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Dear UC San Diego community members,

Supporting the university’s mission and distinctive college system, the Office of Student Conduct provides leadership for the student conduct process through its central coordinating, training, and advising role. We adhere to UCSD’s Principles of Community and work to administer a thorough, transparent, and fair student conduct process that encourages participation by the campus community while holding students accountable for their actions.

This annual report describes the depth and breadth of our involvement in the campus community. Many people believe that a student conduct office merely enforces and upholds campus policies. However, a 21st century student conduct office is involved in a wide range of activities. These activities range from resolving student conduct cases to assisting with students of concern to serving on University-wide committees. Far from being pigeon-holed as the “rules enforcer”, we are a central part of the overall student safety net at UC San Diego.

An important purpose of this report is to tell the story of our student conduct process. The statistical and assessment summaries provide detailed narratives about the impact our process has on UC San Diego students. They also debunk the traditional myths about our process, including that “everyone gets into trouble” and “no one is held accountable.” In reading the report, you’ll see that we try to strike a delicate balance between educating students about their behavior while holding them accountable when they violate the Student Conduct Code.

This report also describes the key role our office plays with policy development; specifically, the annual updates to the Student Conduct Code. Rather than update our policies only when mandated by changes to University of California system-wide policies, federal or state legislation, or overall changes in case law, we make revisions annually to stay in line with best practices and address issues we’ve seen during the course of the academic year. This helps to maintain an up-to-date and effective Code, thereby preventing systematic breakdown of key procedures and structures.

Finally, an increasingly important area of emphasis for our office is coordinating and managing sex offense cases (e.g. sexual assault, stalking, dating violence, domestic violence). We participate in weekly case management meetings with the Sexual Assault & Violence Prevention Resource Center, the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination, and the UC San Diego Police Department to make sure these cases receive the necessary attention they deserve. We also work with these offices to train staff and student members of our Sex Offense Hearing Panel. Additionally, I am currently serving as the student conduct work group lead for President Napolitano’s System wide Task Force on Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault to help develop system wide best practices in this area.

Thank you for taking the time to read this report. We look forward to the beginning of another academic year here at UC San Diego.

Sincerely,

Ben White
Director of Student Conduct
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 (fourth year at UC San Diego)
• Natania Trapp, Student Conduct Coordinator (seventh year at UC San Diego, first in position)
• Caitlin Meagher, Administrative Assistant (second year at UC San Diego, first in position)

STUDENT STAFF

• Terra Dominguez, Student Assistant
• Brittany Norris, Graduate Assistant
• Tania Romero, Student Assistant
TRAININGS, OUTREACH, AND EDUCATION

- **Administrative Resolution Training** – Director of Student Conduct Ben White and Revelle Resident Dean Malik Ismail conducted a two and a half hour comprehensive training for new Student Conduct Officers in October. The training focused on conducting Administrative Resolution meetings, sanctioning, and student records.

- **All-Campus Resident Advisor/House Advisor training** – Resident Advisors and House Advisors participated in a one hour fifteen minute training session in September with Office of Student Conduct staff. Director of Student Conduct Ben White led returning RAs/HAs in a session focused on advanced conduct issues and culminating in the “Battle of the RA/HA Stars”. Student Conduct Coordinator Natania Trapp trained new RAs/HAs on basic student conduct topics, including roles and expectations, report writing basics, and developing a greater understanding of the student conduct process.

- **Chinese Scholars presentation** – Director of Student Conduct Ben White delivered his annual presentation to the visiting Chinese Scholars in November. White discussed the UC San Diego Student Conduct process, key issues in student conduct, and answered questions from participants about the differences of processes between the United States and China.

- **Community Standards Board Training** – Director of Student Conduct Ben White and Sixth Assistant Resident Dean Tony Jakubisin (lead CSB chair) trained new Community Standards Board members on the Student Conduct Review process. Topics included a values clarification exercise, the Student Conduct Review process, the role of the Community Standards Board, and questioning strategies. Community Standards Board members also participated in a joint mock Student Conduct Review with University Representatives in February.

- **Judicial Board Advisors training** – Director of Student Conduct Ben White conducted a follow-up training with the six college judicial board advisors in December. Topics during the meeting included the role of advisors, scheduling logistics, multiple student reviews, and sanction recommendations.

- **“Only My Friends Could See – Legal and Practical Implications of Online Social Networking” presentation** – Director of Student Conduct Ben White and Lana Talampas from the Sexual Assault & Violence Prevention Resource Center (SARC) conducted a presentation geared toward students regarding the legal and practical implications of using online social networking sites. They presented to students through the Center for Student Involvement’s “I-Lead” program in January.

- **Quarterly Workshops** – The Office of Student Conduct held two quarterly workshops during the academic year to provide professional development opportunities for Student Conduct Officers and communicate updates about policies, procedures, techniques, and approaches. This year’s topics included:
  - “Statistics and Assessment” (November) – This workshop focused on discussing the 2012-13 student conduct statistics and assessment results with Student Conduct Officers and related staff. Key points of emphasis and reminders were communicated and discussed with attendees.
  - “Getting Ready for Sun God” (May) – This workshop, led by Director of Student Conduct Ben White focused on key topics relating to the Sun God Festival and featured several guest speakers. ERC Resident Dean Rey Guerrero discussed applicable guest and hosting policies, Muir Dean of Student Affairs Patty Mahaffey explained the Responsible Action Protocol, and SARC Assistant Director Jessica Heredia provided information about the Floaties program. White also discussed sanctioning (festival venue exclusions, sanctions for graduating seniors, off-campus jurisdiction, and detox sanctions) and other points of emphasis.

