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October 5, 2018

Dear UC San Diego community members,

The Office of Student Conduct leads and manages the UC San Diego non-academic student conduct process. We do this by partnering with the campus community to administer a fair and educational process, facilitate student growth and development, and maintain the integrity of our community by holding students accountable for policy violations.

This 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, our office is involved in a wide range of activities, ranging from resolving student conduct cases to assisting with students of concern to serving on University-wide committees. We are a central part of the overall student safety net at UC San Diego. As you read the report, you’ll see we try to strike the delicate balance between educating students about their behavior while holding them accountable when they violate the Student Conduct Code and related policies.

This report tells the story of our student conduct process. The statistical and assessment summaries provide detailed narratives about the impact of our process on UC San Diego students. They also debunk myths about our process, including that “everyone gets into trouble” and “no one is held accountable.” Our current and historical statistical and assessment data provides us with a rich data set providing greater understanding of the scope, trends, and impact of our process. This allows us to engage in purposeful, data-driven decision-making when evaluating improvements and enhancements.

The upcoming academic year marks my ninth year directing the office and I’m excited about the year ahead. We recently updated and revised our mission, values, and learning outcomes to more accurately reflect our purpose and philosophy. We are currently collaborating with our residential area colleagues to implement restorative practices in the residential areas. Finally, we have created comprehensive case turnaround time statistics to assist in alleviating student concerns about how long our process takes to complete. We hope these initiatives, among other things, will push our office and process forward to become even more reflective of UC San Diego’s student centered culture.

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

Sincerely,

Ben White
Director, Office of Student Conduct
MISSION, LEARNING OUTCOMES, AND STAFF

MISSION
The Office of Student Conduct leads and manages the UC San Diego non-academic student conduct process. We do this by partnering with the campus community to administer a fair and educational process, facilitate student growth and development, and maintain the integrity of our community by holding students accountable for policy violations.

VALUES
As Student Affairs professionals, we strive to embody the UC San Diego Principles of Community and the Student Affairs Strategic Plan in the values we promote to our students.

- **Fairness** – We strive to facilitate an equitable and transparent process free from bias and prejudice.
- **Education** – We strive to educate our students about community standards and expectations while providing them the knowledge and skills to enhance their decision making.
- **Accountability** – We value taking responsibility for one’s decisions and the impact of those decisions on our community.
- **Restorative Practices** – We strive to facilitate repairing harm suffered as a result of student conduct-related incidents. We value reintegrating students back into our community after participating in our process.
- **Growth and Development** – We value helping students grow and learn from their decisions to develop into more responsible and community minded individuals.
- **Collaboration** – We value our distinctive residential college system and work collaboratively with our campus colleagues to best serve our students.

LEARNING OUTCOMES
We engage in outcomes assessment to improve student learning, programming, and service delivery. Specifically, we focus on the following student learning outcomes:

- As a result of their resolution meeting with a Student Conduct Officer, students will have greater knowledge, awareness, and understanding of our standards of conduct and consequences for violations.
- As a result of their resolution meeting with a Student Conduct Officer, students will be able to identify and access relevant campus resources.
- As a result of participating in restorative programs (e.g. restorative justice circles and the Practical Decision Making Assessment and Reflection), students will be able to articulate the impact of their decision-making on themselves and other members of the campus community.
- As a result of participating in the Campus Alcohol Risk Reduction Seminar (CARRS), students will be able to identify and articulate practical tools and information for responsible use of alcohol.
As a result of participating in relevant training programs, student participants (e.g. conduct board members, student advocates, and resident/house advisors) will be able to articulate a greater understanding of the non-academic student conduct process and their roles within the process.

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF**
- Ben White, Director (eighth year at UC San Diego, eighth in position)
- Natania Trapp, Assistant Director of Student Conduct (eleventh year at UC San Diego, eighth with Office of Student Conduct, second in position)
- Caitlin Meagher, Student Conduct Coordinator (sixth year at UC San Diego, fourth with Office of Student Conduct, second in position)
- Caroline Kim, Administrative Assistant (fifth year at UC San Diego, second with Office of Student Conduct, second in position)

**STUDENT STAFF**
- Joquel Vasquez, Graduate Assistant
- Julio Navarro, Student Assistant
- Madalyn Rogers, Student Assistant
TRAININGS, OUTREACH, AND EDUCATION

- **Administrative Resolution Training** – The Office of Student Conduct conducted a three hour comprehensive training for new Student Conduct Officers in October. The training focused on student conduct philosophy, due process and evidentiary standards, how to conduct Administrative Resolution meetings, and sanctioning principles.

- **A.S. Office of Student Advocacy Training** – Director of Student Conduct Ben White and Director of Student Legal Services Jon Carlos Senour conducted an introductory three-hour training for the Associated Students Student Advocates in November. The training provided an overview of the student conduct process, applicable due process protections and evidentiary standards, the role of the student advocate, tips for assisting students with Administrative Resolution meetings and Student Conduct Reviews, and strategies for asking effective questions. In April, White and Student Conduct Coordinator Caitlin Meagher facilitated a one hour Sun God Festival-themed training to assist advocates with cases stemming from the Festival.

- **Greek 101** – The Office of Student Conduct presented on the Responsible Action Protocol at Greek 101 presentations in October. Greek 101 is the member education program for new Greek organization members and focuses on community building, student health promotions, hazing education, and sexual assault prevention.

