

OFFICE OF JUDICIAL AFFAIRS
ASSESSMENT SUMMARY
2006-2007

The Office of Judicial Affairs seeks to foster a campus community that provides students with opportunity to reach their educational goals and a community that protects the health, safety, property, and human right of faculty, staff, and students. The Office of Judicial Affairs serves the University by helping to maintain a safe and secure campus community through administration of the Student Conduct Code. To help carry out the mission of the University, the Office of Judicial Affairs enforces the appropriate rules, regulations and policies. When students are charged with violations of the Student Conduct Code, a hearing is held to determine whether or not a violation has occurred. Hearings are held before the University Judicial Board and the Student Conduct Officer. However, if a student acknowledges the violation, he/she can waive their right to a hearing and sanctions will be imposed by the Judicial Affairs Officer.

The purpose of the judicial disciplinary process is educational and sanctions are imposed to teach. As the University Judicial Board hears the majority of the cases and is primarily composed of students, they must be knowledgeable about the University and the Student Conduct Code.

Goal 1, “Student Judicial Procedures Will Be Understood by the University Judicial Board” (UJB).

The outcome of this goal is to determine whether the UJB is sufficiently trained to carry out the duties of hearing cases and determining violations. The training sessions are the primary means of presenting hearing procedures, and the policies and procedures of the Student Conduct Code. Faculty and students who serve on the University Judicial Board are elected in the student elections and faculty is assigned through Faculty Senate. Their familiarity with student judicial procedures is varied.

To determine if the UJB is sufficiently trained to carry out its duties. A survey is used to rate the effectiveness of the training and whether the training provided each Judicial Board member with the necessary information to carry out their duties. The survey is distributed each Spring semester by April 30th. A UJB Training Manual was developed to focus on areas that the UJB indicated more information was needed. Per the recommendation of CSU’s Assessment Review Team, a Pre/Post Test was added to the training in order to provide a direct measure of assessing the effectiveness of the training sessions. Over the past three years, 90% (2004-05), 100% (2005-06) and 95% (2006-07) of the Judicial Board members rated the training effective. The average score for the Pre/Post Test was 90%. To serve on the UJB, all members must be trained. For the past three years, 100 % of the Judicial Board members were trained.

In addition, to serve on the UJB, all members must be receiving training. For the past three (3) years, 2004-05, 2005-06, and 2006-07, 100% of the UJB received training.

Goal 2, “Students Involved With The Judicial Process Will Think It Is Fair,

The purpose of this goal is to obtain student’s perspective on the judicial process and to determine if students involved in the judicial process think their viewpoint in the case is represented (fair) regardless of the hearing body. This is extremely important because one of the purposes of the hearing is for each side to have an opportunity to be heard. The data collected via survey shows that in 2005-06, 75% of the students thought that the process was fair which met the outcome measure. The 75% is probably due to students who had their case heard before the University Judicial Board because they did not respond to the notice of charge and students who selected the UJB initially but later wish they had selected a different hearing body. The UJB is the hearing body by default if a student does not respond by the five (5) working day deadline. 50% of the students who responded said that they should have selected a different hearing body “because students can be tough on other students”. However, they also indicated that they selected the UJB because they thought students would give them a “break”. As the surveys are sent to the students after the hearing and after sanctions have been imposed, students found in violation, may be cynical. Survey responses are anonymous so that the student can be more candid with their responses. To determine whether or not a correlation exists between students found in violation versus a student found not in violation, a question was added in 2004-05 to the survey about whether or not the student was found in violation.

In 2004-05:100 % of the students who returned the survey rated the process as fair and the research conducted shows no correlation between the violation and fairness. But during 2004-05, more students selected to have their case heard before the Judicial Affairs Officer, meaning that they acknowledged that they violated the code as charged. During the session with the Judicial Affairs Officer where the student accepts responsibility for the charges, they have an opportunity to discuss the possible sanctions with the JAO and agree to accept them. This seems to have had an impact on the 40% improvement rate over the 2003-04 year. In 2005-06, 75% of the students who returned the survey rated the process as fair and in 2006-07, 90% of the students rated the process as fair.

