

Office of Student Judicial Programs and the Office of Academic Integrity

Mission

The Office of Student Judicial Programs and the Office of Academic Integrity promote individual student development and a campus climate of civility and accountability. These offices provide processes designed to uphold the behavioral and academic standards of the Code of Conduct and Honor Code which encourage education and accountability. We aim to advance responsible community citizenship through promotion of *The Carolinian's Creed*.

Vision

The Office of Student Judicial Programs (OSJP) and the Office of Academic Integrity (OAI) seek to position themselves as catalysts for the advancement of students' principled decision making and sense of community standards.

Goals

Goal #1: Provide a fair, student centered, and consistent conduct process to uphold the behavioral and academic standards of the Codes and foster individual student development.

Goal #2: Promoting a campus climate of civility and responsible citizenship through education and outreach to the USC community on the behavioral and academic expectations valued by the University and espoused in *The Carolinian's Creed*.

Goal #3: Afford a structured, positive method for addressing students of concern within the campus community through utilization of the behavioral intervention process.

Unit Overview

The Office of Student Judicial Programs oversees and administers the University wide student conduct system. The office staff is comprised of three full time staff members including the Director of Judicial Affairs, Assistant Director of Judicial Affairs, and Office Manager. The Office of Academic Integrity oversees and administers the University wide student Honor Code system. The staff consists of the Director of Academic Integrity. Both offices share a staff of four graduate assistants and ten student assistants.

The Office of Student Judicial Programs and Office of Academic Integrity receive funding from A funds, auxiliary funds, and student fines.

The Office of Academic Integrity was created in Fall 2007 after a major policy revision changed the way academic misconduct was addressed. The Honor Code, approved in Spring 2007 and implemented in Fall 2007, shifted the process for disciplinary action from the individual colleges to a centralized office. This office manages the process and administration of the Honor Code and provides consultation to faculty on academic integrity matters. It was housed jointly with the Office of Student Judicial Programs to share resources as both offices perform similar functions.

In fulfilling our mission both offices have served the Carolina community in the following ways:

- Provided 90 presentations to students, faculty, and staff to promote a campus climate of civility and accountability
 - Staff was able to maintain a similar level of outreach as in 2009-2010
- Educated 2,444 students through the Student Code of Conduct and Honor Code hearing processes to reinforce University behavioral and academic standards
 - 89% of students responding to the conduct assessment indicated that as a result of their hearing, they are more knowledgeable about how to avoid future violations
- Provided outreach and intervention to over 248 referred students of concern through the Behavioral Intervention Team
 - Despite a 71% increase in referrals, there were no adverse incidents that resulted in harm to a student or the university from students engaged in the BIT process. This year, however, marked the first death by suicide of a student who had previously been referred and addressed with services by the team.

Due to the increase of the University's student population both offices experienced an increase in caseload. As the staffing in the offices remained the same, the timeline from incident to resolution exceeds 30 days. This delay in the process reduces the ability of the staff to achieve its mission of impactful education and accountability for students.

While the unit has continued to provide outreach to the community, the unit was unable to fulfill all requests for outreach due to focus on primary functions.

Contextual Statement

The Office of Student Judicial Programs' core functions include oversight and administration of the University wide student conduct system, management of the behavioral intervention process, and promotion of a campus climate of civility and responsible citizenship through outreach.

Data comparison from 2007 to present for student conduct cases:

Year	#Alleged Students	Males	Females	Referral Source – USCPD	Referral Source - Housing
2007-08	1804	1229	575	458	1058
2008-09	2008	1305	703	405	1323
2009-10	2132	1457	675	421	1352
2010-11*	2141	1416	725	551	1324

**numbers accurate as of May 12, 2011*

Data comparison from 2007 to present for behavioral intervention referrals:

Year	#Referred Students	Males	Females
2007-08	87	42	45
2008-09	113	55	58
2009-10	158	75	83
2010-11*	248	144	104

**numbers accurate as of May 12, 2011*

The Office of Academic Integrity's core functions include oversight and administration of the University wide student Honor Code system and promotion of the University's academic expectations as espoused in *The Carolinian's Creed*.

