

UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC



**Division of Student Life
STUDENT CONDUCT & COMMUNITY STANDARDS**

Program Review

November - December 2012

Committee Report

Program Review Committee

Jessica Chi

Joan Lin-Cereghino

Delores E. McNair

Jamie Pontius-Hogan

James Smith

Stacie Turks

Kyle Watson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	4
Individual Reports	
Mission.....	8
Program.....	8
Leadership.....	10
Human Resources	11
Ethics	11
Legal Responsibilities.....	12
Equity and Access.....	13
Diversity.....	14
Organization and Management.....	15
Campus and External Relations.....	16
Financial Resources	17
Technology	17
Facilities and Equipment	18
Assessment and Evaluation	19
Related websites.....	20

Overview

The *Self-Study: Student Conduct and Community Standards Office* is an extensive, in-depth review of the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards (SCCS). Using the program assessment standards developed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), the self-study examined 14 aspects of the Office of SCCS and concluded with 11 recommendations. The program review committee examined each of the 14 standards by first reading the report and recommendations in the self-study; this was followed by a series of interviews, a survey of conduct board members, and a review of additional documents. In general, the program review committee also supports the recommendations offered in the self-study and believes that these recommendations will allow the Office of SCCS to continue serving the many needs of the university. The committee's recommendations are summarized below. Specific comments and recommendations related to each of the 14 standards are provided on pages 8-19.

Commendations

The program review committee commends the work of the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards in several key areas: introducing established best practices to Pacific; working collaboratively with key campus groups, including public safety, student groups, and faculty; and responding quickly, consistently, and fairly to alleged violations of the student code of conduct.

Committee Recommendations

The recommendations from the program review committee focus on five broad areas: financial resources, training and development, three-campus coordination, assessment, and staffing. The recommendations are presented in no specific priority order.

Financial Resources

Consistent with the CAS standards (Standard 11), the Office of Student Conduct would benefit from a specific budget and operating funds. This will allow the Division of Student Life to better identify ways to fund the expansion of services provided by the Office of SCCS including training, assessment, education, outreach, technology, and staffing.

Recommendation: Provide the Office of SCCS with a specific budget and operating funds to support the expansion of services as described above.
--

Training and Development

In order to ensure consistent responses to violations of the student code of conduct, university staff at all three campuses and hearing board members require on-going training. Board members have participated in a wide array of training; due to turnover on the board as well as changes in regulations, annual or semi-annual training opportunities will keep board members updated. The program review committee encourages the Office of SCCS to maintain current training efforts for board members. The Office is encouraged to seek alternative forms of training for board members, including on-line training options (similar to the sexual harassment prevention training provided through the Office of Human Resources). Additional training for faculty in relation to preventing and responding to incidents of academic dishonesty will lead to more consistent responses at all university locations. Similarly, specific training in Title IX investigations that is offered at all three campus locations will ensure consistency in the adjudication of cases.

Recommendation: Provide on-going training to university staff and hearing board members to ensure consistent responses at all university locations and consistency in the adjudication of cases.
--

Three-Campus Coordination

The program review illuminated concerns about different procedures for responding to violations of the student code of conduct at each of the three campuses. While program review

committee members recognize the important distinctions between undergraduate students, graduate students (including those in the professional schools), students who live in the residence halls, and students who participate in Greek organizations, it is imperative that the university develop an overarching statement related to student conduct that describes values and expectations related to student behavior. In addition, it is recommended that the university adopt a common set of prohibited behaviors as well as a reasonably consistent set of procedures for addressing complaints of student misconduct.

As the university expands offerings at the Sacramento and San Francisco campus, the distinction between professional graduate students and other students who may be attending classes at the campus will become less clear. Clarity should be provided to students to identify the judicial processes and policies when attending classes on different campuses. Consistency in student policies between the Stockton undergraduate campus and professional schools in Stockton, Sacramento, and San Francisco will ensure that students moving between the campuses meet the same academic and behavioral expectations of conduct. Concomitantly, the roles of the current staff members who serve as conduct officers at the three campuses may become less clear. Faculty, students, and staff will benefit from clearly defined roles and procedures for reporting and responding to alleged violations of the student code of conduct.