- **Sex Offense Hearing Panel Training** – The Office of Student Conduct, SARC, the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD), and the UC San Diego Police Department jointly trained the members of the Sex Offense Hearing Panel on key issues related to sex offense cases. Topics included: review of
relevant policies and definitions, power dynamics and perceptions, counterintuitive victim behavior, roles and responsibilities, review procedures, and sanctioning.

- **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 deliver presentations to staff groups who interact with the student conduct process. This year’s presentations included sessions with the Chancellor’s Scholars and Global Seminars faculty.

- **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 three 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. Then each judicial board conducted a 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 in January.

- **University Representative Training** – Director of Student Conduct Ben White and Muir Assistant Dean Ann Hawthorne trained new University Representatives on the Student Conduct Review process. Topics included a values clarification exercise, the Student Conduct Review process, the role of the University Representative, and questioning strategies. University Representatives also participated in a joint mock Student Conduct Review with Community Standards Board members in February.

- **Warren Residents presentation** – A Warren College Resident Advisor invited Director of Student Conduct Ben White to present at a “Know Your Rights Presentation” for Warren College residents. Director of Student Legal Services Jon Carlos Senour and A.S. Associated Vice President for Student Advocacy Alex Noronha joined White at the presentation. The presenters discussed basic student rights, student rights during contact with University and public officials, and rights within the student conduct process.
CAMPUS INVOLVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- **UC San Diego Committee Involvement**
  - Alcohol Issues and Trends Committee (Ben White, member)
  - Associate Ombudsperson Search Committee (Ben White, member)
  - Behavioral Threat Assessment Team (Ben White and Natania Trapp members)
  - Bingham Scholarship Committee (Ben White, member)
  - Case Management Group (Ben White, Natania Trapp members)
  - Clery Act Workgroup (Natania Trapp, member)
  - Coordinated Community Response Team (CCRT) (Ben White, member)
  - Demonstrations and Sensitive Issues Committee (Ben White, member)
  - ERC Executive Assistant to the Dean Search Committee (Natania Trapp, member)
  - Greek Advisor Search Committee (Ben White, member)
  - Medical Amnesty Committee (Ben White, member)
  - Sports Facilities Advisory Board (Caitlin Meagher, member)
  - Student Conduct Standards Group (Ben White, chair)
  - Sun God Festival Task Force (Ben White, member; chair of Conduct & Discipline sub-group)
  - VAWA Implementation Group (Ben White, member)
  - Warren Dean of Student Affairs Search Committee (Ben White, member)

- **Other Campus Involvement**
  - 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.

  - Student Conduct Coordinator Natania Trapp served as judges for the annual UnOlympics competition held in September.

  - The Office of Student Conduct joined the Office of the Vice Chancellor – Student Affairs in sponsoring and serving lunch the International Center “I-Café” in February (month).

- **University of California System-Wide 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 and Student Conduct Coordinator Natania Trapp attended the Fall Student Conduct Officers meeting held in November at UC Berkeley.
    - The Office of Student Conduct hosted Spring Student Conduct Officers at the 15th Floor of the Village Tower. Attendees from UC San Diego included White, Trapp, Graduate Assistant Brittany Norris, Sixth College Assistant Resident Dean Tony Jakubisin, Village Assistant Resident Dean Jeff Hill, and Revelle Dean of Student Affairs Sherry Mallory.
    - The student conduct directors of each campus also participate in monthly conference calls to discuss issues impacting campuses. White represents UC San Diego at these calls.

  - Director of Student Conduct Ben White participated in a sexual violence and sexual assault policy briefing with colleagues from campus Title IX, Police, and Student Conduct offices for University of California President Janet Napolitano in May at the UCOP offices in Oakland.

  - Director of Student Conduct Ben White served as the lead for the Student Conduct Workgroup as part of the President’s Task Force on Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault.

- **Professional Development and Involvement**
  - The Office of Student Conduct held the inaugural San Diego Student Conduct Officers meeting in July. This meeting brings together the student conduct offices of San Diego-area institutions to discuss student conduct issues and engage in professional development. Attendees from UCSD included Ben White, Natania Trapp, Brittany Norris, and Caitlin Meagher.
Joining UCSD in this newly formed group were the University of San Diego, San Diego State University, Point Loma Nazarene University, and, Grossmont & Cuyamaca Community Colleges. The group agreed to meet twice a year with the next meeting to be held in January 2015 at the University of San Diego.

- Director of Student Conduct Ben White participated as a member of an ASCA/ACPA Joint Sanctioning Task Force. This group, consisting of ten student conduct officers from campuses around the country, met monthly via conference call to discuss development of sanctioning best practices.

- Director of Student Conduct Ben White attended the UCOP Behavioral Threat Management Workshop in April at the Village Tower. Philip Van Saun, a national expert in behavioral threat management practices, led the workshop and discussed best practices for handling behavioral threats and students of concern.

- Student Conduct Coordinator Natania Trapp and Graduate Assistant Brittany Norris attended the NASPA Alcohol and Other Drugs Conference in January at San Diego, CA.

