Assessment Template

Student Conduct Learning Outcomes Assessment 2017-18

Opt Out of External Report:
Name(s) of Person(s) Responsible for Assessment Project: Benjamin White (SD0000006598@ucsd.edu)
Email Address: btwhite@ucsd.edu
Phone Number: (858) 534-6225
Other Contacts:

Providing Department: Student Conduct

Other Units/Departments Involved in Assessment Project:

Program, Service, or Event Related to Assessment Project:
This assessment project is linked to the UC San Diego campus-wide non-academic student conduct process, centrally administered by the Office of Student Conduct.

Assessment Project Description:
The purpose of this assessment project was to assess student learning through the student conduct process. The assessment was included in the resolution letters for all students participating in Administrative Resolution meetings. It was designed to measure the impact of their experience being documented for violating the Student Conduct Code and what they learned by going through the process. This assessment also was designed to analyze the effectiveness of our Student Conduct Officers and whether students feel they were treated fairly during their student conduct experience.

Unit/Program Specific Goals and 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.

This learning outcome was addressed by specific questions in the assessment.

Relationship to Student Affairs Learning Domains: Think Critically and Solve Problems
Promote Social Justice and Community Responsibility

Assessment Project Start: 09/15/2017
Assessment Project End: 06/30/2018

Population/Sample:
The assessment was included in the resolution letters for all students participating in Administrative Resolution meetings through the UC San Diego Non-Academic Student Conduct Process. During the 2017-18 academic year, 745 students responded to the assessment, which represents a record 41.6% of all students (1793) who received resolution letters.

Type of Assessment: Student learning outcomes and/or behavioral outcomes
Satisfaction study
Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards (e.g., CAS standards)

Other Assessment Type(s):
Assessment Methods: Surveys
Other Assessment Method(s):

Data Collection Tools:
The assessment was distributed to students via student conduct resolution letters emailed to them after their meeting with a Student Conduct Officer.

Data Analysis Methods:
We compiled the survey results from Baseline and reviewed the statistics/narrative answers from each question to determine any significant trends. We also developed a three year comparison spreadsheet to review the differences in responses over time.

How Were the Findings Presented:
The summary of findings, impact of assessment, and what we learned sections are included in our 2017-18 annual report, which will be posted on the Office of Student Conduct website. We shared individual survey results with Student Conduct Officers and their supervisors by providing them with their individual summaries from Baseline.

Progress: 100%
Link Assessment Project in Campus Labs Baseline:

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 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 were 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 About the Assessment Process:**
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.

**Supplemental Information:**
I was unable to link to Campus Labs so I am attaching the results of the assessment here.

I also included graphs and quotes for the external report. I apologize if the formats are a little wonky.

Attached Files

- OSC Assessment Graph (2017-18).docx