- **Hazing Prevention Panel** – In January, Student Conduct Coordinator Caitlin Meagher participated on a panel discussing hazing prevention and risk management with leaders of UC San Diego’s fraternities and sororities. Other panelists included Sergeant Melissa Luth of the UCSD Police Department and Director of Student Legal Services Jon Carlos Senour.

- **IFC Judicial Board Training** – Director of Student Conduct Ben White facilitated training for members of the Interfraternity Council Judicial Board in October and February regarding their roles and responsibilities, hearing procedures, effective questioning, and sanctioning.

- **Quarterly Workshops** – The Office of Student Conduct held one quarterly workshop during the academic year to provide professional development opportunities for Student Conduct Officers and communicate updates about policies, procedures, techniques, and approaches. We also honored the Student Conduct Officers and support staff with an end-of-the-year Awards Luncheon. This year’s topics included:
  - **“Fall Quarter Review”** (December) – This workshop focused on key issues and trends from Fall Quarter 2017 in a group conversation format.
  - **“Student Conduct Awards Luncheon”** (July) – The Office of Student Conduct honored Student Conduct Officers and support staff with the fourth annual Student Conduct Awards Luncheon. Along with treating staff to lunch, Director of Student Conduct Ben White unveiled the yearly Student Conduct All-Star Team. Winners included:
    - **Student Conduct Officer of the Year** – Amber Vlasnik, Marshall College
    - **Newcomer of the Year** – Jason Thibodeaux, Muir College
    - **The Director’s Award** – Mario Garibay, Warren College
    - **All-Star** – Melissa Silverman Garibay, Sixth College
    - **All-Star** – Nathan Harper, Muir College
    - **All-Star** – Demarcus Sharpe, Sixth College
- **Resident Advisor/House Advisor training** – The Office of Student Conduct facilitated individual two-hour trainings for Resident Advisors and House Advisors in each of the seven residential areas during September.
  - The office trained new RAs/HAs on roles and expectations, report writing basics, and developing a greater understanding of the student conduct process. After the individual sessions, Director of Student Conduct Ben White emceed the fourth annual “Battle of the RA/HA Stars”, won by Eleanor Roosevelt College.
  - In addition, in August, Assistant Director Natania Trapp, Administrative Assistant Caroline Kim, and Evergreen State College’s Andrea Seabert trained Marshall and Sixth College Resident Advisors on the basics of Restorative Practices.

- **Residential Security Officer Training** – Natania Trapp and Caitlin Meagher facilitated training for campus Residential Security Officers focusing on their roles in the student conduct process, report writing, and student evaluations.

- **Student Conduct Assistants Training** – In September, Caitlin Meagher and Caroline Kim provided training to Deans’ and Residential Life Assistants about their roles in the Student Conduct process, specifically focusing on how to properly assess violations.

- **Student Conduct Education Sessions** – As part of our goal to educate the campus community about the student conduct process and student rights and responsibilities, we deliver presentations to staff and student groups who interact with the student conduct process. This year’s presentations included sessions with the Global Seminars faculty and the Teaching + Learning Commons.

- **Student Conduct Review Training** – We facilitated three trainings for various members of the Community Standards Board in October and March. Each session focused on the Review process, due process and evidentiary standards, conduct in violation of community standards, and questioning skills. In addition to these sessions, Director of Student Conduct Ben White facilitated a session for Community Standards Board chairs about their roles in the Review process.

- **SVSH-Related Trainings** - In October, Director of Student Conduct Ben White facilitated adjudication and appeals process training for CARE at SARC staff. Presenters included then-OPHD Director Jennifer Broomfield, Assistant Director Natania Trapp, and Student Conduct Coordinator Caitlin Meagher. In October, White and Trapp facilitated training for Respondent Support Advisors about their roles advising Respondents in SVSH cases.
CAMPUS INVOLVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

• UC San Diego Committee Involvement
  o Alcohol & Drugs Issues and Trends Committee (Caitlin Meagher, member)
  o Alcohol Policy Workgroup (Ben White, co-chair)
  o Behavioral Threat Assessment Team (Ben White and Natania Trapp, members)
  o Bingham Scholarship Committee (Ben White, member)
  o Campus Risk Assessment Steering Committee (Ben White, member)
  o Case Management Team (Natania Trapp, member)
  o Clery Compliance Workgroup (Natania Trapp, member)
  o Clery Executive Committee (Ben White, member)
  o Coordinated Community Response Team (Ben White and Natania Trapp members)
  o Demonstrations and Sensitive Issues Committee (Ben White, member)
  o First Amendment Workgroup & Free Speech Student Subcommittee (Ben White, member)
  o Intercollegiate Athletics Equity Diversity & Inclusion Committee (Natania Trapp, member)
  o Marshall College Assistant Director of Residence Life Search Committee (Natania Trapp, member)
  o OPHD Director Interview Committee (Ben White, member)
  o Parent Professional Learning Community (Natania Trapp, member)
  o Residential Security Officer Interview Committee (Caitlin Meagher, member)
  o Restorative Justice Committee (Natania Trapp, co-chair; Caroline Kim, member)
  o Smoking Policy Committee (Caitlin Meagher, member)
  o Student Affairs Assessment & Evaluation Leadership Team (Ben White, member)
  o Student Affairs Assessment & Evaluation Learning Community (Caitlin Meagher, member)
  o Student Affairs Program Review Committee (Ben White, member)
  o Student Conduct Standards Group (Ben White, chair)
  o Sun God Festival Steering Committee (Caitlin Meagher, member)
  o UCPD Officer Interview Committee (Natania Trapp, member)