Data comparison from 2007 to present for Honor Code cases:

Year	#Alleged Students	Males	Females
2007-08	181	100	81
2008-09	153	90	63
2009-10	229	120	109
2010-11*	220	112	108

**numbers accurate as of May 12, 2011*

Referral Source

College/School	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Arts & Sciences	83	84	98	109
Business	5	5	8	12
Education	1	5	0	4
Engineering & Computing	21	5	11	8
Honors	0	0	0	0
HRSM	2	1	7	7
Law	2	1	1	0

College/School	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Mass Communication & Information Studies	5	3	14	11
Medicine	1	2	0	0
Music	1	1	0	2
Nursing	2	2	3	1
Palmetto Programs	2	2	11	5
Pharmacy	1	4	2	4
Public Health	2	3	7	5
Social Work	0	1	3	5
University 101	0	1	4	2
Other				1
TOTAL	130	120	169	176*

**numbers accurate as of May 12, 2011*

Due to the increase in the overall student population, and specifically the first year class, the student conduct case load has increased, as mentioned previously, and has caused a delay in the time to resolution for cases. In 2003, the Office of Student Judicial Programs had three full-time staff members in addition to two graduate students to hear code of conduct cases. This report reflects the work of only two full-time staff members in addition to four graduate students to hear conduct cases (an additional staff person has been approved). Additionally, the behavioral intervention referrals have dramatically increased, which has affected the staff's ability to address them in a timely manner while still effectively managing the offices' respective case loads. The Behavioral Intervention Team was not created in 2003 and therefore did not detract from the staff's caseload responsibilities. With current staffing the time devoted to hearing conduct cases is divided due to managing the Behavioral Intervention Team caseload. We are adding a full time coordinator to help manage judicial and BIT cases to bring the office closer to the 2003 staffing model.

The Office of Academic Integrity was designed to have two full time staff members due to the nature of the caseload, which is more time intensive than an average student conduct case. However, it has only been staffed by one staff member since 2007. Whether due to an increase in student population or an increase in awareness of services, the honor code case load has also seen a rise in numbers and reporting. With only one staff member to hear honor code cases, this causes a significant delay in time to resolution for students.

The increase in behavioral intervention referrals has enhanced the offices' collaboration with the Counseling and Human Development Center, Law Enforcement & Safety, and University Housing in addressing each individual referral effectively.

A change for the Office of Academic Integrity is the addition of a full-time staff member. The approval to hire a full-time Coordinator will have a positive impact on reducing the time to case resolution for students alleged to have violated the Honor Code and increasing the office's outreach efforts.

Goal #1: Provide a fair, student centered, and consistent conduct process to uphold the behavioral and academic standards of the Codes and foster individual student development.

Performance Blueprint Analysis of Goal Achievement: With 2,444 students seen through both conduct processes to date, the offices have surpassed the number of students seen any year at this time. Despite this increase, the offices remain committed to providing an educational process that meets the standard of the goal above. As a way of achieving this goal, the office looked at how the conduct processes can be more developmental by revising the training provided to conduct administrators to include more specific educational learning outcomes. This change was reflected in the students’ feedback on the process where 79% of respondents stated that they believed the student conduct process was fair and 89% of respondents stated that as a result of their hearing they are more knowledgeable about how to avoid future violations. Additionally, OSJP staff dedicated at least 2 hours daily to review other campus conduct administrators’ hearing decisions to ensure they are consistent with provided parameters for corresponding violations and align with the decision-making among the 40 campus conduct administrators.

Challenges the offices have faced in fulfilling this goal include a lack of staffing and funding. Challenges regarding lack of appropriate staffing as outlined in the contextual statement impact time to case resolution. The funding shortage hinders the offices’ ability to seek outside professional development which includes the ability to explore alternative methods of administering conduct systems and to seek advanced professional training.