Recommendations: To ensure a fair and equitable student conduct process: (1) Develop an overarching statement regarding student conduct that includes the values and expectations related to student behavior. (2) Adopt a common set of prohibited behaviors as well as a reasonably consistent set of procedures for addressing complaints of student misconduct.

Assessment

The Office of SCCS is to be commended for its regular assessment of Pacific students. The program review committee recommends that the Office expand its assessment efforts to include students who have been sanctioned as well as current board members. Student assessments will help the program confirm that students are meeting learning objectives

established by the Office. Regular assessment of board members can help identify areas for development and training.

Recommendation: Expand current assessment efforts in order to confirm that students who have been sanctioned are meeting learning outcomes; include regular assessment of board members to identify training needs.

Staffing

The increase in the number of reported violations of the student code of conduct; plans to expand course offerings at the Sacramento, Stockton, and San Francisco campuses; efforts to develop an on-line tracking/monitoring system; and the need for additional training and assessment, suggest a need to increase staff in the Office of SCCS. Because the program's current initiatives are vested in a limited number of staff, any staff departures could compromise the integrity of the student conduct process.

The Director of SCCS currently provides training in relation to due process procedures, prevention, and specific subjects (such as investigating allegations of sexual misconduct). The program review committee recommends that training efforts be delineated so the Director can focus on prevention, intervention, and procedural training. Subject-specific training offered by a different staff member will help ensure a separation of responsibilities and provide greater potential for sustainability of the current positive work done in the Office of SCCS. Furthermore, an additional staff member can manage technology upgrades and conduct outreach efforts throughout the university. While it is beyond the purview of the program review committee to make recommendations regarding specific organizational structures, it is clear that additional staff will allow the Office of SCCS to expand services as described above and protect the interests of the university.

Recommendations: (1) Hire additional staff in the Office of SCCS to expand programs and services as described above. (2) Designate one university official responsible for overseeing student conduct procedures at the three campus locations.

Part 1. Mission

1. Reviewed by: Delores E. McNair, Assistant Professor, Gladys L. Benerd School of Education
2. Process of Review: Interviewed Linda Dempsey, Heather Dunn Carlton, Lou Matz, Jenn Mazzota; William Oye (Diablo Valley College and member of the Association of Student Conduct Administration [ASCA] since 1995); interviewed by Jamie Pontius-Hogan in relation to this standard: Daniel Bender and Mary McGuire. Current students, staff, and faculty who serve on conduct boards were surveyed (59 board members responded to the survey). Students who have received sanctions were also contacted for this report; of the 20 who were contacted, none responded to the request to be interviewed.
3. Consistency of Part 1 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study is consistent with the CAS Standards.
4. Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study: The self-study includes a recommendation that the university "establish a three-campus process for the review of student conduct policy violations that ensures compliance with all state and federal regulations, while also taking into consideration the unique constituencies and student needs at each campus." The results of the program review support this recommendation.
5. Additional Comments: While the professional standards and ethics for each of the professional schools may require a different level of response, it is essential that the university establish overarching values related to student conduct as well as standards for responding to violations student conduct codes in a fair and consistent manner.

<p>Review Committee Recommendations: The Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards should work with representatives from the three campuses, School of Pharmacy, residential and Greek life to develop (a) an overarching statement regarding prohibited behaviors and (b) the processes for responding to and adjudicating violations of the student code of conduct.</p>
--

Part 2. Program

1. Reviewed by: Delores E. McNair, Assistant Professor, Gladys L. Benerd School of Education
2. Process of Review: Interviewed Linda Dempsey, Heather Dunn Carlton, Lou Matz, Jenn Mazzota; William Oye (Diablo Valley College and member of the Association of Student Conduct Administration [ASCA] since 1995); interviewed by Jamie Pontius-Hogan in relation to this standard: Daniel Bender and Mary McGuire. Current students, staff, and faculty who serve on conduct boards were surveyed (59 board members responded to the survey). Students who have received sanctions were also contacted for this report; of the 20 who were contacted, none responded to the request to be interviewed.
3. Consistency of Part 2 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study is consistent with the CAS Standards.
4. Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study: There were several recommendations related to this standard in the Self-Study. These included developing on-line monitoring and tracking system, creating a plan for disseminating information to the campus community to

support prevention and intervention, providing additional staffing, and adjusting the current procedures related to the recruitment of potential faculty panelists (currently coordinated by Academic Council. An additional recommendation from self-study indicates that "A joint committee should be established to review all policies, ensure appropriate levels of consistency, and confirm compliance with all state and federal regulations, and communication of records between campuses."

