased between two and four percentage points each year.
• **Incident Location and Month of Incident**
  o About 80 percent of all incidents occurred in campus residential areas, with the Village, Revelle, and Warren being the most frequent locations. Over the past three years, about 20 percent of all incidents occurred in the "main campus" area, which includes the UC San Diego Bookstore, Sun God Detox, and campus roadways.

![Incident Location and Month of Incident](chart)

- Over the past three years, the most common months for incidents are May and October. One of the big reasons is there are several campus events during these months, including the Sun God Festival.

![Incident Location and Month of Incident](chart)
Administrative Resolutions
- Of the 4044 students participating in the student conduct process, 99.5 percent had their incident resolved without a formal Student Conduct Review.
- Students who had their incident resolved without a Student Conduct Review either received a Notice of Inappropriate Conduct or met with a Student Conduct Officer in an Administrative Resolution Meeting.
- This past year, 68.3 percent of students processed had their cases resolved through a meeting with a Student Conduct Officer, down 5.4 percent from 2011-12 and 23.1 percent from 2010-11.
  - The reason for the lower percentage of incidents handled through an Administrative Resolution meeting is that more incidents are low-level in seriousness (e.g. smoking, noise, etc.) and the formal process is not necessary to resolve them.
  - The Office of Student Conduct has also attempted to identify lower level cases as they are processed and send a Notice of Inappropriate Conduct for these cases. This allows the colleges and residential areas to focus on incidents necessitating a direct resolution.
Students who resolved their incident through the Administrative Resolution process, accepted responsibility for at least one Student Conduct Code violation in 73.1 percent of meetings. In 26.2 percent of meetings, the Student Conduct Officer dismissed the alleged violations because the student was not responsible or there was a lack of evidence. Less than one percent of students who met with a Student Conduct Officer in an Administrative Resolution meeting had their case ultimately resolved through a Student Conduct Review.
Violations

- About 83 percent of all Student Conduct Code violations during the 2012-13 academic year involved the Housing and Residential Life Policies (Section VII, Letter F). This comes as no surprise given that 76.2 of all incidents occurred within residential areas.

- Interestingly, the percentage of violations involving Housing and Residential Life Policies increased 6.1 percent from 2011-12 and 8 percent from 2010-11. We anticipate an additional increase this coming academic year with an increased number of residential students living three to a room.

- More than half of all violations involve alcohol-related policies, up five percent from a year ago. The other common violations involved Housing and Residential Life Policy violations, including Noise/Quiet Hours, Guest/Visitor Behavior, and Smoking. With the new Smoke-Free Policy going into effect this academic year, we will be monitoring whether there will be a significant increase in smoking-related cases.

- Interestingly, we do not see a significant number of controlled substance-related cases. About 2.5 percent of all violations involve controlled substances. However, over the past two academic years, we have dismissed two students for distribution of controlled substances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Common Violations</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% VIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Policies (Res Life Policies &amp; Univ Alc Policy)</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>4982</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise/Quiet Hours</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest/Visitor Behavior</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Comply</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/Controlled Substances</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sanctions

- The most common sanction assigned to students accepting responsibility or found responsible for violating the Student Conduct Code was a formal warning. Interestingly, the number of formal warnings increased by nearly 400 from the previous year. Part of this reason is that Student Conduct Officers were advised to use this as a baseline sanction for a wide-range of cases and that it took the place of residential probation (eliminated as a sanction in the Revised Student Conduct Code).

- The Ethics Workshop has seen a steady increase of referrals for students over the past three years. Ninety seven students were referred to the workshop in 2012-13, which is two and a half times more students than were referred in 2011-12. Typically, students involved in theft cases or who have engaged in poor decision making are referred to the workshop.

- Fourteen students were suspended for at least one quarter and one student was dismissed from the University. Grounds for suspension and/or dismissal typically include distributing controlled substances, engaging in a physical altercation, violating probationary status, and committing a significant number of violations. Additionally, suspensions increased by four from 2011-12 and dismissals decreased by one.