- Student Conduct Coordinator Natania Trapp attended the Gehring Institute in July at the University of Louisville. Sponsored by the Association for Student Conduct Administration, the institute is the premier training program for student conduct professionals.

- 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)
  - National Association of Clery Compliance Officers and Professionals (NACCOP)
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 2014. These changes were approved by Chancellor Khosla and will be officially implemented for the 2014-15 academic year on September 25th, 2014.

Some of the key proposed changes included:

- Organizing and managing all Student Conduct Reviews, including those conducted by college judicial boards, through the Office of Student Conduct.
- Adding domestic violence, dating violence, and a revised stalking standard to the Conduct in Violation of Community Standards.
- Reducing the period of maintaining suspension records of suspensions from permanent to 7 years.
- Clarifying the sanctioning process for students found responsible by a Conduct Board or Review Officer at a Student Conduct Review.

The proposed changes were initially reviewed and discussed by the Student Conduct Standards Group for review. Feedback was received from the greater campus community during Spring 2014 in an open campus comment period. The full summary of approved revisions is available on the Office of Student Conduct website.

Additionally, the Responsible Action Protocol, originally launched during Sun God 2012, was approved as a permanent campus policy by Chancellor Khosla in March 2014. The Protocol provides “amnesty” for students who self-refer and are referred for assistance due to an alcohol-related medical emergency. Forty six 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 education 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.

- Assistant Vice Chancellor – Student Life or their designee
  - While the Assistant Vice Chancellor – Student Life has primary responsibility handling issues relating to Student Organization, many related administrative tasks have been delegated to Center for Student Involvement staff. There are numerous places where there is no designation that the Director of Student Conduct’s designee may handle specific tasks. The proposed changes help to make this consistent throughout the document.

- Associate Dean of Admissions and Student Affairs, School of Medicine
  - The School of Medicine clarified that all reports should be routed through the Associate Dean of Admissions and Student Affairs rather than the Director of Student Life for Medical Education.

- Conduct Board Advisor
  - With the Office of Student Conduct administering and coordinating all Student Conduct Reviews, the staff member assisting the Conduct Board or Review Officer with the Review has become more of an advisor than a coordinator. The proposed changes reflect this change.

- Conduct Board Coordinator or Director of Student Conduct
  - By centralizing the administration of all Student Conduct Reviews, the Director of Student Conduct or their designee has assumed many functions handled by the Conduct Board Coordinator (Conduct Board Advisor) for reviews by college judicial boards. The proposed changes reflect this change throughout the document.

- Conduct in Violation of Community Standards
  - The University of California Office of the President (UCOP) is implementing required changes to the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline that we need to incorporate into the Code. Most of these changes are due to the federal government's requirements through the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (e.g. domestic violence, dating violence). Additionally, after considerable discussion and campus comment, UCOP has revised the stalking standard of conduct. This new standard is reflected in the proposed revisions.
Due to changes mandated by the Violence Against Women Act, all cases involving sex offenses are to be handled under the UC San Diego Interim Policy for Reporting and Responding to Sex Offenses. This allows these cases to be investigated and initially managed by the Office for the Prevention for Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD). Additionally, these cases will be resolved under the UC San Diego Hearing Procedures for Alleged Sex Offenses, Harassment, and Discrimination Violations.

The Student Conduct Standards Group also suggested to make “conduct that threatens the health or safety of any person” a separate standard of conduct. Members pointed out that this standard does not belong with the types of conduct described in the “physical abuse” standard and would be more understandable as a separate standard.

Additionally, UCOP added language to the system-wide student conduct policy stating that the standards will not be used to infringe upon First Amendment rights. We added this language to mirror the system-wide policy.

- **Conflicts of interest**
  - In reviewing the Code, we noticed that there was no process for notifying participants of situations when a Board member, Conduct Board Advisor, or Review Officer disqualifies themselves from a Review for a conflict of interest. The proposed change adds in language covering this type of situation.

- **Director of Student Conduct or their designee**
  - While the Director of Student Conduct has primary responsibility for administering the Code, many administrative tasks have been delegated to staff from the Office of Student Conduct. There are numerous places where there is no designation that the Director of Student Conduct’s designee may handle specific tasks the proposed changes help to make this consistent throughout the document.

- **Gender neutral pronouns**
  - We received feedback and a request to change pronouns used in the Code to gender neutral. For example, instead of “Director of Student Conduct or his/her designee”, it would be “Director of Student Conduct or their designee”. Per the request and a conversation with Shaun Travers from the LGBT Resource Center, this change would help to make a more inclusive and accessible Code for students, staff and faculty who do not identify with a specific gender.

- **Grounds for appeal**
  - The Council of Provosts asked to clarify the grounds of appeal. The proposed change clarifies that the first ground of appeal relates to the decisions of responsibility for the violations made by the Board in its report.

- **“Multi-area” Reviews**
  - Currently, the Code has no provision for which Board(s) handle Reviews involving respondents from more than one college or residential area. In the 2008-12 version of the Code, these were handled by the Campus-wide Judicial Board. Keeping with this tradition, we propose to have these “multi-area” reviews heard by the Community Standards Board.

- **Questions during the Review**
  - We received some feedback to clarify the roles of Review participants in regards to asking questions in the Review. The proposed language makes it clear that the Board or Review Officer and Respondent may ask questions of witnesses presented by the University Representative. It also clarifies that the University Representative may ask questions of the Respondent and his/her witnesses.

