

**Office of Student Judicial Programs and Office of Academic Integrity Mission Statement:**

Promoting civility, integrity, and the ideals set forth in the Carolinian Creed to foster a better living and learning environment in the university community. The Office of Student Judicial Programs and the Office of Academic Integrity are committed to providing and ensuring an educational campus climate conducive to the personal and professional development of each student. All aspects of the university student conduct process and honor code process are directed or supported by these offices. Student conduct codes, honor codes and policies are developed in collaboration with faculty, staff, and students. The primary functions include: adjudicating student conduct cases by meeting with students alleged to have violated policies and determining appropriate sanctions for students found to be in violation; presenting to classes and organizations concerning student conduct, honor codes and ethical decision making; offering educational counseling and referrals to students who have violated conduct codes or been affected as a result of violations of student conduct codes; distributing publications concerning student conduct codes, honor codes and hearing procedures; and selecting, training, and advising Carolina Judicial Council members. These offices also encourage responsible community citizenship through promotion of The Carolinian Creed.

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

**Goal #1:** To promote responsible citizenship, the Office of Student Judicial Programs provides a student conduct system that is fair, student centered, and consistent. The accuracy and effectiveness of the judicial process will be ensured through thorough training and assessment.

a. **Performance Blueprint Analysis of Goal Achievement:**

While increasing responsible citizenship is difficult to measure, the office can attempt to grow closer to this by training effective, compassionate, and consistent hearing officers to encourage students' positive developmental growth. We have met the targets set to ensure goal achievement by providing in depth training to campus hearing officers, Resident Mentors, and Carolina Judicial Council members. The first Student Voice assessment of the campus hearing officer training was launched and results indicated positive feedback on the content and format.

Overall, the student conduct system managed over 1300 cases. Upon review of the nearly 740 hearing decisions by housing and greek life hearing officers, it is apparent that the training was successful since more cases fell within the consistency parameters than in past years.

Learning outcomes, competencies, and practical applications were developed for the Carolina Judicial Council trainings. An evaluation tool was launched in March 2010, 638 students were sent the survey and 201 responded. Of the respondents, 95% agreed with the statement "My hearing officer treated me with respect." Ninety percent agreed with the statement "Whether I agree or not, I understand the rationale for the decision made in my case." Lastly, 87% agreed with the statement "I have altered my behavior as a result of going through the hearing process." Between March 15<sup>th</sup> and May 18<sup>th</sup> there were 13 CJC hearings held with two more scheduled to be heard by May 26<sup>th</sup>. As predicted,

the 15 hearings were unable to be resolved by the last day of classes. Based on these demands, the over 1300 cases the office has purview over, and the opportunities for growth that cannot be explored under the current staffing plan, the recommendation to the Division is to provide financial support for at least one additional full time staff member.

Contributes to Division Goal: 1; Outcome C

**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)**

- 1087 individual student meetings with OSJP staff hearing officers;
- 648 individual student meetings with Residence Life staff hearing officers;
- 90 individual student meetings with Office of Greek Life staff hearing officers;
- 28 Carolina Judicial Council Hearings (Please note number of originally reported CJC hearings should have been 15)

**Initiative 1B:** Provide intensive training and regular reviews to improve and maintain the consistency and accuracy of the hearing process and database information. Provide ongoing training to campus hearing officers on the judicial process, developing their hearing skills, and accurate use of the database. Provide training for new and returning Resident Mentors on identifying and documenting student code issues, in addition to the judicial process and their role in it. Provide training to residence life area administrative assistants on accurate use of the database. Conduct training for student and faculty/staff Carolina Judicial Council members. Review all hearing decisions made by housing and greek life hearing officers for consistency and accuracy in the hearing process.

#### **1B. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- Two trainings for campus hearing officers for a duration of five hours on the judicial process, hearing skills, and database usage;
- Three trainings for Resident Mentors for a duration of five hours;
- Five trainings for residence life area administrative assistants for a duration of seven hours;
- Fourteen weekly training sessions, a mock hearing, and one two-day retreat consisting of four intensive training areas for student CJC members for a total duration of 25 hours;
- 738 campus hearing officer decisions reviewed by OSJP/OAI staff .

**Initiative 1C:** Review standard sanctions, training modules for hearing officers, and statistics to monitor relevance and cohesiveness of practices. Refine and improve the separate training class for the CJC student members focusing on “Hard Skills” (e.g., kinesics, questioning; statement analysis, sexual assault training). Develop learning outcomes and competencies, and a grading

system. Evaluate and revise housing hearing officer training. Monitor the tracking mechanism for repeat offenders to determine if there are trends.