Goal 3: Students Found in Violation of CSU Drug and Alcohol Policy Will Complete Sanctions

In order for students to learn from the judicial process, the completion of sanctions that have been imposed is very important. This goal is concerned with making sure students complete the sanctions imposed when they are found in violation of the drug and alcohol policy. All students who are found in violation of a drug or alcohol violation (after all appeals are exhausted) must attend a drug and/or alcohol education session and complete a project. Meeting this outcome continues to be a challenge because total enforcement

would require a heavy handiness that may cause more harm than good i.e. Do we want to suspend or expel a student who has not completed a paper on drug or alcohol use? However, as the goal has not met the 100%, the review committee revised the goal to what can be realistically enforced. The intent is to have students complete the sanctions so that they can learn about alcohol and drug use. Based on the number of alcohol and drug cases for 2005-06, (19 alcohols and 13 drugs) a 75% completion rate would meet the goal. For the 2006-07 year, the Office of Judicial Affairs placed “holds” on the records of those students that have not or do not complete drug and alcohol sanctions. This resulted in a 90% completion rate for 2006-07. In addition, the Parental Notification Policy combined with speaking to parents about alcohol use among college students during orientation, also seems to have some impact with the completion rate. The most significant impact is the holds that have been placed on student records. The 90% completion rate for 2006-07 is 20% higher than the previous year.

The effectiveness of those students who do complete sanctions is measured by the recidivism rate for both drug and alcohol. In 2005-06, the outcome measured was changed to report whole numbers rather than percentages. In 2005-06 0/ 19 students were repeaters of an alcohol violation and 2 / 13 students were repeaters of a drug violation. In 2006-07, 2/15 students were repeaters of an alcohol violation and there were no reports of drug violations.

As the Office of Judicial Affairs is committed to providing students with the highest quality services and ensuring that the judicial disciplinary process resolves conflict, the Office of Judicial Affairs will begin to educate and develop programming for students who are found in violation of **Section III.T. Misuse of Computers**. During the 2006-07 academic year, the Office of Judicial Affairs has had a significant number of complaints regarding the inappropriate use of Face book by students. Based on the nature of the complaints and the lasting impact of information posted in cyberspace, the Office of Judicial Affairs sees this as an important issue that needs to be addressed.

These goals focus on the basic principles of the office, which is the health, safety, and human right of the campus community in addition to the moral and ethical development of students.

Valerie Hinton Hannah
Judicial Affairs Officer

Revised 5/22/07

List of Program Goals

Department or Unit Name: Department of Student Life

Individual Completing Form: Valerie Hinton Hannah

Program Name: Judicial Affairs

Date: 18-May-07 Data for (2006-2007) Revised

Goal 1:

Student Judicial policies and procedures will be understood by the University Judicial Board.

Goal 2:

Students involved with the campus judicial process will think it is fair.

Goal 3:

Students found in violation of CSU Drug or Alcohol Policies will complete sanctions.
--

Program Assessment Report

Department or Unit Name: Student Life

Individual Completing Form: Valerie Hinton Hannah

Program Name: Judicial Affairs

Date: 18-May-07

Goal #1 Student Judicial policies and procdures will be understood by the University Judicial Board

Outcome Measures	Research Completed	Findings	Review	Actions	Improvements
# 1 80% of the University Judicial Board (UJB) members, who receive training, will rate the training as understandable and effective.	All UJB members were surveyed at the end of Spring semester/2007. This is completed on an annual basis.	2004-05: 90% of the UJB rated the training as understandable and effective. 2005-2006: 100% of the UJB rated the training as understandable and effective. 2006-2007: 95 % rated the training as understandable and effective.	Judicial Affairs Officer, Dean of Students, CAS review team	2004-05 Training manual developed 2005-06: Added midyear training review session; pre/post test added to training session as a direct measurement of training. 2006-07 same as above.	2004-05: Exceeded outcome measure by 10%. 2005-06: Exceeded outcome measure by 20%. 2006-07: Exceeded outcome measure by 15%.
#2 100% of the UJB will attend the training session	Data on the UJB training is tabulated at the end of Spring semester.	2004-05: 100% attendance. 2005-06: 100% attendance. 2006-07: 100% attendance	Judicial Affairs Officer, Dean of Students, CAS review team.	2004-05: No additional action warranted. 2005-06: Same as above. 2006-07: Same as above.	