The data has provided institutional support for two additional staff members. It is anticipated the staff members will join the office in June 2011.

Initiative 1A: Students alleged to have violated the Code of Conduct will have an individual meeting to promote personal accountability by addressing the consequences of their behavior on themselves and others.

1A. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

Data from August 15 to May 12 for students found “Responsible” for Code of Conduct violations:

Classification	Number	Greek Affiliation	Number
Freshman	782	Fraternity	352
Sophomore	242	Sorority	180
Junior	65		
Senior	48		
Graduate	4		
Medicine	1		
Law	1		
EPI	8		
TOTAL	1151	TOTAL	532

Athletic Affiliation	Responsible Conduct	Responsible Honor Code	BIT
Baseball	0	0	1
Men's Basketball	2 pending	2 cases involving 1 student	1
Women's Basketball	0	0	0
Cheerleading	3	1	0
Equestrian	0	0	0
Football	7 cases involving 4 students; 2 pending	2	0
Golf	1 pending	0	0
Men's Soccer	1	1 pending	0
Men's Swimming	4	1	0
Women's Swimming	1	0	1
Men's Tennis	0	0	0
Men's Track	2 plus 1 pending	3 involving 2 students	1
Women's Track	8 cases involving 6 students	1	0
Volleyball	1	1	1
TOTAL	33 cases; 28 students	12 cases; 10 students	5 cases; 5 students

- OSJP conduct administrators conducted 935 individual student meetings;
- Residence Life conduct administrators conducted 1,397 individual student meetings;
- Greek Life conduct administrators conducted 112 individual student meetings;
- 38 students resolved 31 cases through Carolina Judicial Council hearings;
- Frequency and type of alcohol and drug sanctions:
 - 636 alcohol fines
 - 541 students were sanctioned to the Carolina Awareness of Alcohol Policies and Safety class and assessments
 - 217 students were sanctioned to group counseling (alcohol and drug violations combined)
 - 150 drug fines
 - 190 students were randomly drug tested
 - 173 students were sanctioned to the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) individual screening
 - 388 students were given community service with the reflection essay
- 1798 student conduct process assessment surveys were sent to students with a return rate of 33%;
 - 93% of respondents stated that their conduct administrator treated them with respect;

- 74% of respondents stated that they understood how their individual behavior impacts others;
- 81% of respondents reported that they have altered their behavior as a result of going through the hearing process;
- Regarding the number of Carolina Awareness on Alcohol Policies and Safety (CAAPS) assessments sent to students; 520 completed the pre-test survey, 509 completed the course evaluation, and 472 have completed the post-CAAPS behavioral assessment (due to this assessment being 4 weeks after the April courses, the numbers are appropriately lower at this time).
 - 93% of students stated they would be using the course content in future decision making;
 - 97.5% of students reported that the “facilitators created a comfortable environment for participants to listen, interact, and learn”;
 - 89% of 487 respondents report 4 weeks after the course that they use a designated driver.

Initiative 1B: Provide intensive training and regular reviews to improve and maintain the consistency and accuracy of the student conduct process and database information.

1B. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- 3 trainings for approximately 45 campus conduct administrators on student conduct process and hearing skills;
- 4 trainings on accurate use of database;
- 2 trainings for over 250 Resident Mentors;
- 2 trainings for approximately 20 faculty/staff Carolina Judicial Council (CJC) members;
- 9 trainings for over 40 student Carolina Judicial Council (CJC) members;
- 1,327 hearing decisions by campus (housing and Greek Life) conduct administrators were reviewed for consistency;
- 100% of respondents on the campus conduct administrators assessment reported confidence in their readiness to hear cases;
- 100% of respondents on the campus conduct administrators assessment reported confidence in their knowledge of the database system and in completing a case resolution form;
- 100% of student CJC members assessed reported understanding their role as a panel member in the hearing process.