• Other Campus Involvement
  o Director of Student Conduct Ben White is a member of the Vice Chancellor – Student Affairs Leadership Team.
  o The Office of Student Conduct managed the annual Sun God Sobering Center in April. Specifically, the office was responsible for checking students into and out of the Center, entering reports into the Advocate database, and managing front end volunteers.
  o Assistant Director Natania Trapp, Student Conduct Coordinator Caitlin Meagher, and Administrative Assistant Caroline Kim served as judges for the annual UnOlympics competition held in September.
  o Ben White, Natania Trapp, and Caitlin Meagher participated in Student Affairs Demonstration Monitors Training in December.
  o For the third consecutive year, Director of Student Conduct Ben White participated in the Discover the Law program, sponsored by Student Legal Services, White presented about the area of Sports Law.
University of California System-Wide Involvement

- The Office of Student Conduct is a regular participant with the University of California (UC) Student Conduct Officers group.
  - Student Conduct Coordinator Caitlin Meagher and Graduate Assistant Joquel Vasquez attended the Fall Student Conduct Officers meeting held in November at UCLA. Director of Student Conduct Ben White attended the Spring Student Conduct Officers meeting held in May on the UC San Francisco campus.
  - The student conduct directors of each campus also participate in monthly conference calls to discuss issues impacting campuses. White represents UC San Diego on these calls.

- For the fourth consecutive year, Director of Student Conduct Ben White facilitated training for the UC Irvine Student Conduct Board.

- Assistant Director Natania Trapp represents UC San Diego in the Respondent Support Coordinators system wide group.
  
  Director of Student Conduct Ben White attended a system-wide Title IX cross-functional meeting in September at the UC Office of the President in Oakland.

- White and Trapp attended UC system wide Dating and Domestic Violence training held at UC Riverside in December.

Professional Development and Involvement

- The Office of Student Conduct hosted restorative justice training for campus student affairs professionals in March. The training was conducted by Assistant Director Natania Trapp, Administrative Assistant Caroline Kim, and Sixth College Director of Residence Life Tony Jakubisin and focused on the basics of restorative practices on a college campus.
  - Trapp, Kim, and Jakubisin also facilitated restorative justice training for Evergreen State College (Olympia, WA) in March.

- The Office of Student Conduct is a founding member and organizer of the San Diego Student Conduct Officers Group. This group brings together the student conduct offices of San Diego-area campuses to build relationships, discuss student conduct issues, and engage in low-cost professional development.
  - The 15 San Diego-area campuses participating in the group are: Ashford University, CSU San Marcos, Cuyamaca College, Grossmont College, Mesa College, Mira Costa College, Miramar College, Palomar College, Point Loma Nazarene University, San Diego City College, San Diego Continuing Education, San Diego State University, Southwestern College, UC San Diego, University of San Diego
    - For the July meeting, hosted by Mesa College, campus attendees included Ben White, Natania Trapp, Caitlin Meagher, and Caroline Kim.
In collaboration with the Office for Students with Disabilities, the Office of Student Conduct co-sponsored a presentation in October by disability services expert Dr. Jane Thierfield Brown entitled, “Strategies for Working with Students on the Autism Spectrum”.

Student Conduct Coordinator Caitlin Meagher attended the Advocate Database Symposium hosted by Symplicity Corporation at UCLA in May.

Office of Student Conduct professional staff are members of the following professional associations:

- Association for Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA) (Ben White, Natania Trapp, Caitlin Meagher)
- NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (Natania Trapp)
- Education Law Association (ELA) (Ben White)
- National Association of Clery Compliance Officers and Professionals (Natania Trapp)
STATISTICAL SUMMARY

• Overall Incident Statistics
  o During the 2017-18 academic year, we processed 952 incident reports, about an 11 percent decrease from 2016-17 (1062) and an almost eight percent decrease from 2015-16 (1027). Nearly three-fifths of all incident reports (561) were submitted by Residential Security Officers and a record low 14 percent of all cases submitted were by Resident Advisors.
  
  o During the course of the academic year, 2329 individual students (2855 total including graduate and professional students) were processed through the student conduct process. The number of individual students increased three and a half percent from the past two years while the total students processed remained constant. Also, the percentage of the undergraduate population seen through the student conduct process remained the same as 2016-17 but represents a significant decrease from the 12.4 percent seen in 2013-14.
  
  o About half of all cases involved alcohol and/or controlled substances. Another 40 percent of cases involved other violations such as Residential Life Policy violations and failure to comply. The remaining cases consisted of a variety of incidents, including theft from the UC San Diego Bookstore, illegal file sharing and downloading, and sexual violence & sexual harassment.
  
  o For the third consecutive year, about 81 percent of all students referred to the student conduct process were involved in only one incident, equating to a repeat incident rate of 19 percent. These numbers were similar to previous years and compare favorably against the 74.1 percent seen in 2012-13.
  
  o The overall recidivism rate decreased slightly in 2017-18 to 12.8 percent. The alcohol recidivism decreased to a record low 5.7 percent after increasing by one and half percentage points in 2016-17.
- **College and Residential Populations**
  - The six undergraduate colleges have seen relatively similar numbers of students involved with student conduct incidents over the past five years.
  - Over the past three academic years, the percentage of students from individual colleges has come in between six and a half and nine percent.