- **Record retention period for suspensions**
  - The Council of Deans of Student Affairs recommended that student conduct records relating to suspensions are kept for seven years from the time of the incident rather than permanently. Given that most suspensions are less than one quarter (e.g. one academic quarter) and are typically for violations
in multiple cases, the SCSG felt that keeping these records permanently would be a detriment to a student in the future. The change removes suspensions from the language below.

- **Sanction recommendations**
  - The proposed revisions clarify that if a respondent does not appear at a Review, the Board or Review Officer will determine non-binding advisory sanction recommendations based off the information in its possession. The current Code states that the Board or Review Officer may assign sanctions, which is not congruent with the sanctioning process.
  - We clarified the process of assigning sanctions after a Student Conduct Review. There has been lack of clarity as to whether the original Student Conduct Officer has the discretion to vary his/her final sanctions from the Board/Review Officer’s recommendations. The intent of the section, when written, was to allow for the original Student Conduct Officer consider but not be bound to the sanction recommendations made by the Board or Review Officer. The proposed changes codify this intent and describe the resources the Student Conduct Officer should access in assigning sanctions after a Review.
  - We have also clarified that the Student Conduct Officer has the discretion to determine whether a suspension or dismissal should be assigned, even if the Board or Review Officer does not recommend these sanctions. If this occurs, the Student Conduct Officer is required to consult with the Council of Deans of Student Affairs, who will make the final decision as to sanctions.
  - Additionally, this section has been revised regarding sanctioning for students from the School of Medicine and Skaggs School of Pharmacy. These students have been subject to sanctions via the student conduct process AND their school-specific professional committees. The revisions eliminate this “double sanctioning” and invest final sanctioning authority with the school-specific professional committees.

- **Student Conduct Review organization**
  - Traditionally, Student Conduct Reviews are organized by either the Office of Student Conduct (Community Standards Board, Review Officers) or the respective Dean of Student Affairs office (College Judicial Boards). To create greater consistency in the organization and administration of reviews, this function was transferred to the Office of Student Conduct for all reviews during the current academic year. The proposed changes in this area make this transfer permanent. However, each college judicial board still functions in its normal manner with a college staff member, chosen by the Dean, as its advisor. The net change is that the Office of Student Conduct administers and organizes the Review rather than the Dean’s Office.

- **Student Conduct Review referrals**
  - We clarified that when a respondent does not accept responsibility for one or more alleged violations and the allegations are not dismissed, the Student Conduct Officer refers the matter to the Office of Student Conduct for a Student Conduct Review. Additionally, we clarified that when the Student Conduct Officer determines there is not a Preponderance of the Evidence to sustain all alleged violations, the case will be dismissed.

- **Student Conduct Reviews during the summer**
  - Each year there are a couple of Student Conduct Reviews to schedule after the end of the academic year. Typically, we are not able to provide students with a Conduct Board to review their case because most student members are away from campus during the summer. This creates a several month lag period extending the time the case is open while potentially compromising the appearance of key witnesses. The proposed revision allows the Community Standards Board to handle reviews during the summer. It also provides the Director of Student Conduct or their designee the opportunity to request temporary appointees if enough regular appointees are not available for comprise a review.
Student Conduct Reviews vs. Conduct Board Reviews

- Our process refers to “formal hearings” as “Student Conduct Reviews”, which are conducted by a Board or Review Officer. There are three sections in the Code where the term is referenced as a “Conduct Board Review” rather than “Student Conduct Review”.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- Overall Incident Statistics
  - During the 2013-14 academic year, we processed 1314 incident reports, a similar number to 2012-13 (1301). Thirty-two percent of all reports came from Resident Advisors or House Advisors, which is similar to the previous year’s numbers.

  - Nearly 90 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 10 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 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, 2959 individual undergraduate students (2994 total including graduate and professional students) were processed through the student conduct process. These students represent 12.4 percent of the entire undergraduate population.

  - About 79 percent of all students referred to the student conduct process were involved in only one incident, equating to a repeat incident rate of 21 percent. The number of student who were involved in only one incident increased by five percentage points from 2012-13.

  - The overall recidivism rate decreased by almost two percentage points this past year (15.7% to 14.0%) and alcohol recidivism decreased by almost three percentage points (11.5% to 8.7%).
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• **College and Residential Populations**
  o For each of the six undergraduate colleges, we saw about 12 percent of their student populations.
  
  o The six undergraduate colleges had seen increased numbers of students involved with student conduct incidents over the past three years. However, we saw similar numbers of students in 2013-14 from each college as we did in 2012-13.
  
  o The larger percentage of students from Revelle is partly explained by a higher number of documentations for potential Housing and Residential Life Policy violations at the end of each quarter.

![Percentage of students per college documented (2010-11 to 2013-14)](image1)

  o We saw about 26.4 percent of all on-campus residential students, a three and a half percentage point decrease from 2013-14. However, the percentage of residents is still about five to six percentage points above the levels of 2010-11 and 2011-12. Interestingly, there were about 2700 more residents in 2013-14 than in 2010-11 and many students are now living three to a room.