- Given that alcohol-related cases are the most common case type seen in the student conduct process, the number of students referred to alcohol education programs/modules increased in 2012-13. Nearly double the number of students (307 from 163) were assigned to complete the Alcohol 101 Plus online intervention module while double the number of students (39 from 21) were assigned to complete the ProSAFE program offered through CAPS. However, the number of students referred to the CARRS program, conducted by the Student Health Center, decreased by about 40 from 2011-12, likely due in part to the increased use of the other alcohol education options.
### Most Common Sanctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% VIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Warning</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection Paper</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARRS Programs</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Student Conduct Reviews**
  - During the 2012-13 academic year, we conducted 19 Student Conduct Reviews. This is an increase of three from 2011-12 and an increase of 11 from 2010-11.
  - As illustrated below, 78.9 percent of students participating in a Student Conduct Review were found responsible for at least one alleged violation. Additionally, the most common case types advanced to reviews were for drugs, alcohol, and physical assault/battery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT CONDUCT REVIEWS</th>
<th>Resp</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Officers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Judicial Boards</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Standards Board</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Appeals**
  - We saw a major increase in the number of sanction reduction requests and appeals this year. We had a combined seven appeals/sanction reduction requests in the previous two years combined, in comparison to a total of 29 this year. We believe the increase is attributable to the implementation of the Revised Student Conduct Code and Student Conduct Officers informing students about their appeals rights during Administrative Resolution Meetings.
  - The Council of Provosts (COP) handles sanction reduction requests and appeals for undergraduate students. Of the 29 requests to COP this year, 21 involved sanction reduction requests while eight were appeals from Student Conduct Reviews. COP upheld or modified all 29 appeal requests.
  - Because most of the requests asked to have sanctions reduced, the most common ground of appeal seen by COP was that the "sanction was grossly disproportionate to the offense". The most common case types involved physical assault/battery, alcohol, disruptive behavior, and weapons.

- **Sun God Detox Center**
  - The Office of Student Conduct, in partnership with the Sexual Assault Resource Center, Student Legal Services, and the Student Health Center, once again co-organized and managed the Sun God Detox Center during the annual Sun God Festival. The center is designed to provide a safe place for festival participants (primarily UC San Diego students) who self-report or are observed by University officials to have an alcohol-related medical emergency.
  - The Detox Center had 95 people admitted this year, a 20% percent increase over 10-11 and 11-12.
  - Over the past three years, about a third of all people admitted to Detox are typically non-affiliates. This year, 31% of people admitted to Detox were non-affiliates.
  - The Detox Center typically provides service for a greater percentage of non-residential students. The three year average is 65% but in 10-11 and 12-13 there was a 70/30 split between residential students and non-residential students. A reason for this is that many of the students are upper-class. About 60 percent of the UCSD student who are admitted to detox are of fourth year status or greater.
Medical transports from detox increased in 2012-13. There were seven students who were checked in-going to be checked in who had to be medically transported. This is more than the last two years combined.

- **Sun God Weekend**
  - The overall number of incidents during Sun God weekend has nearly doubled over the past three years. This year we had 176 incidents reported in comparison to 144 in 11-12 and 96 in 12-13.
  - About 40 percent of all Sun God incidents involve the student being admitted to our on-campus detox center. Around 13 percent of all academic year incidents occur during Sun God weekend.
  - About 86 percent of all Sun God incidents involve alcohol.
  - Controlled substances are normally involved with about 10 percent of all Sun God weekend incidents. However, there was a major spike in drug activity last year with 18 percent of all SG incidents involving controlled substances.
  - Police Officers are involved in about 47% of all Sun God incidents. This is a significant increase over the normal level of police involvement and directly relates to the detox center.
  - There are typically more documentations at Marshall, Revelle, Warren, and Muir. However, the professional staff in each residential area have different strategies for responding and documenting incidents.
ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Our annual assessment project is linked to the UC San Diego campus-wide non-academic student conduct process, which is centrally coordinated by the Office of Student Conduct.

The purpose of the assessment project was to assess student learning through the student conduct process. It was designed to measure the impact of their experience being documented for violating the Student Conduct Code and what they learned by going through the process. The assessment also was designed to analyze the effectiveness of our Student Conduct Officers and whether students feel they were treated fairly during their student conduct experience.

The assessment was included in the resolution letters for all students participating in Administrative Resolution meetings through the UC San Diego Non-Academic Student Conduct Process. During the 2012-13 academic year, 922 students responded to the assessment, which represents about 34% of all students (2640) who received resolution letters.

We discovered from the assessment that about three fifths of the respondents said they learned about the Student Conduct Code prior to starting classes at UC San Diego, either through materials in their admissions packet or a new student orientation/transfer program. What this data shows is that a majority of respondents know about the Code prior to arriving on campus and before the incident occurred.