5. Additional Comments: Separate policies and procedures related to the adjudication of student conduct issues have evolved at the three university campuses (Sacramento, San Francisco, and Stockton). On the Stockton campus, separate procedures have also evolved in the Thomas J. Long School of Pharmacy, residential life, and Greek life. The different procedures reflect ethical standards related to the professional schools as well as internal procedures of the Greek organizations. While there is a need to ensure a consistent response to violations of the student code of conduct, it is also important to recognize the different professional standards and ethics. Regular (i.e., annual or semi-annual) meetings of the staff responsible for adjudicating matters related to student conduct may help ensure fairness and safeguard students' due process. As the university expands offerings at the three campuses, it will be essential to identify students' rights and responsibilities, due process procedures, and staff who will respond to violations of the student code of conduct.

There is a need for on-going training for staff at all three campuses, in the professional schools, and housing/Greek life. Training can help ensure that board members have the skills needed to respond to the complex issues presented. The Office of SCCS is to be commended to providing supplemental training for board members who are asked to adjudicated cases involving sexual misconduct. While most panelists generally agreed or strongly agreed they were prepared to serve on boards related to alcohol violations, drug violations, and academic dishonesty, there was less agreement about preparation for serving on boards related to a sexual assault case. Since the training for board members on sexual assault cases is supplemental, it may be that respondents had not yet participated in the training. Annual or semi-annual training for board members will continue to support the development of new board members. Such training could be in-person or on-line (similar to the training module for preventing sexual harassment in the workplace).

The Office of SCCS is to be commended for working with faculty to integrate learning modules related to academic honesty and sexual consent in Pacific Seminar courses. These experiences help reinforce Pacific's values and promote positive community standards.

Interviewees expressed concern that faculty may not consistently report violations of the student code of conduct, especially in relation to academic dishonesty. There is a sense that faculty members prefer to respond to such incidents individually without reporting them to the Dean of Students. These approaches make it difficult for university officials to identify students who may consistently violate Pacific's honor code. An on-line tracking system would be one way to provide a university-level response to multiple violations; however, the system may not alleviate faculty members' reluctance to report violations. Consultation with Pacific's Academic Council may provide some insight into ways this issue could be addressed; similarly, integrating a module into the orientation and training for new faculty could help. Annual workshops offered through the Center for Teaching and Learning may be another option.

Creating a plan for disseminating information about student conduct may support efforts aimed at prevention and intervention. Providing a report similar to the *Clery Report* (campus crime statistics) may help broaden awareness of the types of incidents that occur at the university. Including a comparison to national trends could help contextualize the information for readers. The information in the report could be used to design new training efforts aimed at prevention and intervention as well as to update the curriculum in the Pacific Seminars.

Review Committee Recommendations: (1) It is unclear whether a new committee is required in order to develop consistent values and procedures on the three campuses. At a minimum, SCCS should work with professional schools and housing/Greek life to create an overarching statement regarding student conduct processes and training. Regular (i.e., annual) evaluation and coordination of efforts can help ensure consistency while maintaining processes specific to the professional standards of dentistry, law, and pharmacy as well as housing and Greek life. (2) The Office of SCCS should continue its efforts to train new board members and provide on-going, regular training for board members, including supplemental training for cases involving sexual misconduct. (3) The program review committee recommends that the Office of SCCS prepare and disseminate an informational report related to violations of the student code of conduct. (4) The Academic Council can be a key partner in supporting the work of the Office of SCCS in three areas: (a) identification of potential board members, (b) response to incidents of academic dishonesty, and (c) training of new faculty. The program review committee supports the recommendation in the Self-Study that the Director of SCCS work with the Academic Council to identify potential board members. In addition, the program review committee recommends that the Office of SCCS continue to work with faculty to develop/update learning modules for Pacific Seminar as needed. Finally, the program review committee recommends that the Office of SCCS work with the Academic Council to design and offer workshops related to preventing and responding to incidents of academic dishonesty.