  ![Percentage of students per college documented (2015-16 to 2017-18)](image)

  - For the fifth consecutive year, there was a decrease in the percentage of on-campus residential students seen in the process. This past year, we saw 16.3 percent of all on-campus residential students, a small decrease from 2016-17. The current percentage of residents is similar to the levels of 2010-11. Interestingly, there were about 4000 more residents in 2017-18 than in 2010-11 and many students are now living three or more to a room.

- **Gender**
  - During the 2017-18 academic year, 63 percent of students referred to the student conduct process identified as male. This is similar to 2016-17 and a three percentage point increase from 2015-16. The 37 percent of students identified as female referred to the process was the lowest since 2011-12.

  - Interestingly, the percentage of male and female undergraduate students at UC San Diego is about even each year. However, the split in the student conduct process is typically at least two males for every female.

  - Additionally, we saw about 10 percent of the male undergraduate population and 6.1 percent of female undergraduate population. The percentage of both female and male undergraduates were similar to what we saw in 2016-17.
- Incident Location and Month of Incident
  - About 85 percent of all incidents occurred in college and residential areas, with North Campus (the Village), Warren, and Graduate & Family Housing being the most frequent locations. Most of the remaining incidents occurred in other campus areas, including the UC San Diego Bookstore, Sun God Sobering Center, in parking lots, and on campus roadways.
  
  - Over the past three years, the most common months for incidents typically are April, October, and November. This is due to the increased number of campus events during these months, most notably the Sun God Festival in April.
• **Resolutions**
  o Of the 2872 total students participating in the student conduct process, 99.5 percent had their incident resolved without a formal Student Conduct Review.
  o Students who had their incident resolved without a Student Conduct Review either received a Notice of Informal Warning or met with a Student Conduct Officer in an Administrative Resolution Meeting.
  o This past year, 70 percent of students processed had their cases resolved through a meeting with a Student Conduct Officer, down two percentage points from 2016-17.
    ▪ The reason why not all incidents are handled through an Administrative Resolution meeting is that many incidents are considered “low-level” (e.g. smoking, noise, etc.) and the formal process is not necessary to resolve them.
    ▪ The Office of Student Conduct sends a Notice of Informal Warning for most of the lower level cases. This allows the colleges and residential areas to focus on incidents necessitating a direct resolution.
  o Students who resolved their incident through the Administrative Resolution process, accepted responsibility for at least one Student Conduct Code violation in 75.2 percent of meetings similar to 2016-17. In the remaining meetings, the Student Conduct Officer dismissed the alleged violations because the student was not responsible or there was not a preponderance of the evidence to support the allegations.

• **Turnaround time**
  o The average administrative resolution was completed in 21.4 business days from the date of the incident. This was a similar average as seen in 2016-17. Our annual goal is for the average case to be completed in 20 business days or less.
  o In tracking case turnaround time, we calculate the following metrics:
    ▪ “**20 Under**” refers to the number of resolutions closed in 20 business days or less and encompasses the time from the date of the incident to when the resolution letter was sent to the student. In 2017-18, this metric was 65.1 percent. Our goal for this metric is 70 percent or more.
    ▪ “**Assignment to Letter**” refers to the length in time from when a case is assigned to a Student Conduct Officer to when the resolution meeting letter or Notice of Informal Warning is sent to the student. In 2017-18, this metric was 3.7 business days. Our goal for this metric is 5.0 business days, which was met in 2017-18.
    ▪ “**Incident to Assignment**” refers to length of time from the date of an incident to the date the case is assigned to a Student Conduct Officer. In 2017-18, this metric was an average of 4.5 business days. Our goal for this metric is five business days or less, which was met in 2017-18.
    ▪ “**Letter to Resolution**” refers to the length in time from the date the resolution meeting letter is sent to the student to when the resolution summary letter is sent to the student. In 2017-18, this metric was an average of 13.2 business days. Our goal for this metric is 10.0 business days.
    ▪ “**Over 20**” refers to resolutions closed in more than 20 business days. In 2017-18, this metric was 34.9 percent. Our current goal for this metric is 30 percent or less.
“Resolutions” refer to the number of individual meetings with students to resolve alleged Student Conduct Code violations. This number includes resolutions where the student failed to appear for a meeting with the Student Conduct Officer. In 2017-18, this metric was 1793 resolutions.

- For Notices of Informal Warning (NIW), they were completed in 11.2 business days from the date of the incident. Our current goal is to complete them in 10.0 business days or less. In tracking NIWs, we compiled the following metrics:
  - 20 Under – In 2017-18, this metric was 86.9 percent. Our current goal for this metric is 90 percent.
  - “Assignment to Letter” - In 2017-18, this metric was an average of 4.2 business days. Our current goal for this metric is 5.0 business days, which was met in 2017-18.
  - “Incident to Assignment” - In 2017-18, this metric was an average of 7.0 business days. Our current goal for this metric is 5.0 business days.
  - “Over 20” - In 2017-18, this metric was 13.1 percent. Our current goal for this metric is 10 percent.
  - “NIWs” refer to the number of notices sent to students as informal warnings. In 2017-18, this metric was 891 letters.

Violations
- Eighty-one percent of all Student Conduct Code violations during the 2017-18 academic year involved the Undergraduate Housing and Residential Life Policies (Student Conduct Code Section VII, Letter F). Additionally, another six percent came from Graduate Housing Policy Violations. This comes as no surprise given the high number of incidents occurring within campus residential areas.