![Percentage of residents documented (2010-11 to 2013-14)](image2)
• Gender
  o During the 2013-14 academic year, 61 percent of students referred to the student conduct process were male. This similar to 2012-13 but a four percentage point decrease from 2011-12 and a six percentage point decrease from 2010-11. The percentage of female students referred to the process has risen from 31.9 percent in 2010-11 to 38.9 percent in 2013-14.
  
  o Interestingly, the percentage of male and female undergraduate students is about even each year. However, the split through the student conduct process is typically two males for every female.
  
  o Additionally, we saw 16 percent of the male undergraduate population and about nine percent of female undergraduate population. Both percentages were similar to 2012-13 but have increased from the levels seen four years ago.
Incident Location and Month of Incident
- About 70 percent of all incidents occurred in campus residential areas, with Revelle, the Village, and Warren being the most frequent locations. Most of the remaining incidents occurred in the “main campus” area, which includes the UC San Diego Bookstore, Sun God Detox, parking lots, and campus roadways.

Over the past four 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.

Number of incidents per year by campus area (2010-11 to 2013-14)

Number of incidents per month (2010-11 to 2013-14)
**Administrative Resolutions**

- Of the 3884 total 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, 72.7 percent of students processed had their cases resolved through a meeting with a Student Conduct Officer, up four and a half percentage points from 2012-13.
  - The reason why not all incidents are handled through an Administrative Resolution meeting is that many 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 sends a Notice of Inappropriate Conduct for most of the lower level 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 68.2 percent of meetings. In 31.8 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 75 percent of all Student Conduct Code violations during the 2013-14 academic year involved the Housing and Residential Life Policies (Section VII, Letter F). This comes as no surprise given that 70 percent of all incidents occur within campus residential areas.

- Interestingly, the percentage of violations involving Housing and Residential Life Policies decreased eight percentage points from 2012-13. Much of this decrease occurred due to increased number of violations in main campus areas. There were increased numbers of alcohol and controlled substance contacts in parking lots and roadways, theft from the UCSD Bookstore and campus stores/eateries, failure to comply and obstruction with University officials (e.g. police officers), and violation of probationary statuses.

- The number of violations involving alcohol-related policies, decreased nearly 10 percent from 2012-13. However, we saw an increased number of incidents involving arrests, transports, and students sent to detox. These incidents typically involve additional violations such as conduct threatening the health or safety of any person, failure to comply, and obstruction.

- The other common violations involved Housing and Residential Life Policy violations, including Noise/quiet Hours, Failure to Comply, Guest/Visitor Behavior, and Smoking.

- The new Smoke-Free Policy went into effect this academic year, resulting in a 30 percent increase of students accepting responsibility for smoking violations. Most of the increased violations occurred in the residential areas due to the prohibition of all smoking, no matter how far from a building. As this policy continues, it will be important to develop education programming and sanctions for students who violate this policy as formal warnings and probation are the main sanctions used for these violations.

- We saw a major increase in controlled substance violations in 2013-14, with 70 percent more violations than in 2012-13. The numbers went back to the levels seen in 2010-11 and 2011-12 and it will be interesting to see if these numbers remain consistent in future years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Common Violations</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</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>1761</td>
<td>6743</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise/Quiet Hours</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest/Visitor Behavior</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Comply</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/Controlled Substances</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>4.4%</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, which is the starting sanction for many cases.

- The Ethics Workshop has seen a steady increase of referrals for students over the past four years. One hundred twenty eight students were referred to the workshop in 2013-14, which is a thirty percent increase from 2012-13 and four times the number that were referred in 2011-12. Typically, students involved in theft cases or who have engaged in poor decision making are referred to the workshop.
  - The Ethics Workshop is being rebranded and restructured in 2014-15 as the Practical Decision Making Assessment and Reflection. We are transitioning the program from a group participation model to a more individualized assessment and reflection. We received extremely positive feedback from students who completed such an assessment this past year and decided to restructure the sanction for the upcoming year.
Eight students were suspended for at least one quarter and four students were dismissed from the University. Grounds for suspension and/or dismissal typically include distributing controlled substances, sexual assault, engaging in a physical altercation, violating probationary status, and committing a significant number of violations. Of the four dismissals, three were for sexual assault violations. Given the increasing number of reports for sexual assault, domestic and dating violence, and stalking, the number of suspensions and dismissals may continue to increase.

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 continued to increase in 2013-14. We have received extremely positive feedback from students assigned to the CARRS program, especially in learning more about responsible use of alcohol. We hope to continue referring students to the three alcohol-related interventions (Alcohol 101 Plus, CARRS, and Pro-SAFE).

With the increased number of drug and controlled substance incidents, it will be important to develop a “CARRS” equivalent for drug and controlled substance violations. The Sun God Task Force recommended developing a comprehensive alcohol and drug education program for the campus, and a middle level drug education module would fit well within the overall program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Common Sanctions</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</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>1036</td>
<td>3437</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection Paper</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol 101 Plus</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARRS Program</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Conduct Reviews**

- During the 2013-14 academic year, we conducted 19 Student Conduct Reviews. This was the exact same number of reviews that were held in 2012-13.