Part 3. Leadership

1. Reviewed by: Jamie Pontius-Hogan, Assistant Dean of Student Life, Stanford University
2. Process of Review: Following a review of Part 3 of the *Self-Study: Student Conduct and Community Standards Office*, themes were highlighted for further review. Interviews were conducted to ascertain additional information and detail with Daniel Bender, Ben Ellis, Heather Dunn Carlton, Lynn King, Mary McGuire, Joanna Royce-Davis, and Stacie Turks.
3. Consistency of Part 3 with CAS Standards: The SCCS is led by Director Heather Dunn Carlton, with support from a shared staff person and two part-time graduate assistants. The self-study provides an overview of the responsibilities of the Director of Student Conduct and Community Standards. The Director is well qualified to meet the obligations of her role, and has specific expertise in the areas of collegiate alcohol and drug prevention efforts and Title IX requirements. The SCCS Director collaborates with various university entities to provide support and guidance in upholding campus policy.
4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: No recommendations were offered in the Self-Study for Part 3: Leadership.
5. The positive working relationships between and among the Student Conduct Hearing Officers on the Stockton campus allows for collaborative decision-making regarding appropriate venues

to adjudicate conduct cases. Though current consensus appoints leadership to the SCCS Director, should disagreement in recommended procedure occur, no formal authority resides with the SCCS Director. Considerations should be made for the sustainability of the current program; if staffing structure changes or new people begin to attend the weekly meetings, there is no clear line of authority.

Review Committee Recommendations: (1) For the sake of consistency and transparency, the decision-making structure on the Stockton campus should be clarified. (2) Designate a university official responsible for overseeing student conduct procedures at the three campus locations.

Part 4. Human Resources

1. Reviewed by: Jessica Chi, Student
2. Process of Review: Interview with Heather Dunn Carlton, Director of Student Conduct and Community Standards
3. Consistency of Part 4 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study is consistent with the CAS Standards.
4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: Self-Study recommends that an Assistant Director position be created to ensure compliance with all federal regulations related to student conduct, permit more timely review of student conduct cases, and provide an additional qualified staff member to assist the Director. The self study also includes a recommendation for full-time support staffing for SCCS and an established agreement with Housing and Greek Life for continued support of two graduate student positions with SCCS, including summer staffing.
5. Additional Comments: Based on the amount and scope of the work related to student conduct and community standards, the results of the program review support these recommendations.

Review Committee Recommendations: Provide SCCS with more staffing, including full-time professional staff and graduate staff.

Part 5. Ethics

1. Reviewed by: Stacie Turks, Director, Counseling Services
2. Process of Review: Interviewed Mary McGuire, Asst. Dean of Student Affairs (includes serving as the Student Conduct Officer) at McGeorge School of Law on 11/7/12. Interviewed Jamie Pontius-Hogan from Stanford University on 11/14/12. Interviewed Daniel Bender, Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs and Registrar at Dugoni Dental School on 11/16/12. Reviewed Ethical Principles and Standards of Conduct from Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA).
3. Consistency of Part 5 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study is consistent with the CAS Standards.

4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: The recommendation from the self-study to establish a three campus process for review of conduct policy violations seems appropriate, especially in the context of the university plan to add majors and programs (undergraduate and graduate) to the Sacramento and San Francisco campuses.
5. Additional Comments: The process of adjudication at the dental school is as follows:
All allegations of unethical student behavior are investigated by a senior faculty member (appointed by the Dean) acting as an Initial Reviewer. If there is sufficient evidence to support the allegations and the student agrees to the proposed sanction, the Initial Reviewer recommends the appropriate disciplinary action to the Dean. If the student disagrees with the findings of the Initial Reviewer or the proposed sanction, the allegation will then be forwarded to the Ethics Committee.