- The five most common violations involved Alcohol, Noise/Quiet Hours, Failure to Comply, Guest/Visitor Behavior, and Smoking.

- For the fourth consecutive academic year, we saw a decreased number of students referred to the student conduct process who were arrested. Eleven students were arrested and referred to the student conduct process in 2017-18, compared to 23 students in 2016-17, 26 students in 2015-16, and 43 students in 2014-15.

- We saw a marked decrease of the number of incidents involving students sent to detox facilities in 2017-18. This is attributable to the significantly lower number of students admitted to the Sun God Festival Sobering Facility. Not surprisingly, about 80 percent of students sent to detox facilities in 2017-18 were documented during the Sun God Festival, similar to previous years.

- Forty-one students were transported to the hospital for alcohol or controlled substance related medical emergencies and referred to our office. This was a decrease of 14 from 2016-17 and five from 2015-16.
Sanctions

- The most common sanction assigned to students accepting responsibility or found responsible for violating the Student Conduct Code was a formal warning (38 percent of all sanctions), which is the starting administrative sanction for many cases. The other most common sanctions assigned included the Alcohol Self-Assessment Questionnaire (14.1 percent), non-academic disciplinary probation (12.1 percent), reflection papers (8.3 percent), and the Practical Decision Making Assessment and Reflection (7.9 percent).

- Probation has been used increasingly less by Student Conduct Officers over the past several years. In 2017-18, 284 students were placed on at least one quarter of probation, in contrast to 601 in 2013-14. Part of the reason for the decreased numbers include the continued decrease of students with repeat incidents and responsibility.
Nineteen students were suspended for at least one quarter and one student was dismissed from the University in 2017-18. Grounds for suspension and dismissal typically include sexual violence and sexual assault, distributing controlled substances, engaging in physical altercation, violating probationary status, intentionally covering fire safety equipment, and committing a significant number of violations.

We issued six interim suspensions during the 2017-18 academic year, a decrease of two from the previous year and four less than in 2015-16.

- Three interim suspensions involved physical altercations, two involved Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy incidents, and the remaining incident involved possession of weapons on campus.
- Three of the six interim suspensions were fully upheld by the Hearing Officer while the remaining three were modified or removed, a similar ratio as in the past two academic years.

**Student Conduct Reviews**
- During the 2017-18 academic year, we conducted 17 Student Conduct Reviews. This was four less than were held in 2016-17 and three less than 2015-16. Note that at the time of publication, six requested Reviews were in the process of being held or scheduled.

- Eighty-eight percent of students participating in a Student Conduct Review were found responsible for at least one alleged violation in 2017-18. This is in comparison to 60 percent, 77 percent and 78 percent responsibility in each of the previous three academic years. Additionally, the most common case types referred to Reviews involved conduct threatening the health or safety of any person and controlled substances. However, several case types not normally sent to a Review, including bookstore theft and illegal file sharing and downloading, were heard and all resulted in findings of responsibility.

**Appeals and Sanction Reduction Requests**
- We saw a decrease in the number of sanction reduction requests and appeals in comparison to previous years. We processed 36 sanction reduction requests and appeals in 2017-18 in comparison to 50 in 2014-15, and 59 in 2015-16, 51 in 2016-17.

- Of the 36 requests received by the Office of Student Conduct this year, 35 involved sanction reduction requests while one was an appeal from a Student Conduct Review decision. The appeal body or officer (e.g. Council of Provosts, Dean of the Graduate Division) upheld 71 percent of the requests and modified all but one of the remaining requests.

- Because most of the requests asked to reduce sanctions, the most common ground of appeal invoked by students was that the "sanction was grossly disproportionate to the offense". The most common case types involved theft, alcohol, non-academic dishonesty, and disruptive behavior.

- The Sexual Violence & Sexual Assault (SVSH) Appeal Board hears student appeals for SVSH cases involving sexual assault, sexual harassment, dating & domestic violence, stalking, and other related violations. The Board held three hearings during the 2017-18 academic year, which resulted in affirming the decisions made by the investigator and Student Conduct Officer.
• **Sun God Weekend**
  o This is the third consecutive Sun God Festival under the Saturday afternoon format (12pm to 6pm).
  
  o This year’s attendance was 8,950 students in comparison to 12,161 students in 2017 and 9,714 students in 2016.
  
  o The total number of incidents during Sun God Weekend (Friday, Saturday, and Sunday) significantly decreased this year compared to the past six years. This year 74 incidents were reported in comparison to 110 in 2017. The number of incidents this year is the lowest number over the past eight years since detailed Sun God Weekend statistics have been compiled.
    - Typically, between 10 and 13 percent of all academic year incidents occur during Sun God weekend. This year, a record low of 8.3 percent of all academic year incidents occurred during Sun God Weekend.
    - Of the 74 incidents occurring during Sun God Weekend, 94.5 percent (70) happened on the day of the Festival (Saturday). This is the same as 2017 and a higher percentage than both 2016 (80 percent) and 2015 (83.6 percent).
  
  o Nearly 84 percent of all 2018 Sun God Weekend incidents involved alcohol, down from 85.5 percent in 2017. This is in comparison to 77.5 percent in 2016 and 74.7 percent in 2015.
  
  o Cases involving drugs decreased from 10 to 7 this year, similar to 2016 (6).
  
  o About 40 percent of all Sun God Weekend incidents involved students being admitted to the on-campus Sobering Facility, the lowest since 2013. This is in comparison to 61.8 percent in 2017, and 52.9 percent in 2016.
The percentage of incidents involving law enforcement personnel decreased. This year, one third of all Sun God incidents reported to the Office of Student Conduct involved law enforcement personnel in comparison to about 65 percent in each of the past three years.