- As illustrated below, 94.7 percent of students participating in a Student Conduct Review were found responsible for at least one alleged violation. This was a 15.8 percentage point increase from 2012-13. Additionally, the most common case types advanced to reviews were for sexual assault, alcohol, controlled substances, 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>College Judicial Boards</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Standards Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offense Hearing Panel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Officers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appeals**

- We have seen a major increase in the number of sanction reduction requests and appeals over the past three years. We had a combined seven appeals/sanction reduction requests in 2010-11 and 2011-12 compared to a total of 29 in 2012-13 and 40 in 2013-14. We believe the increase is attributable to the implementation of the Revised Student Conduct Code in 2012 and Student Conduct Officers informing students about their appeal rights during Administrative Resolution Meetings.

- The Council of Provosts (COP) handles sanction reduction requests and appeals for undergraduate students. Of the 40 requests to COP this year, 36 involved sanction reduction requests while four were appeals from Student Conduct Reviews. COP upheld or modified all 40 appeal requests.
Because most of the requests asked to reduce sanctions, the most common ground of appeal seen by COP was that the “sanction was grossly disproportionate to the offense”. The most common case types theft, alcohol, physical and sexual assault and disruptive behavior.

A large number of the sanction reduction requests involved the restitution charge assessed for theft from the UC San Diego Bookstore. In many cases, COP has decreased the charge because they determined it was disproportionate to the offense (e.g. $300 fine for taking a granola bar). The Office of Student Conduct and Council of Deans are working with the Bookstore to address issues of disproportionality with this charge and sanctions for these cases overall.

**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. A new addition to this year’s Detox Center was a “Level 2” option for students who needed more individualized medical assistance.

The Detox Center had 74 admittees in 2013-14, a 15% percent decrease from 2012-13 and a similar number to 2010-11 and 2011-12. Overall, about 57% of all admittees were male, which is consistent with previous years. Interestingly and not consistent with the above, more than half of all Level Two admittees were female.

During the three years prior to 2013-14, about a third of all Detox admittees were non-affiliates. However, with the exclusion of non-affiliates from the Festival, only 6.8% (5) of all admittees were non-affiliates. This decrease is largely due to not selling wrist bands to non-affiliates and prohibiting guests in the residential areas.

There is usually a high percentage of non-residential students in Detox. The three year average coming into this year was 65%. However, there was a flip of these numbers this year as 58% of students seen in detox lived on campus. Similarly, there are a large number of fourth year students in Detox. In 2012-13, nearly 60% of all students in Detox were fourth year. However, that percentage decreased to 43% this year.

A potential explanation for both of these differences may be that with the exclusion of guests from the Village and ERC, fewer non-residential students came on campus prior to attending the Festival.

Additionally, fourth-fifths (80%) of all students admitted to Detox Two were residential students in comparison to less than half (49%) for Detox One.

There still are no conclusive statistics when it comes to college affiliation or residential areas. There is a pretty even spread so that no one college or area has a major contribution to Detox.

However, 12 ERC students were admitted to Level One but only one in Level Two. Similarly, 11 Warren students were admitted to Level One but only four in Level Two.

Medical transports from detox decreased slightly from 2012-13. Five students were checked in/going to be checked in who had to be medically transported. This is two less than 2012-13.

It appears that time in Level One Detox decreased this year. Anecdotally, many of the students who needed longer to sober up were seen in the Level Two area this year.

As has been previously shown, many of the students seen in Detox are not “problem” drinkers but rather ones who have less experience drinking. Many students report they have had stressful mid-terms and projects and want to de-stress, have fun, and forget a stressful week. Their lack of experience/lack of tolerance puts them at risk and given that they typically live off-campus, they are more likely to be observed by police/RSO/RA.
The Detox Centers are typically quite busy between 4pm and 10pm with at least 10 students admitted an hour. However, due to the heat and residential area guest restrictions, the first student did not arrive until around 4:30pm. Consistent with 12-13, about 36% of admittees (27 of 74) were brought to the centers between 8pm and 10pm. Additionally, nearly 63% of all students admitted to detox came between 6pm and 9pm.

- For Level One, nearly half (49.1%) came to Detox between 7pm and 9pm. This was not the case in Level Two, as there was a fairly even distribution of when students arrived. The exception was the six students (30% of total) who arrived between 6pm and 7pm.

### Sun God Weekend
- The overall number of incidents during Sun God weekend decreased slightly this year compared to 12-13. This year we had 155 incidents reported in comparison to 176 in 12-13 and 144 in 11-12. Almost half (48.6%) of all Sun God weekend incidents involve the student being admitted to our on-campus detox centers.
- Around 13 percent of all academic year incidents occur during Sun God weekend.
- About 85 percent of all Sun God incidents involve alcohol.
- Cases involving drugs decreased to eight this year down from 14 in 12-13.
- Police Officers were involved in about 55% of all Sun God incidents reported to student conduct. This is a significant increase over the normal level of police involvement and directly relates to the detox center. There was a significant law enforcement presence on campus that contributed to this increase.
- Most college/residential areas did not see significant change in documented incidents. However, both Muir and Warren saw major drops in documented incidents.
• Responsible Action Protocol
  o The Responsible Action Protocol provides “amnesty” for students who self-refer and are referred for assistance due to an alcohol-related medical emergency. Forty six students qualified for the Protocol in 2013-14, nearly double the number of cases from 2012-13 (24).

- There is almost an even split when it comes to gender of students qualifying for the RAP. The difference between genders is similar to the overall gender ratio of the undergraduate population.

- For the most part, there was an even distribution of students by college who qualified for the RAP in 2013-14, although Revelle and ERC had the most students for the second year in a row.
Interestingly, about a third of the students (14 of 46) qualifying for the RAP in 2013-14 were Biology majors, which was a significant increase from 2012-13 (2 of 24).