The ethics committee conducts hearings on matters related to student behavior and violations of the Code of Ethics. The committee is a joint faculty-administrative committee comprised of a chair selected by the Dental Faculty Council, three elected faculty members, and five elected students, one from each DDS and IDS class. In addition, four elected faculty members and three elected students, one from each class, act as alternates, and may be called to serve during committee review of a complaint that may involve an elected member or when an elected member is unable to be present. Recommendations of the ethics committee are submitted to the dean for action. The decision of the dean can only be appealed through University channels (Office of the Provost). Privileged information related to petitions, petitioners, and all deliberations and recommendations of the committee are treated as confidential and will remain "in committee" except as reported through appropriate channels.

Students attending the McGeorge School of Law receive a copy of the "Code of Student Responsibility" at orientation. The process of procedural rules for adjudicating a complaint is as follows:

A complaint is submitted in writing to the dean. The Dean or designee may reach a disposition by agreement with the student, refer the matter to presenting counsel, or dismiss the complaint.

Review Committee Recommendations: Establish a three-campus process for review of conduct policy violations to ensure procedural fairness and comparable due process.

Part 6. Legal Responsibilities

1. Reviewed by: Stacie Turks, Director, Counseling Services
2. Process of Review: Interviewed Mary McGuire, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs (includes serving as the Student Conduct Officer) at McGeorge School of Law on 11/7/12. Interviewed Jamie Pontius-Hogan from Stanford University on 11/14/12. Interviewed Daniel Bender, Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs and Registrar at Dugoni School of Dentistry on 11/16/12. Reviewed Ethical Principles and Standards of Conduct from Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA).
3. Consistency of Part 6 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study is consistent with the CAS Standards.

4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: The recommendation from the self-study to establish a three campus process for review of conduct policy violations seems appropriate, especially in the context of the university plan to add majors and programs (undergraduate and graduate) to the Sacramento and San Francisco campuses.
5. Additional Comments: All interviewees indicated that they are following the legal guidelines required by the professions.

Review Committee Recommendations: Establish a three-campus process for review of conduct policy violations to ensure procedural fairness and comparable due process.
--

Part 7. Equity and Access

1. Reviewed by: Kyle Watson, Associate Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering
2. Process of Review: Following a review of Part 7 of the *Self-Study: Student Conduct and Community Standards Office*, phone interviews with Daniel Nuss, Director of Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD), and Serjio Acevedo, Director of Multicultural Affairs, were conducted.
3. Consistency of Part 7 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study is consistent with the CAS Standards.
4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: The recommendation to extend efforts to recruit students from under-represented schools and colleges is supported by the review committee.
5. Additional Comments: SCCS has developed a fair and equitable process for dealing with students with disabilities and the complications that arise when a student with a disability is involved in a violation of the student code of conduct. It is important for SCCS to determine whether a disability has been a contributing factor in the violation of the student code of conduct and SSD is frequently contacted by SCCS regarding this topic. The collaborative relationship between SCCS and SSD was initiated by the current Director of SCCS and this relationship provides a valuable service for our students.

SSD indicates that some students are made aware of SSD through having committed a violation of the student code of conduct and receiving a sanction that involves utilizing the support of SSD. These students often continue to use the support of SSD beyond the term of their sanction thereby providing an example of an educational rather than punitive approach to violations of the student code of conduct.

Alternative promotional campaigns (social media, etc.) could be used to recruit a more diverse population of board members, in particular student board members. In particular, promotional campaigns could be used to publicize these positions to students from under-represented schools and colleges.

Review Committee Recommendations: (1) SCCS should continue their collaboration with SSD and utilize the services provided by SSD in cases where these services would provide an educational benefit to the student. (2) With appropriate staffing, an alternative promotional campaign (social media, etc.) could be used to recruit a more diverse population of student members. (3) Faculty and staff from units that have under-represented hearing board membership should be contacted to aid in the recruitment of students from these units.

Part 8. Diversity

1. Reviewed by: Kyle Watson, Associate Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering
2. Process of Review: Following a review of Part 8 of the *Self-Study: Student Conduct and Community Standards Office*, phone interviews with Serjio Acevedo, Director of Multicultural Affairs, and Lisa Cooper, Assistant VP for Diversity and Community Engagement, were conducted.
3. Consistency of Part 8 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study is consistent with the CAS Standards.
4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: There were no recommendations in this section.
5. Additional Comments: Policies that are in place within SCCS that allow for alternative processes to hearing boards that are aimed at the restorative and educational impact on the students are appreciated. An example of this is an incident involving an academic fraternity that resulted in insensitive, stereotypical remarks about African-American students, where rather than hearing boards, an alternative event was organized in order to educate the involved students about this issue.