Initiative 1C: Foster partnerships with parents to promote their students’ development within the student conduct process and support the office’s goal of individual responsibility.

1C. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- The Parental Notification Q & A handout and letter was revised to encourage parents to reinforce parental expectations on behavioral standards and personal responsibility;
- A parent’s guide section on the OSJP website was developed and added;
- 193 parental notifications were sent for alcohol violations and drug violations.

Initiative 1D: Students alleged to have violated the Honor Code will have an individual meeting to promote personal accountability and understanding of academic standards by addressing the consequences of their behavior on themselves and others.

1D. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- For 2010-2011, as of May 12, 2011:
 - 220 alleged students
 - 40 freshmen, 48 sophomores, 42 juniors, 67 seniors, 23 graduate students
 - 112 males, 108 females
- 2010-2011 cases (which can involve more than one student) referred from each individual college/school:

School/College	Cases Referred	School/College	Cases Referred
Arts & Sciences	109	Music	2
Business	12	Nursing	1
Education	4	Palmetto Programs	5
Engineering & Computing	8	Pharmacy	4
HRSM	7	Public Health	5
Mass Communication & Information Studies	11	Social Work	5
		University 101	2

- Number of individual student meetings with OAI conduct administrator:
 - 2009 cases resolved in Fall 2010 – 50 individual meetings; 32 students resolved informally
 - 2010-2011 cases – 230 individual meetings; 141 students resolved informally
- Number of College Committee hearings:
 - 2009 cases resolved in Fall 2010 – 4 hearings involving 6 students
 - 2010-2011 cases – 5 hearings involving 5 students
- Frequency and type of sanctions given for 2010-2011 cases:
 - Written warning – 13
 - Conduct Probation – 100
 - Suspension 3
 - “X” on the transcript - 9
 - Academic Integrity Workshop – 59
 - Research project/essay - 30
- 132 honor code process assessment surveys were sent to students and the return rate was 13%;
- 72% of students responded in the assessment feedback that their hearing officer treated them fairly and without bias;
- 55% of students responded in the assessment that they had an “excellent” or “good” understanding of the Honor Code after their case was resolved;
- 75 % of students responded in the assessment feedback that they have a better understanding of how their behavior may affect other people.

Goal #2: Promoting a campus climate of civility and responsible citizenship through education and outreach to the USC community on the behavioral and academic expectations valued by the University and espoused in *The Carolinian's Creed*.

Performance Blueprint Analysis of Goal Achievement: Contemporaneous with the President's Civil Discourse Initiative, the Office of Student Judicial Programs' staff researched and piloted a civility workshop this Fall as a sanction. The workshop assessment shows that 84.61% of the class agreed that as a result of attending the class "they gained more knowledge about what it means to be part of the Carolina Community and how they can meet the expectations of the community." Due to the success of the pilot, a second workshop was held in April 2011. 100% of the spring attendees agreed that as a result of attending the workshop, "they gained more knowledge about what it means to be part of the Carolina Community and how they can meet the expectations of the community." Four more workshops are scheduled for 2011-2012 due to the success of this program. Expansion of the workshop will be explored to accommodate the demand for this type of education; therefore outreach to University Housing staff is anticipated.

Outreach by the offices included presentations on academic integrity, behavioral issues, and classroom management. Even with 90 presentations provided, the offices were still unable to fulfill all presentation requests due to the need to focus on primary functions. The Office of Academic Integrity had a 116% increase in the amount of U101 "Cocky Never Cheats" presentations provided from last year, and the office was not able to fulfill all requests received. The Office of Student Judicial Programs continues to provide outreach, specifically to U101 classes, and seeks new opportunities to provide outreach to new constituents.