### **1C. Key Performance Indicators**

- Learning Outcomes and Competencies were developed for the each of the CJC training classes but no grading system was developed;
- The evaluation results of revised training for housing hearing officers are as follows;  
77% of the participants agreed that they would now be able to hear a case on their own.  
100% of the participants felt more educated about using the judicial database after the training.  
85% of the participants strongly agreed that they understood the philosophy behind the sanctioning and felt comfortable issuing and explaining the sanctions to students.
- Upon review of the statistical reports and data, we are not confident in the accuracy of the information as we cannot clearly extrapolate the exact data regarding alcohol violations and any repeat offenses. We will continue to work on gathering this data by specifying the data fields we are looking for and narrowing our scope to obtain accurate information. Alternatively, we were able to extrapolate alcohol offenses and students who repeated with another alcohol offense within the academic year. There were 44 two-time repeat offenders for alcohol, 5 three-time repeat offenders for alcohol, and 1 four-time repeat offender for alcohol within the 2009-2010 academic year.

**Initiative 1D:** Maintain compliance with federal laws and applicable regulations regarding student records. Provide Clery Act statistics to ensure compliance with federal laws. Utilize parental notification in the judicial process. In compliance with confidentiality regulations, process requests for dean certifications which require student disciplinary information.

### **1D. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- Clery Act statistics were provided in October 2009 to the University's Law Enforcement & Safety Division for reporting purposes;
- 75 parents were notified regarding alcohol violations and 65 parents were notified for drug violations to date;
- 378 dean certifications processed to date.

**Goal # 2:** Increase awareness of the Honor Code and its process to the University community. Staff will educate faculty on the promotion of academic integrity in the classroom and how to report alleged violations of the honor code. Staff will educate students on the importance of academic integrity and the honor code process.

#### **a. Performance Blueprint Analysis of Goal Achievement:**

Overall, the objectives of the goal were achieved with some room for growth and improvement. OAI increased its number of student presentations this year but had a reduction in faculty presentations. The CTE video for faculty, however, is available at any time on-line and may be a contributing factor to the reduction in requests from faculty. Outreach to campus offices regarding promotion of the Honor Code was attempted with four areas within the division, three of which had sufficient references to the Carolinian Creed and another which is still being developed. The number of case referrals remains consistent from previous years, however the number of college committee hearings has increased from 9 in 2009 to 13 in 2010 with additional hearings pending. These hearings have increased time to resolution for all cases within the office, delaying case outcome for the student and feedback to faculty who refer cases. Within individual schools and colleges, faculty awareness and utilization of the process has improved due in part to the office's regular interactions with the college's assistant and associate deans. Evaluations to assess the Honor Code process by faculty and students were sent out at the end of April and again the first week in May. While response rates were low, the overall feedback for the process by both students and faculty was positive. Specific responses are outlined under initiative 2D.

For next year, OAI will make intentional communication with individual colleges and schools to offer presentations to faculty. The OAI will continue to outreach to campus offices to promote awareness of the Honor Code and the services of the office. Further, the OAI will explore more intentional outreach between Carolina Judicial Council and Student Government to promote academic integrity and the Honor Code among the general student body. Additionally, a regular assessment schedule will be implemented to gather on-going feedback on the Honor Code process. Our recommendation to the Division leadership is in order to decrease time to case resolution and to increase outreach opportunities, an additional professional staff member is needed.

Contributes to Division Goals: #2 Outcome A

**Initiative 2(A):** Utilize and update marketing tools to promote the Office of Academic Integrity and the Honor Code to the university community. Develop a communication plan and calendar for distribution of information to faculty, staff, and students. Maintain an academic integrity website that explains the Honor Code, academic integrity process, on-line flow charts, FAQs, and additional resources.

## **2A. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- One major redesign project of the Office of Academic Integrity website to increase usability for faculty;
- Printed 500 promotional items to increase awareness of honor code to students.

**Initiative 2B:** Provide proactive and reactive educational measures to the university community about academic integrity. Provide presentations for faculty addressing the academic integrity process and honor code. Carolina Judicial Council (CJC) with the Office of Academic Integrity will present an in-classroom presentation for students on the honor code. Explore and research potential online academic integrity tutorials for all new incoming students. Conduct a four-session academic integrity workshop for students found in violation of the honor code.

## **2B. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- One presentation with live video feeds offered to faculty;
- 16 presentations to students;
- Preliminary research was done for on-line tutorial, but no recommendations have been developed based on research of tutorials;
- Four AI workshops conducted with 89 students participating;
- Results of the workshop evaluation are:
  - 68% agreed the Academic Integrity workshop was a useful experience.
  - 89% agreed the presenters were knowledgeable in the information that was presented.
  - 73% agreed the assignments were beneficial and would help them to process the material covered in the workshop.
  - 74% agreed that they will use the information on ways to prevent cheating (session #1) in their future classes.
  - 75% agreed that they understood the “serial cheaters” (from session #2) have a detrimental effect on their college degree.
  - 71% agreed the workshop gave them the tools to maintain integrity in areas of their life outside the classroom.