Program Assessment Report

Department or Unit Name: Student Life

Individual Completing Form: Valerie Hinton Hannah

Program Name: Judicial Affairs

Date: 18-May-07

Goal # 2

Student who are involved in the Campus Judicial Process will think it is fair.
--

Outcome Measures	Research Completed	Findings	Review	Actions	Improvements
#1 75% of students who are involved in the Judicial Process will rate the process as fair	All students involved in the judicial process were surveyed at the end of each semester.	2004-05: 100% of the student who returned the survey rated the process as fair. 2005-06: 75% of the students who returned the survey rated the process as fair. 2006-07: 90% of the students who returned the survey rated the process as fair.	Dean of Student Life wanted to know the level of student satisfaction with the judicial process.	2004-05: Fairness rating increase is due to an increase number of students who had their case heard before the Judicial Affairs Officer. This provides students with an opportunity to participate in the sanctioning process. 2005-06 Students who did not respond to the notice of charge and had their case referred to the UJB rather than the JAO rated the process as fair. But, this was lower than the previous year.	2004-05: Outcome measure met by 40%. 2005-06: Outcome measure met. 2006-07: Outcome measure met by 15%.

Program Assessment Report

Department or Unit Name: Student Life

Individual Completing Form: Valerie Hinton Hannah

Program Name: Judicial Affairs

Date: 18-May-07

Goal #3

Students Found In Violation of the CSU Drug or Alcohol Policy Will Complete Sanctions

Outcome Measures	Research Completed	Findings	Review	Actions	Improvements
#1 75% of the students found in violation of the alcohol policy will complete sanctions.	Data on the sanctions completed by the student found in violation of alcohol policy is collected each semester	2004-05: 70% (19 of 27students completed alcohol sanction) 2005-06: 70% (12 of 19 students completed alcohol sanctions) 2006-07: 90% (13 of 15 students completed alcohol sanctions).	Alcohol violations were reviewed by the Judicial Affairs Officer an the Dean of Students.	2004-05 Students meet with Judicial Affairs Officer for Alcohol/Drug Education. 2005-06 "Holds were placed on student records for those who did not complete sanctons. 2006-07: Continue with above.	Holds on student records improved the findings for 2005-06 as those students could not register until completing sanction. Also, decreased the number of alcohol referrals for 2006-07.
#2 75% of the students found in violation of the drug policy will complete sanctions.	Data on the sanctions completed by the student found in violation of drug policy is collected each semester	2004-05 70% (12 of 17 students completed drug sanctions). 2005-06: 50% (4 of 8 students completed drug sanction) 2006-07: No referrals for drug violations.	Drug violations are reviewed by the Judicial Affairs Officer, the Dean of Student Life.	2005-06 Holds placed on students records for non-compliance with sanctions. 2006-07 No referrals for drug violations.	
#3 The recidivism rate for both alcohol and drug violations will be 5% or less.	Broaden drug and alcohol education programs. Develop a more pro-active approach. Data concerning drug and alcohol recidivism is collected at the end of each semester.	2005-06 : 0/19 alcohol repeaters. 2005-06: 2/13 drug repeaters. 2006-07: 2/15 alcohol repeaters. 2006-07: 0/0 drug repeaters	Judicial Affairs Officer and the Dean of Students.	Continue alcohol and drug education sessions. Individual follow-up sessions, parental notification policy, and have more intensive counseling for repeaters.	Recidivism rate is in keeping with desired outcome.