Marshall, Revelle, and Sixth had an increased number of incidents during Sun God Weekend, while Muir, The Village, and Warren saw a decreased number of incidents. In particular, Marshall (13 incidents) had the most incidents in their residential area since 2014. Also, after averaging 11 incidents a year since 2015, Warren had two incidents during the weekend of this year's Festival.

Seven students used and qualified for the Responsible Action Protocol (RAP) on the day of the Festival. This is in comparison to 12 students who used and/or qualified for RAP on the day of the 2017 festival and nine students for the 2016 festival.

- Sun God Sobering Facility
  - Twenty nine students were admitted to the Sobering Facility this year, a 135 percent decrease from 2017, and an 80 percent decrease from 2016.
    - The number of students admitted was the lowest amount since 2011 (40).
    - Overall, about 24 percent of all admittees were male in comparison to 44 percent in 2017, which is a significant difference from previous trends where males were the majority admitted to the sobering center. Consistent with last year’s numbers (70 percent), the majority of all Level Two admittees were female (7 of 8 students).
    - About 24 percent of all students admitted to the facility qualified for the Responsible Action Protocol, a seven percentage point increase from 2017.
  - Typically, a high percentage of students not living on campus are seen in the Sobering Facility. About three fifths (58.6 percent) of students in the facility this year did not live on campus. This is consistent with previous years, with the exception of 2014, which saw a majority of residential students rather than those from off-campus.
    - Similarly, typically a large number of upper class (third and fourth year) students are seen in the Sobering Facility. This year and consistent with previous years, almost 80 percent of all students admitted were upper class students.
    - Inconsistent with the past three years, half of students admitted to Level Two did not live on campus. Nearly 70 percent of students in Level One did not live on campus, identical to the percentages seen in 2016 and 2017.
  - No students checked in had to be medically transported (after initially being arrested). This is in comparison to one in 2017 and none in 2016.
  - Four students admitted to the facility (13.8 percent of all students admitted to the facility) were removed due to arrest. In comparison, 12 students were removed due to arrest in 2017 and seven in 2016.
  - Overall average time spent in the Sobering Facility by students not removed by arrest or transport (3hr 56 min) decreased 8 minutes from 2017 (4hr 4 min).
• Males averaged 3 hours 14 minutes while females averaged 4 hours 13 minutes.

• Students in Level Two typically spend more time in the facility than those in Level One.
  - Level Two admittees averaged 4 hours 39 minutes, about an hour more than those in Level One. This is consistent with last year’s numbers.
  - Females in Level Two typically average about an hour more than those in Level One. This year, the difference was about 50 minutes.
  - Traditionally, males in Level Two average about 30 minutes more than those in Level One. However, the past two years the difference was about 1 hour and 13 minutes.

  o Most students (89.6 percent) were brought to the Sobering Facility between 3pm and 5pm.
    - For Level One, a nearly all (20 of 22) came between 3pm and 5pm. This was similar to Level Two, as seven of eight admittees (87.5 percent) came to the facility during the same time period.

  o Similar to 2016, volunteers used breathalyzers to assess student Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) when they arrived in the Sobering Facility. Twenty three of 29 admittees consented to participating in the screening.
    - Nearly three fourths of the students screened (17 of 23) had BACs at .10 or above. This percentage is similar to the results in 2016.
    - About 57 percent of the students screened (13 of 23) had BACs at .15 or above compared to about one-half in 2016.
    - Thirty percent of the students admitted (7 of 23) had BACs at .20 or above in comparison to about one quarter in 2016.

• Responsible Action Protocol
  o The Responsible Action Protocol (RAP) provides “amnesty” for students who are self-referred or referred by another person for assistance due to an alcohol or controlled substance-related medical emergency. Thirty-seven students qualified for the Protocol in 2017-18, a decrease of 9 students from 2016-17.

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

  o Twenty-four of 37 students were assigned to and completed the Campus Alcohol Risk Reduction Seminar (CARRS) facilitated by Student Health Services. Other outcomes completed by students qualifying under RAP included the Alcohol Self-Assessment Questionnaire, reflection papers, and counseling assessments.

  o The Office of Student Conduct recognizes students who help invoke the protocol by calling and/or asking University officials for assistance. We send these students a “thank you” note and give them OSC-related merchandise, including a RAP t-shirt, OSC water bottle and other related items. We also give them additional information about RAP so they can pass it along to their friends and fellow students.
Seventy percent of people calling for help were friends or roommates of the student needing assistance. Six students were referred by other students they did not know, four students referred themselves, and one student was referred by an unknown person.

Now that the program has been in effect for five years, we are updating it to become more accessible and understandable to students.

- First, we are changing the name of the program to “Medical Amnesty Program”. This is in response to some confusion as to what “RAP” means. It also is in response to the connotation of the “RAP” abbreviation to rape.

- Second, we are proposing to reduce the limitation of using the program from once every two years to once per academic year (including the ensuing summer sessions). The limitation was put in place to prevent abuse of the program but we have not seen any issues with this over the past five years.