**Initiative 2C:** Develop partnerships with campus offices and constituencies to assist with promotion of the Honor Code and the Office of Academic Integrity. Further the partnership with University Libraries to include Honor Code information in University 101 Library presentations. Continue the partnership with University 101 by providing optional academic integrity presentations (“Cocky Never Cheats”) to U101 classes and providing academic integrity information in *Transitions*. Develop a partnership between Carolina Judicial Council and Student Government to help promote the honor code and academic integrity to students. Develop a partnership with the Student Success Center to help promote the honor code and academic integrity issues to supplemental instruction leaders and tutors. Maintain partnerships with each dean or assistant/associate dean for each college and school within the university to help promote the honor code and the Office’s resources to faculty, and sustain the communication protocol for honor code case discussions.

## **2C. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- 13 “Cocky Never Cheats” presentations provided to U101 classes;
- One chapter in *Transitions*; which covers academic integrity issues;
- The partnership between Carolina Judicial Council and Student Government has not yet been developed to discuss promotion of the honor code;

- Will offer to make one presentation to the Student Success Center's student staff to promote the honor code and address academic integrity issues;
- Weekly interactions occur with appropriate deans regarding active honor code violations.

**Initiative 2D:** Enhance the utilization and effectiveness of the honor code process. The Office of Academic Integrity will provide consultation, adjudicate violations of the honor code and assess the process. Create a new staff position in the Office of Academic Integrity to increase the availability of staff for educational outreach and improve the efficiency and timeliness of the honor code adjudication process to be in place for Fall 2010.

## **2D. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- Faculty consultations were not tracked, however faculty contacts were tracked and 649 contacts were made with faculty during the Spring 2010 semester,
- 153 cases referred, involving 220 students;
- 114 students resolved informally, 17 students were witnesses;
- 10 2009-2010 cases (involving 15 students) resolved through a formal hearing; 4 cases charges dismissed, 6 cases involve students not enrolled, 45 cases pending resolution (involving 64 students);
- Evaluations to assess the Honor Code process were sent to 134 students and 125 faculty. Eighteen students responded and 32 faculty responded.

### **Student results:**

94% agreed with the statement "I understand why the rule I was accused of breaking is important."

63% rated their understanding of the Honor Code before their hearing as excellent or good.

88% rated their understanding of the Honor Code after their hearing as excellent or good.

88% agreed with the statement "My hearing officer treated me with respect."

82% agreed with the statement "My hearing officer treated me without bias or impartially."

82% agreed with the statement "My hearing officer explained the rationale behind my sanctions to me."

### **Faculty results:**

84% agreed the sanctions were appropriate for the nature of the incident.

97% would use the process again.

84% thought the process to refer students was clear.

87% thought an appropriate level of communication was maintained for their case.

93% would feel comfortable recommending the process to a colleague.

- Progress on position creation and job description approval process was not taken because of budget cuts.

**Goal #3:** Increase the awareness of campus behavioral standards and utilization of services offered by the OSJP to faculty, staff, and students.

a. **Performance Blueprint Analysis of Goal Achievement:**

Upon review of statistics we have surpassed last year's numbers regarding outreach to faculty, staff and students. In Fall 2008 we reached 577 faculty/staff members in presentations. In Fall 2009, we had a significant increase which included 793 faculty and staff members being educated on the purposes and services of our department. In addition, one of the presentations allowed for a live feed, therefore the number of participants are unknown and are greater than our documented number. In Fall 2009, our department had 68 presentations reaching 1,557 students; which surpasses our 36 presentations to 723 students for the Fall of 2008. No initial targets were set, however the increase shows that we were able to exceed the last year's outreach numbers. Due to the three person professional staff team in the department we are limited on the amount of outreaches we can conduct. However, we value the utilization of our services within the campus community and the amount of time dedicated last Fall is representative of this.

The success rate/number of requests for outreach was due in part to academic affairs' needs for the office's services and the credibility of our office and staff. Our ability to reach more community members and to attempt to bring consistency to behavioral standards and civility is hampered by the prioritized need for the small staff to adjudicate cases and monitor the overall systems. Our recommendation to the Division leadership is to increase our outreach by providing at least one additional professional staff member that can provide case management assistance while current staff provides credible outreach.