Even with a majority of the respondents stating they knew about the Code prior to arriving on campus, only 44 percent of the respondents "strongly agreed" or 'agreed' that if they were more aware of the Student Conduct Code, the incident would not have occurred. An additional 30 percent of respondents said they 'neither agreed nor disagreed' with the statement. These results run counter to widely-held assumptions that if students knew more about the relevant policies, they would have acted differently. Furthermore, 20 percent of the respondents to this question submitted comments about why they 'disagreed' with this statement, including students who said:

- "Alcohol is ubiquitous and unavoidable. In order for a minor to avoid a situation in which he is surrounded by alcohol he must necessarily alienate himself from his peers."
- "I knew the ramifications that my actions would instill upon me, but I mistimed and misjudged my actions. It was entirely my fault, as I was completely aware of the consequences."
- "I was aware that my activities did violate the code, but I did not properly evaluate the risks of violating them."
- "Most students are aware of the Student Conduct Code, but they decide to drink anyways if it is a safe atmosphere and they are sure they won't get caught."
- "The Student Conduct Code isn’t exactly on my mind every time I make a decision. In my opinion, it actually doesn’t have anything to do with any decision that a student makes, unless it’s about cheating."

As stated above, these statements do not support the theory that students are not aware of the Student Conduct Code and basic consequences when they are involved in an incident. Additionally, the statements and data show that, even if they knew about the Code, such knowledge would not have changed their behavioral choices.

One area that we see potential for significant improvement is the timeliness of the process. Only 72 percent of respondents "strongly agreed" or 'agreed' that they were notified of their potential violations soon after the incident. Similarly, about 75 percent of respondents "strongly agreed" or 'agreed' that once they were notified of the alleged violations, their resolution meeting took place within 10 academic days. There are many variables with administering the student conduct process, especially with the submission of reports. Sometimes, it takes a week or two after an incident to get a meeting letter out to a student because the accompanying police report has yet to arrive. Other times, the delay is due to issues with administrative backlog. We hope to alleviate this issue during the upcoming year by providing more administrative assistance support to the college and residential life offices.
We used to receive frequent anecdotal information from students and other members of the campus community that the student conduct process was unfair and Student Conduct Officers were "out to get" them. Happily, the data in this assessment showed that, for the vast majority of situations, this is no longer true. The data includes:

- Nearly 90 percent of respondents 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' that they were able to explain their side of the issue during the resolution meeting.
- Eighty-seven percent of respondents 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' they were treated with respect by the Student Conduct Officer throughout the process.
- Eighty-six percent of respondents 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' that they were provided a clear and understandable explanation of the alleged violations during their resolution meeting.
- Eighty-three percent of respondents 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' that the Student Conduct Officer demonstrated fairness in making the decision in the case.

However, we were concerned with a lower rate of agreement for whether students were informed of their appeal rights during the resolution meeting. Seventy-nine percent of respondents 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' they were informed of their appeal rights. Interestingly, this number increased by four percent after we reminded Student Conduct Officers in January to inform students about their appeal rights. Given the importance for students to know their rights, especially for requesting a reduction in sanctions, we will continue to emphasize this for the upcoming academic year.

One of our key goals is for students to learn more about the importance of community standards. Nearly 85 percent of respondents 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' that the student conduct process helped them learn about the importance of community standards. Additionally, 75 percent of respondents stated that as a result of participating in the process, they changed their behavior positively. While this number is lower than the community standards answer, it is important to note that only two percent of respondents 'strongly disagreed' or 'disagreed' with this answer (Note that nearly 20 percent answered either 'neither agree' nor 'disagree' or 'not applicable').

Finally, we asked respondents “Specifically, what have you learned while going through the process”. Nearly 700 respondents (75.9%) responded to this question, which provided us with additional data, albeit anecdotal to describe what students learned from the process. Responses of what students learned included:

- “Be careful with your actions. Other people can interpret your actions in unpredictable ways.”
- “Honestly, I can’t say much has changed before and after the process. I consider myself a good person. I just did something I knew wasn’t allowed and got in trouble. I took the risk, but seeing as there was no malice in any of our actions, I don’t think this is a life-changing experience.”
- “I learned that the rules are established for a purpose in mind. They are not intended to hamper my well-being but rather, promote it.”
- “One night of bad decisions can lead to a greater amount of stress, worry, and consequences.”
- “While bitter for having been mischaracterized by the RSO, I actually did gain a greater appreciation for the effects alcohol consumption can have on the body, the consequences of being caught with alcohol when under 21, and the benevolence the university displays by allowing for students to go through this process.”

The majority of comments exhibited a positive response in what was learned from the process. There were comments criticizing the timeliness of the process, the way in which staff or RAs handled certain parts of the process, and the process itself. These comments are a good reminder that the student conduct process is predicated on fairness and the nature of interactions students have with staff or RAs during the process impacts the student’s perception of the process.