Over the past two years, SCCS and the Office of Multicultural Affairs have coordinated their orientation presentations with the goal of creating (a) an inclusive community and (b) an environment conducive to learning. This has resulted in developing a common language between these programs that can be used to educate Pacific Ambassadors and Student Advisors about these topics, and, in turn, they can be more effectively communicated to the freshman class.

SCCS has a broad awareness of policies at the institutional level and beyond that are required in order to have a non-bias response to student issues. SCCS does a good job of reaching out and connecting with other offices in Student Life who might be able to serve as a bridge and provide support for students that are going through difficult times. It is important that students of all backgrounds not feel intimidated by a process that could easily seem punitive in nature when the focus is actually on educating the student. SCCS does a good job of making sure the educational benefit of the process is realized.

Review Committee Recommendations: (1) SCCS should continue their collaboration with the Office of Multicultural Affairs in organizing orientation efforts that focus on creating an inclusive community within an environment conducive to learning. (2) SCCS should also continue to seek the input of and collaborate with other offices from the Division of Student Life in dealing with sensitive student issues.

Part 9. Organization and Management

1. Reviewed by: Jamie Pontius-Hogan, Assistant Dean of Student Life, Stanford University
2. Process of Review: Following a review of Part 9 of the *Self-Study: Student Conduct and Community Standards Office*, themes were highlighted for further review. Interviews were conducted to ascertain additional information and detail with Daniel Bender, Heather Dunn Carlton, Ben Ellis, Lynn King, Mary McGuire, Joanna Royce-Davis, and Stacie Turks.
3. Consistency of Part 9 with CAS Standards: Recent changes to the organizational structure of Student Leadership and Involvement have an ongoing impact on SCCS. Though the internal organization of the office remains the same, reporting channels and real and perceived authority may continue to shift. There is a commonly identified responsibility for workflow as well as the training and monitoring of graduate student staff members.
4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: There were no recommendations in this section.
5. Additional Comments: The current case management system serves its purpose, but more sophisticated systems exist that would allow for routine administrative tasks to be standardized. This would allow professional staff to re-dedicate time for aspirational, rather than reactive, goal setting.

Considerations should be made for the sustainability of the program, as the internal organizational structure is based on the skill set of current staff. The Director has responsibilities for both prevention and adjudication, and in some instances (i.e., Title IX concerns), there can be a perceived conflict of interest. Adding an additional FTE with experience in conduct and/or prevention work would allow for in-depth programming in the specified areas.

Student conduct efforts do not appear to be coordinated across Pacific's three campuses. The McGeorge School of Law and Dugoni School of Dentistry have policies in place to serve students on their campus, but the entire University would benefit from a formal connection between these locations in communicating policy and adjudicating conduct. The shift to a three-campus model should be reflected in the expectations of and by members of the student communities.

Review Committee Recommendations: (1) To ensure procedural fairness, consideration of creating an overarching statement outlining due process inclusive of all three campuses is encouraged. As undergraduate students begin to take courses on campuses other than the Stockton campus, clarification should be provided as to what process applies to those students. (2) Difference in authority for conduct decisions on the three campuses should be reviewed, and administrative titles should reflect appropriate formality for interactions with faculty and off campus representatives.

Part 10. Campus and External Relations

1. Reviewed by: Joan Lin-Cereghino, Professor and Assistant Chair of Biological Sciences
2. Process of Review: Part 10 of the *Self-Study: Student Conduct and Community Standards Office* was reviewed through individual discussions with Stacie Turks, Director of the Counseling Services; Gregg Jongeward, Senior Associate Dean of the College of the Pacific; Holly Trexler, Associate Director of Athletics; Mary Ann Pearson, Student Victim Advocate; Marcos Gridi-Papp, Assistant Professor of Biological Sciences; Peggy Rosson, Assistant Dean of Students; Heather Dunn Carlton, Director, Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards, and Corrie Martin, Director, Women's Resource Center.
3. Consistency of Part 1 with CAS Standards: The Self-Study was consistent with the mission and the CAS standards.
4. Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study: There were no recommendations in this section.
5. Additional Comments: All the staff and faculty from the organizations interviewed responded very positively about existing interactions with the Student Conduct and Community Standards Office. Though some encouraged further outreach and training with external organizations, such as the Women's Center of San Joaquin, all interviewees universally praised the efforts of the Director to carry out the mission of SCCS, specifically those aimed at prevention. All departments interviewed expressed the desire to continue the robust relationships with SCCS.