Over the past two years, about two thirds of students qualifying for the RAP are under 21 years of age. Specifically, about 37 percent of all students qualifying for the RAP were 18 years of age.

Now that the RAP is a permanent policy, the focus in 2014-15 will be to increase its visibility in the campus community, collaborate with student groups (e.g. Associated Students, Greek Council, College Judicial Boards) to reach more students, and interconnect it to existing bystander intervention programs.
STUDENT CONDUCT PROCESS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

This is the second year we have conducted an assessment of the student conduct process. The purpose of the assessment project is to assess student learning through the student conduct process. The assessment was included in the resolution letters for all students participating in Administrative Resolution meetings. It is 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 is also 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 saw an interesting, yet positive difference in this year’s results. There was a significant increase in responses indicating that respondents ‘strongly agreed’ with the statements they were asked to answer. This type of increase was seen for most every question asking for the respondent’s level of agreement with statements.

For example, we saw a 15.2 percentage point increase of responses indicating ‘strongly agree’ for the statement, “I was provided a clear and understandable explanation of the alleged violation(s) during my Administrative Resolution meeting.” Similarly, we saw a 13.5 percentage point increase of ‘strongly agree’ responses for the statement, “As a result of meeting with the Student Conduct Officer, I gained a greater understanding of the consequence of my behavior.” We believe these results show that students are feeling more confident that they are being treated fairly in our process, which seems to be creating more satisfaction with their overall experience.

About 48 percent of the students responding to the survey identified themselves as first year students, similar to 2012-13. About a quarter of the respondents identified themselves as second year students, about 15 percent identified as third year students, and close to 10 percent identified as fourth year students. These numbers are all similar to what we received in 2012-13. Additionally, 85 percent of respondents reported that they live on campus, up five percentage points from 2012-13. The results also showed that 85 percent of all respondents are from the state of California, including nearly 53 percent from Southern California.

We know from the assessment that about half 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. Interestingly, we saw an eight percentage point increase of students who said they received this information from meeting with a Student Conduct Officer about the alleged violations. Even with this increase, the data still shows that a majority of respondents knew 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 37 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 38 percent of respondents said they ‘neither agreed nor disagreed’ with the statement. These results continue to run counter to widely-held assumptions that if students knew more about the relevant policies, they would have acted differently. While preventative education is always an important part of our process, this assessment continues to show that actually being documented and going through the student conduct process makes the most impact on student decision making and behavior.

An area that we see potential for continued improvement is the timeliness of the process. About 79 percent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ that their incident was resolved within a reasonable amount of time, a seven percentage point improvement from 2012-13 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. Some comments we received from students about this included:

- “I feel the meeting would have been a bit more productive if the event in question was fresher in my memory.”
• “The sanctions for my case and many others took longer than the specified time; this was a source of anxiety, especially during Finals Week.”
• “I wasn’t sent the email regarding appointments until over a month after, which in my opinion is far too long.”

We hope the timeliness of the process will continue to improve during the upcoming academic year as we will provide more extensive assistance, training, and support to the college and residential life offices. We also will have a staff member in our office regularly follow-up on outstanding cases, which should help to prevent cases from remaining open for long periods of time.

Our office places a high priority on students being treated fairly in the student conduct process. The data in this assessment showed that, as was the case in 2012-13, this is true for the vast majority of students. The data includes:

• About 90 percent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ that they were able to explain their side of the issue during the resolution meeting.
• Ninety percent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ that they were provided a clear and understandable explanation of the alleged violations during their resolution meeting.
• Similar to 2012-13, 83 percent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ that the Student Conduct Officer demonstrated fairness in making the decision in the case.

However, we are still concerned with a lower rate of agreement for whether students were informed of their rights to a sanction reduction request during the resolution meeting. Seventy-five percent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ they were informed of their right to request a reduction in sanctions. 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 main goals is for students to learn more about the importance of community standards. Nearly 75 percent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ that the student conduct process helped them learn about the importance of community standards. This number was 10 percentage points lower than in 2012-13 but 15 percent of respondents answered ‘neither agree nor disagree’, an answer not included in the previous version of the assessment. Similar to 2012-13, 75 percent of respondents stated that as a result of participating in the process, they changed their behavior positively. Both of these answers show that the vast majority of students who go through the student conduct process are learning about campus standard and by virtue of participating in our process, changing their behavior in a positive way.

Finally, we asked respondents “Specifically, what have you learned while going through the process”. Nearly 800 respondents (81%) 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:

• “Every decision I make has an impact on myself as well as the people around me. I need to be more aware of what I am getting into, and realize the consequences of a negative decision before making that choice.”
• “I have a greater appreciation for those around me that may not consent to the behavior I have previously demonstrated. I have a greater appreciation for my living space and the implications my behavior has on it.”
• “I learned that even though I was not doing anything wrong, my actions and the actions of my peers can be interpreted as something the RSOs need to investigate and I should be more aware of that.”
• “There is a wide support system at UCSD that I had little knowledge of before this process. However, after speaking with my Dean of Student Affairs, I have gained more confidence that I am not alone in my struggles as a student at this institution.”
• “To drink safer. It is unrealistic to assume that 19-20 year olds in college won’t drink alcohol, so you have to educate them about what can happen (DUIs, poisoning) from not partying safely.”