- Finally, we are planning to incorporate the program into the campus Alcohol Policy, which is currently undergoing extensive revisions.

### Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment

- During the 2017-18 academic year, the Office of Student Conduct received 28 reports of alleged violations of the University of California Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment policy (SVSH). This is in comparison to 31 reported cases in the 2016-17 academic year and 13 in the 2015-16 academic year. These cases are investigated and adjudicated under the UC system wide Student Adjudication Model.

- We received a range of SVSH case type, including sexual assault, dating/domestic violence, sexual harassment, and stalking. About 54 percent of the 31 reports involved sexual assault or domestic violence, in comparison to 77 percent in 2015-16.

- There was a wide distribution of case resolution for students involved with SVSH incidents reported this past academic year.
  - Ten cases are currently being reviewed for potential investigation.
  - Eight complaints were closed without an investigation due to lack of information, request from the Complainant not to investigate or other factors.
  - Six Respondents are currently in the investigation phase.
  - Three Respondents were found responsible for at least one violation and assigned sanctions.
  - Two Respondents were found not responsible for all alleged violations.

- Two SVSH Respondents were placed on interim suspension prior to or during their case being resolved and two Respondents received sanctions of a one year suspension or more.
STUDENT CONDUCT PROCESS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This is the sixth consecutive year we conducted this assessment for student conduct resolution meetings. Moreover, it is the third straight year we have used the same set of questions with no changes to those questions.

Overall, student responses that ‘strongly agreed’ with the statements they were asked about their experience with the student conduct process continued to maintain their current level or increased. We also continue to see extremely thoughtful comments from students about our process and most importantly, its impact on them as students and the timeliness, or lack thereof, for resolving cases.

We noted continued agreement with student perception of how Student Conduct Officers administer the process. This past year, a record 75 percent of responses indicated that students ‘strongly agree’ with the statement, “I was given the opportunity to explain my perspective about what happened in my incident.” This is a four percentage point increase from 2015-16 and a one percentage point increase from 2016-17. Similarly, a record 74.5 percent of students responding agreed that the Student Conduct Officer assigned fair and appropriate sanctions, an increase of four percentage points from 2015-16. Even more encouraging is the continued increase of students who answered ‘strongly agree’ to this question. Thirty eight percent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ with this question, up from 32.5 percent in 2015-16 and 34.4 percent in 2016-17.

We believe these results continue to show that students generally feel confident they are treated fairly in our process, which appears to create greater satisfaction with their overall experience. The comments illustrate why structuring our process as relational rather than adversarial benefits everyone involved. When students are comfortable meeting with their Student Conduct Officer and receive sanctions tailored to their case, they are more likely to feel their perspective is being heard and more receptive to feedback about positive behavior change.

About 41 percent of the students responding to the survey identified themselves as first year students, about 27 percent identified as second year students, about 17 percent identified as third year students, and eight and a half percent identified as fourth year students. Additionally, more than fourth fifths of respondents (85.1 percent) reported that they live on campus, an increase of three percentage points from 2015-16. The results also showed that over 80 percent of all respondents are from the state of California, including about half of them calling Southern California home.

Typically, 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 through a new student orientation/transfer program. Interestingly, we have seen a three year decrease in the percentage of students who became aware of the Code through their Administrative Resolution meeting. In 2017-18, 26.5 percent of respondents indicated that they became aware of the Code through their administrative resolution meeting, down from 27.4 percent in 2016-17 and 28.9 percent in 2015-16. Conversely, the percentage of students who learned about the Code through their Orientation program increased from 26.7 percent in 2015-16 to nearly 35 percent in 2017-18.
While the majority of students know about the Student Conduct Code prior to being documented for policy violations, this knowledge does not always serve as a deterrent to engaging in such behavior. As a follow-up to whether students are aware of the Student Conduct Code, we ask, “why did you disagree that if you had been better aware of the Student Conduct Code, this incident may not have occurred?” Fifty five percent of the responses stated that they knew about the Code but still engaged in the behavior. Consistent with previous years, a majority of responses noted that they already knew about the Student Conduct Code but either engaged in the behavior anyway or didn’t particularly think about the Code in their decision making process. A large number of comments submitted by respondents about what they learned and how they’ve changed their behavior tend to focus around being more aware of their actions, the process, and potential outcomes.

Given this data, we will assess in the 2018-19 survey whether better awareness of the potential consequences, rather than just of the Code itself, may have prevented the incident from occurring. Asking this question, along with adding a follow-up question about how we can better inform students of these consequences may provide us with valuable data to share with colleagues as they design orientation and training programs.

Timeliness of the process continues to be an area of needed improvement and a major point of emphasis for our office. About 81 percent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ that their incident was resolved within a reasonable amount of time, a three-percentage point increase from 2016-17 and one percentage point increase from 2015-16. We were pleased that the percentage of students who strongly disagreed with this question has decreased in each of the past three years. Timeliness of the process continues to be one of the most frequent concerns students have expressed about the process in their survey answers.

These results remind us that student conduct incidents cast a long shadow over students, even in cases where the potential sanctions aren’t very serious. Students want to resolve the issue at hand and refocus on their academic and other endeavors. As will be discussed in the impact section, we continue to work on speeding up the administrative part of the process to facilitate this important reintegration phase in a timelier manner.