However, despite the strongly complimentary tone of all commentary, some suggestions to strengthen the relationship and position of SCCS within the campus and with external entities can be offered:

(1) The website for Student Conduct and Community Standards is currently accessed through 'Safety and Conduct' under 'Campus Life'. Perhaps the link to SCCS could be put directly under the Student Life Division instead of on the same page at the University Police.

(2) The Self-Study mentions the generation of a report that documents the results of all violations and subsequent actions of the SCCS. Such a report would be central to showcase all the efforts of the SCCS to the external community and internal community of Pacific. It might also help with prevention as the students see the consequences of their choices. The publication and posting of this annual report is strongly encouraged, although an additional staff person or alternate data retrieval system might be necessary for the report to come to fruition.

(3) Communication and handling of student conduct violations by housing and athletics are facilitated by weekly meetings with SCCS.

Faculty members, though improving, are the least consistent in reporting and acting upon violations of the student conduct code. Additionally, there are differences between the different schools as to the consequences of confirmed violations. Perhaps it would be beneficial to add training regarding the Honor Code during New Faculty Orientation to instill at an early stage the necessity of using the services of the SCCS. Such training could lead to stronger relationship between faculty and the SCCS.

Review Committee Recommendations: The committee recommends that the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards continue to maintain the excellent relationships it has with campus organization and external entities. To strengthen these relationship, the Review Committees recommends: (1) linking the website of Student Conduct and Community Standards directly to the webpage of the Student Life Division, (2) following through on the publication of a complete report of SCCS cases and outcomes, and (3) introducing new faculty to the services of the SCCS and the necessity of reporting violations of the Honor Code at Pacific.

Part 11. Financial Resources

1. Reviewed by: Jessica Chi, Student
2. Process of Review: Interviewed Heather Dunn Carlton, Director, Student Conduct and Community Standards
3. Consistency of Part 11 with CAS Standards: Because the Office of SCCS has no programmatic funds specifically allocated as an operational budget, it is difficult to assess whether or not SCCS has adequate funding to accomplish its mission and goals.
4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: Self-Study recommends that a department budget be established to include stable programmatic funds to support staffing, prevention and intervention services, production of the student handbook, and expenses associated with maintaining a data management system.
5. Additional Comments: SCCS does not have a specific budget line and when there needs to be an expense, it comes out of the Student Life/Student Advising fund. SCCS utilizes other sources to fund prevention programs, such as any money generated from students taking the online alcohol education or drug education program or money received from grants (such as to fund RADD). In the past, SCCS has been able to utilize these other sources for funding or justify its expenditures from the Student Life/Student Advising fund. Auxiliary enterprises, such as residence life, could provide an additional revenue stream to support technology, training, and additional staff.

Review Committee Recommendations: Establish a departmental budget to support additional staff, prevention programs and outreach efforts, membership in professional organizations such as ASCA, attendance at annual professional conferences (i.e., ASCA, NAPSAs, and ACPA), production of the student handbook, and technological upgrades.

Part 12. Technology

Reviewed by: Jamie Smith, Student

2. Process of Review: Interviewed Heather Dunn Carlton and Vivian Torres. Reviewed similar database management systems utilized by SCCS officers
3. Consistency of Part 12 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study is consistent with the CAS Standards.

4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: No recommendations were made in the self-study.
5. Additional Comments: The Office of SCCS utilizes a joint database system (Room Management System or RMS) with Housing and Greek Life Office for the management and sharing of critical information and for comprehensive reporting. Though extended to fit the needs of SCCS, the system was not created with the concerns and needs of student conduct officers and is not user friendly. Alternative database management systems offer more flexibility, reporting tools currently not available, automated responses, and better ways to coordinate student conduct records across all three campuses, including the professional schools, residence life, and Greek life.