The Academic Integrity Committee, while only meeting twice a year, continues to provide forward direction for the Office of Academic Integrity through programmatic and policy change recommendations which serves as a good resource for the office's future growth. This fall, an assessment was launched to gather feedback from the student community on *The Carolinian's Creed* awareness and programming. As a result, areas of improvement were identified and changes will be made based on that data for marketing and programming efforts.

Initiative 2A: Engage in outreach to faculty, staff, and students on behavioral and academic expectations at the University.

2A. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- 2 presentations were given to approximately 60 faculty and 425 teaching assistants on classroom management and student conduct issues.
- 5 presentations were conducted for approximately 95 faculty on awareness and utilization of Honor Code process;
- 38 presentations were provided for approximately 1072 students on common behavioral pitfalls;
- 15 presentations were conducted for approximately 760 students on academic integrity issues;

- 13 presentations were provided for approximately 286 students on personal ethics and *The Carolinian's Creed* by staff and student Carolina Judicial Council members;
- 4 presentations were provided to campus offices including USCPD, the Career Center, and Orientation on student conduct and behavioral interventions.

Initiative 2B: Maintain and enhance partnerships with campus offices and constituencies to assist with the promotion of the Honor Code.

2B. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- 28 presentations were provided to approximately 671 students regarding academic integrity through University 101;
- Regular and open communication with college deans to process honor code cases and provide updates on overall case information and encourage use of the process by faculty continues on a weekly basis;
- The Academic Integrity Advisory Committee met in December 2010 and May 2011 to review the Honor Code process and functions of the office;
- Outreach to teaching assistants on preventing academic dishonesty was done through a workshop hosted by the Center for Teaching Excellence in February 2011.

Initiative 2C: In conjunction with the Carolina Judicial Council, coordinate and implement Carolinian Creed programming.

2C. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- One student organization, Carolina Productions, and two campus offices, Office of Student Engagement with the Center for Teaching Excellence, hosted events for Creed Day in addition to three events hosted by the Carolina Judicial Council;
- 5 programs were held on Creed Day;
- Creed Day marketing and advertising included posters hung in residence halls and select academic buildings; advertisements in *The Daily Gamecock*, and flyers handed out on Greene Street
- An assessment tool was developed and implemented for the CJC Creed Day program to assess impact on the participants.
 - 150 students randomly self-selected to participate in a survey utilizing handheld devices to assess awareness and program ideas for Creed Day.
 - 90.67% of respondents knew the University has a Creed
 - 61.33% of respondents did not know about Creed Day events
 - 45.33% of respondents like to hear about events via Facebook
 - 51.33% of respondents indicated they would like movies to be part of Creed programming; 37.33 % would like to see a speaker to be part of Creed programming; 36.67% would like to see an interactive game be part of Creed programming.

- Five student organizations, Carolina Productions, EMPOWER, BGLSA, Carolina Service Council, and International Student Association, as well as the Office of Multi cultural Student Affairs hosted events for Creed Week in addition to three events hosted by the Carolina Judicial Council;
- Eight programs were held during Creed Week
- Creed Week marketing and advertising included posters hung in residence halls and select academic buildings; advertisements in *The Daily Gamecock*, and flyers handed out on Greene Street

Initiative 2D: Recruit and train student and faculty/staff Carolina Judicial Council members to reflect the values of the Creed and uphold the integrity of the conduct and honor code principles and processes to the Carolina Community.

2D. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- 10 faculty were recruited based on Deans' nominations for candidates who demonstrate values of the Creed to serve on CJC;
- 12 new student members were selected to the Council in Fall 2010
 - 9 males, 3 females
 - 7 juniors, 2 freshmen, and 3 sophomores
- 1 presentation was provided to CJC members outlining their role in upholding and promoting *The Carolinian's Creed*,
- 2 mock hearing training provided to address maintaining the integrity of the conduct processes as a hearing body;
- 272 total hours of community service were completed by 33 CJC members over six events, with the main service activity being participation in Relay for Life, demonstrating leadership and modeling the values of the Creed.