As part of their participation in the student conduct process, we want students to better understand the impact of their behavior, experience positive behavior change, and learn more about the importance of community standards. A record 85.2 percent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ that as a result of meeting with the Student Conduct Officer, they gained a greater understanding of the impact of their behavior on others. Similarly, about 79 percent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ that, as a result of the process, they have changed their behavior positively. In addition, a record 80.6 percent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ that the student conduct process helped them learn about the importance of community standards. These answers show that the vast majority of students who go through the student conduct process are learning about campus standards, gaining a greater understanding of how their behavior impacts others, 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?” About 81 percent of respondents (out of 745 total) responded to this question, which provided us with additional data, albeit anecdotal, to describe what students learned from the process. In evaluating the comments, the most common were from students about being more aware, careful, or responsible with their actions and gaining a better understanding of the student conduct process and policies. Specific responses included:
• “As a part of this process, I have seen first-hand the consequences of my actions. This has allowed me to understand that I need to be more responsible and take into account the severity of my actions that can impact my future and in my career. This has helped me learn that being a good student and a positive member of the school community is very important.”
• “Drinking alcohol, in my dorm, is not a problem. It becomes so, however, when I start disregarding quiet hours and volume size.”
• “I have learned that your sphere of influence has a big impact on an individual. It is critical to surround yourself with people who promote good community values.”
• “The conduct process was a necessary remediation step and I know that it was effective because it has given me a chance to reevaluate my priorities as a university student.”
• “It is absolutely okay to distress and have fun since college is stressful. However, it is not so if you do not know how to handle yourself in these situations.”

IMPACT OF ASSESSMENT ON PROGRAM

The most positive aspect of this assessment is adding to an already robust set of data about the student conduct process. We now have eight years of student conduct statistical data in addition to six years of results from this assessment. We definitively know the number of cases, types of sanctions, and demographic data along with a strong sense of what the students gain from the process and how it affects them in their experience as a student. This data allows us to identify trends, tell the “story” of student conduct at UC San Diego, erase myths, and more effectively plan for each academic year. For us, this assessment is a significant part of our annual planning and evaluation process.

We are once again reminded that the timeliness of the process needs to improve. As a result of the findings from the assessment, we will continue providing extensive assistance, training, and support to the college and residential life offices to assist with improved case turnaround time. For the second straight year, we calculated a comprehensive set of metrics to statistically evaluate case turnaround time, including compiling the number of business days it takes to handle a case from the date of the incident to the date the resolution letter is sent to the student. This past year, case turnaround time came in at an average of 21.4 business days, which translates to a little over one calendar month. While calculating this statistics, we noticed that a few specific factors contributed to longer turnaround times within this overall average.

First, we noticed inconsistency across the residential life offices on how quickly meeting and decision letters were sent to students. The case turnaround time metrics have allowed us to pinpoint the specific staff causing delays in the process, allowing us to work directly with supervisors to alleviate the issues. We have reiterated case turnaround time expectations to colleagues in an effort to provide greater consistency across campus.

Second, we noticed that not following up and closing out cases where a student fails to appear for their meeting significantly increases case turnaround time. We previously made a change to the Student Conduct Code providing that Student Conduct Officers send a second meeting letter to students who fail to reply to the initial letter. We realized that even though the change was made and discussed at meetings, it wasn’t fully implemented in a couple of offices. We’ve already begun reiterating the importance of diligent follow-up with these situations. Quicker response with these letters should assist with decreased turnaround time in 2018-19.
After carefully and thoroughly reviewing this year’s results, we are planning to make major changes to the survey questions over the summer. First, we are looking reducing the size of the survey to make it easier and less time consuming to review the results. The survey is open to students from about two weeks prior to the first day of classes to two weeks after Spring Quarter finals. This window captures the maximum number of students who might respond but leaves less than a month to evaluate the responses, review statistical data, and write this report. Several years ago we significantly reduced the number of questions by half in an effort to make the survey less onerous for students and easier to evaluate. Similarly, we are hoping that by reducing the number of questions, we will facilitate a similar effect in 2018-19.

In addition to shortening the survey, we are revising or adding questions to capture responses about the following information:

- Were students referred to other campus resources (e.g. Student Legal Services, A.S. Advocacy, CAPS, Basic Needs, Off-Campus Student Housing, etc.) during their meeting? If so, which resources were they referred to?
- Did the student become more aware of applicable policies and procedures by participating in the process? If so, which policies and procedures did they learn more about?
- If the student was more aware of the consequences of their behavior (rather than the Code itself), would they have engaged in the behavior at issue?

We are considering removing demographic information questions, including year in school, residence, and home location. We initially included these questions because we had difficulty getting this information from our database. Fortunately, our database provider has made it easier to get this information in our reporting function, so we no longer need it in the survey questions.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

The main lesson we learned this year is to provide Student Conduct Officers (and their supervisors) with their results from the survey. We’ve been extremely effective using the data on a big-picture, programmatic scale but we haven’t distributed the results to our colleagues until this summer. We realized that providing each Student Conduct Officer with the responses and results from the students they met with will give them greater insight into how students perceive their experience with them. We also recognized that providing supervisors with this information helps resolve issues we’ve been working to resolve (e.g. timeliness concerns) but also show them the positive work their staff members are doing through the process. We have wanted to provide this data in the past but time considerations prevented it from happening. This time around, we made a concerted effort to review each Conduct Officer’s results and send them to the Conduct Officers and supervisors. Data is great to have but it doesn’t have as much of an impact if it’s not distributed to the right people.