Review Committee Recommendations: Alternative database management systems developed specifically for student conduct offices, such as Maxient or the Advocate system from Symplicity™, should be explored and implemented to ease the retrieval of information related to student conduct, improve communication with students, expedite the student conduct review process, track fulfillment of student sanctions, improve data collection and reporting, and free up staff time to engage in other activities, such as education and outreach.

Part 13. Facilities and Equipment

1. Reviewed by: Jamie Smith, Student
2. Process of Review: Interviewed Heather Dunn Carlton and Vivian Torres; compared security measures with other departments on campus
3. Consistency of Part 13 with CAS Standards: Not all Standards are being met to the full extent. Specifically measures (1) 13.3.2 “work space that is well-equipped, adequate in size, and designed to support their work and responsibilities” (2) 13.3.4: staff members “are trained in safety and emergency procedures for securing and vacating the facilities.”
4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: The self study includes two recommendations: (1) "Evaluation of space needs to ensure privacy and sufficient work space for graduate and professional staff managing prevention and student conduct services. There is a critical need for private spaces that ensure that student conduct proceedings are confidential and in compliance with federal and state privacy regulations related to student educational records." (2) Dedicate budget line to specifically address technology needs that support prevention and intervention education programs, including alcohol, marijuana, and sexual assault prevention and staff requirements for confidentiality and efficiency." The results of the program review support these recommendations
5. Additional Comments: There is currently no emergency response set in place for the safety and security of SCCS officers. The nature of the SCCS officers’ work brings them into contact with students who may be in a volatile emotional state and may act out, possibly even assault. In the case of an emergency, the SCCS officers may not be able to easily contact emergency services or call for aid.

Review Committee Recommendations: The program review committee recommends that the Office of SCCS consult with the Office of Public Safety to identify strategies to improve the security of the staff (i.e., panic buttons, emergency lines, etc.).

Part 14. Assessment and Evaluation

1. Reviewed by: Joan Lin-Cereghino, Professor and Assistant Chair of Biological Sciences
2. Process of Review: Part 14 of the *Self-Study: Student Conduct and Community Standards Office* was reviewed by individual discussions with Peggy Rosson, Assistant Dean of Students; Heather Dunn Carlton, Director, Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards; and Sandy Mahoney, Director, Assessment and Student Development Services. Additionally, data provided in the Spring 2012 NASPA survey of Pacific students was reviewed.
3. Consistency of Part 14 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study is consistent with the CAS Standards.
4. Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study: There were no recommendations in this section.
5. Additional Comments: The Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards engages in thorough practices of assessment and evaluation of its programs, publications and personnel. The Assistant Dean of Students evaluates the Director of SCCS on an annual basis, and the Director evaluates the staff of SCCS. Additionally, all members of SCCS write yearly self-evaluations. In terms of assessment, the Director of SCCS provides informal feedback immediately following a hearing to Hearing Board members. SCCS also reviews its own website and publications such as *Tiger Lore* annually. Additionally, students who go through the Level 1 Alcohol Education Program are assessed prior to and after the education. All the assessment and evaluation data suggest that, in general, SCCS is achieving the intended outcomes for all of its activities. Furthermore, the NASPA survey indicates that students at Pacific recorded more positive reactions and were more satisfied with student conduct and academic integrity issues than those at similar institutions nationally. However, students who have been sanctioned have not regularly provided feedback to indicate the extent to which the sanction has changed their behavior or resulted in new learning. Furthermore, students, faculty, and staff who serve as board members do not participate in a regular assessment process regarding their experiences. Current data collection efforts as well as the need for expanded assessment of board members and students who receive sanctions illustrate a need for additional staffing in the SCCS Office.

Review Committee Recommendations: The Review Committee praises the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards for their thorough and effective practices of assessment and evaluation. The amount of data collected clearly demonstrates the need for additional staffing in the SCCS Office to support on-going assessment of all Pacific students, in particular, students who have been sanctioned, and conduct hearing board members.

Related Websites

Advocate – Symplicity

www.symplicity.com/advocate-student-conduct-software

Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA)

www.theasca.org

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS)

www.cas.edu

Maxient

www.maxient.com

NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education

www.naspa.org