Initiative 2E: Coordinate a campus wide review process of the Student Code of Conduct.

2E. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- This initiative has not yet been launched but is in the initial planning stages. With an additional staff member more time can be devoted to this project. Preliminary student focus groups have been conducted through partnership with the HESA assessment course.

Initiative 2F: Provide reports and information on required or federally mandated student disciplinary information to requesting agencies, institutions, and campus partners in compliance with applicable privacy laws.

2F. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- 313 disciplinary reference checks processed;

- Clery Act statistics were provided to the Division of Law Enforcement and Safety in October 2010; below are the top categories reported:

Clery Category	On Campus	On Campus – Residence Halls	Non Campus	Public Property	Uncategorized
Disciplinary Actions: Drug law violations	28	109	1	1	11
Disciplinary Actions: Liquor law violations	126	360	48	40	32

- Due to the nature of the office’s work, consultations by our staff occur daily regarding FERPA and privacy matters with parents, students, faculty, staff, and attorneys.

Goal #3: Afford a structured, positive method for addressing students of concern within the campus community through utilization of the behavioral intervention process.

Performance Blueprint Analysis of Goal Achievement: The Office of Student Judicial Programs continues to provide outreach to the campus community on the behavioral intervention process. Publications, including the new South Carolina Cares cards and the Dealing with Distressing Student Behavior file folders, were distributed this summer across campus outlining the resources available for students in distress. The outreach is working as a campus awareness tool to promote a central reporting location, which is critical to the success of the process. The strength of the outreach is demonstrated by the number of referrals received which has increased from 145 total last year to 248 to date. There was a 102% increase in the number of alcohol transports from 2008-2009 academic year to 2010-2011 academic year. This increase emphasized the need to include parents as valuable partners in this process, and this year, 108 parents were notified about their student’s involvement in the behavioral intervention process.

Due to the data on the increased BIT caseload, approval was secured for a full time staff member to split responsibility between code of conduct cases and BIT cases. Goals are to better monitor cases and track trends on student issues. Even with the addition of a new staff member, it is anticipated that the significant increase in BIT referrals (71% this year) and the time intensive nature of these cases will still require more staff time than two staff members with half-time responsibilities for BIT. The recommendation still remains for a budget for the team which is needed to fund office supplies, substance abuse/mental health assessment instruments, outreach materials, training programs, and marketing tools.

Although the team has been able to address every referral, the magnitude of referrals has strained partner offices to address them in a timely manner. The Counseling and Human Development Center remains a primary partner in addressing these students of concern, but their current staff shortages limit their availability to complete assessments quickly and provide enough groups to accommodate the number of students requiring group counseling as an intervention. Sixty-six students this year were referred off campus for intervention due to class conflicts with limited on campus group counseling intervention options.

Initiative 3A: Coordinate a multidisciplinary Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT) to evaluate and manage referrals and to connect critical students with resources that can support their wellness and development.

3A. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- 248 students were referred to the BIT;
- 38 weekly full team meetings held to evaluate and track referrals;
- Case referrals by type:
 - 115 involuntary transportation to the hospital for alcohol or drug abuse
 - 77 erratic behavior,
 - 56 self-injurious behavior
- 123 referred students were resolved through soft interventions;
- 19 students were assessed by CHDC that completed the 4-session assessment;
- 227 students were scheduled for group counseling;
- 19 students that successfully completed the alcohol BIT counseling process had an additional alcohol/drug violation;
- 108 parental notification letters were sent.

Initiative 3B: Provide education and distribute materials to the university community to increase the utilization of the behavioral intervention process.

3B. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- The “Dealing with Distressing Student Behavior” file folder was revised and over 6640 were distributed to key constituents and faculty;
- “Carolina Cares” cards were produced and over 2167 were distributed to strategic campus locations and constituents;
- 6 presentations to over 535 faculty and staff members were conducted on the BIT process.