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.
ETHICS WORKSHOP ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

This was the first year we used an electronic assessment method for the Ethics Workshop, a practical decision making seminar used as a sanction for Student Conduct Code violations related to decision making issues. Previously, we used hard-copy paper surveys, which made it more cumbersome to collate and compile overall data. We also revised and expanded the assessment from a simple survey about what the participants liked and disliked about the session to an expanded instrument assessing actual learning outcomes.

In looking at the data, students responded positively about the impact of the session on their decision making. Eighty five percent of respondents (91 of 107) 'strongly agreed or agreed' that as a result of attending the workshop, they have a greater understanding of ethics and decision making in their everyday life. Similarly, 83 percent (89 of 107) ‘strongly agreed or agreed’ that the workshop helped to provide a greater understanding of how their decisions affect others. These results show that the workshop has the intended effect of helping students understand their decisions and decision making processes.

We developed targeted questions related to the program’s learning outcomes and specific modules. The data includes:

- Eighty eight percent of respondents (94 of 107) stated that they were able to identify one person who sees them as a role model and described why they are a role model for that person.
- Ninety three percent of respondents (100 of 107) articulated at least two examples of positive ethical behaviors by others and/or myself.
- Ninety percent of respondents (97 or 107) identified one ethical admission and the rationalizations and decision points within that admission.

These results show that students are meeting the specified learning outcomes that support practical decision making. However, a few respondents disagreed that they were able to meet these goals. Their comments included:

- "Ethics are relative and I am confused that sometimes you get penalized for acting ethically, which is why some people are in this course in the first place."
- "I feel I already have a good understanding, I just chose to ignore it at the time."
- "I already knew the effect of my decisions."
- "That I was correct in my previous ideologies and ethics are still a fabricated system of ideas to keep people in line."

These comments support the data we receive in our general assessment of the student conduct process that students knew they were violating campus policy, they chose to do it anyway. It continues to support the concept that the student conduct process is where they think about their decisions and how they will avoid similar circumstances.

We also asked respondents to describe what they learned from the workshop. Nearly every participant provided a response, which provided us with an additional data, albeit anecdotal to describe what students learned from the process. Responses of what students learned included:

- "I learned about decision making and ethics and I realized just how many consequences my actions have on myself and those around me."
- "I learned that it’s important to think of all the possibilities and consequences to the decisions that you make. Every choice counts and you always have a choice to either do the right or wrong thing."
- "Someone looks up to you. So whenever you do something. Imagine what they would think of you."
- "The part of the workshop that I learned most from was the Rationalizations handout. I definitely have used some of the Rationalizations in the past and looking through a detailed list was very helpful in gaining better understanding of some of the factors that drive my decisions."
- "The workshop was really different than what I expected. I learned that the situation I had been involved in did not define me or my ethics."

In looking at student demographics, about 60 percent of all respondents were either first year or second year students and about 62 percent of respondents lived on campus. Additionally, about half were from Southern California and almost a fifth of all attendees classified themselves as international students.
We are making several changes to the workshop for 2014-15 based on several years of feedback from students and the data gleaned from this assessment. These changes include:

- Changing the name from “Ethics Workshop” to the “Practical Decision Making Seminar”. Many students have concerns about being assigned to an “ethics” workshop. Given that most of the violations involve issues around decision making rather than ethics, we felt changing the name would help reduce student concerns.

- Reducing the cost of the session from $75 to $50. Many students, especially students involved with Bookstore theft cases, expressed concerns about financial hardships and, in that context, a $75 session fee seemed excessive. The CARRS program, at only $50 a session, provided us a useful benchmark in this area.

- Decreasing the length of the session from three hours to two hours. This change alleviates the common criticism of session being too long. After discussion among the OSC staff, we determined that two hours would be appropriate for such a seminar. We’ve also spent some time reworking the modules to focus more on practical decision making and this has allowed us to decrease the time commitment.

- Taking a greater role, as an office, in the administration and delivery of the workshop. With additional professional staff in our office, we can provide greater professional staff oversight for the program and personally facilitate the workshop. Our outside facilitator has been effective during her tenure but we feel that our office staff should be able to facilitate these sessions in a similar fashion.

- Develop the capability to bill students’ accounts directly for the session rather than having them bring a check to the office. This will eliminate concerns about “cash” handling while also recognizing that many students do not have actual checks and have to get money orders from their bank to pay for the session.

- Developing an electronic registration system to streamline registration for the seminar. We are looking at various options for this purpose.

- Developed a “self-directed” option for students with scheduling conflicts. With this option, students come to the office and complete the seminar through written directions results in a written summary rather than group discussion. We’ve had about a half a dozen students complete this option, with a couple of the students expressing that they appreciated the opportunity to think through these issues and put them in writing. Thanks to these sessions, we are eliminating the reflection paper requirement and incorporating it into the seminar as the final module.

Overall, we think all of these changes will help to provide greater efficiency for our office while reducing some of financial barriers and administrative frustration for students to attend the session.

Once we complete our academic year statistics, we will look at data relating to the Ethics Workshop. Specifically, we will compile and analyze data around recidivism, types of violations, and these data sets will allow us to determine the common violations for students taking the seminar along with analyzing whether the workshop has an impact on recidivism, especially in comparison to other sanction programs.