Contributes to Division Goals: 1 Outcome A

**Initiative 3A:** Enhance and maintain the judicial programs website that explains the judicial process, FAQ's, resources for faculty and staff, and the specific resources outlining how to deal with various student conduct and classroom management issues.

**3A. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- Distributed two specific resources: the "Dealing with Distressing Student Behavior" file folder to 80 new faculty members and the six-panel handout outlining the BIT, OAI and OSJP processes to all new teaching assistants;
- Website revisions will be launched in July 2010
- . From August to May 18<sup>th</sup> there have been 8,231 visitors to the OSJP website.

**Initiative 3B:** Engage in outreach to faculty and staff on student behavior issues by

developing and presenting programs on conduct and classroom behavior/management. Include key audiences such as new faculty and new teaching assistants. Provide individual consultations for faculty/staff on classroom management issues.

### **3B. Key Performance Indicators KPI**

- 450 TA's attended one workshop on classroom management;
- 94 faculty and staff participants were in presentations on Judicial and BIT;
- 90 participants in the New Faculty Presentation;
- 7 presentations and or trainings conducted with campus partners;
- 15 consultations completed with faculty and or staff.

**Goal #4:** The Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT) provides a structured, positive method for addressing students of concern within the campus community through utilization of the behavioral intervention process.

a. **Performance Blueprint Analysis of Goal Achievement:**

The primary target for the Behavioral Intervention Team was to increase utilization of the referral process. Over the past 2 years, the referrals have increased 166%. Over 145 students this academic year have been individually evaluated by the Team to determine the appropriate intervention. All students of concern have been addressed and tracked through the intervention process. The implementation of a parental notification policy for students hospitalized for substances resulted in over 80 parental contacts to date. As the number of cases has increased drastically and there is no longer a full time staff member solely dedicated to handle these time intensive cases, the recommendation is two-fold. A full-time staff member is needed to manage these cases closely and a budget for the Team is needed to fund office supplies, assessment instruments, outreach materials, training programs and marketing tools.

Contributes to Division Goals: 2; Outcome E

**Initiative 4A:** Coordinate a multi-disciplinary team to evaluate and manage referrals made to the behavioral intervention process. Utilize the behavioral intervention protocols and mental health disturbance policies to address students referred to BIT. Track the students who are engaged in the BIT process. Track the progression and resolution of students in the BIT process. Utilize parental notification.

### **4A. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- 160 students referred through BIT;
- 35 weekly full team meetings to evaluate and track referrals;
- 145 cases (50 erratic behavior, 20 suicide ideations or attempts, and 75 involuntary transportation to the hospital for alcohol or drug abuse);
- Over 80 parental notifications;
- 27 referrals were resolved through soft intervention;
- 52 students assessed by CHDC completed the 4-session assessment;

- 142 students attended group counseling;
- 12 students that have successfully completed the alcohol BIT counseling process have had an additional alcohol/drug violation.
- **15 BIT currently not enrolled**

**Initiative 4B:** Develop a marketing piece for the Behavioral Intervention Team. Review and maintain the Behavioral Intervention website that explains the BIT process, FAQs, a referral form, and resources for faculty, staff, and students. Distribute publications to students and other key constituents on services available via the Behavioral Intervention Team.

#### **4B. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- Distributed 550 “Dealing with Distressing Student Behavior” file folders to key constituents and faculty;
- One main revision process conducted on the BIT website to increase user friendliness and ease of navigation of site.
- “Carolina Cares” cards to be printed and distributed in high traffic student areas in June of 2010.

**Initiative 4C:** Provide education to the university community to increase the utilization of the behavioral intervention process. Educate the university community about the behavioral intervention protocols and mental health disturbance policies to address student situations requiring assistance. Revise and present programs on behavioral intervention and methods for reporting concerns about students to faculty and staff, in conjunction with campus partners.

#### **4C. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- Five presentations conducted to faculty and staff members on the BIT process;
- Distributed “Dealing with Distressing Student Behavior” file folders to attendees;
- 550 faculty and staff attended presentations

**Goal #5:** The University of South Carolina values are outlined in the Carolinian Creed and our department is charged with fostering a campus community that promotes integrity and character development through the Carolinian Creed.

##### **a. Performance Blueprint Analysis of Goal Achievement:**

The primary objective of this goal is to elevate the Carolinian Creed to a shared and indoctrinated keystone of the campus community. University 101 classroom presentation requests about the Creed have remained high and have been co-presented by student CJC members. The Carolinian Creed and its history continues to be a common theme in CJC trainings and meetings. However, the offices continue to struggle with meeting this overall goal due to inadequate funding and university support. While Carolinian Creed Day experienced moderate success, there is significant room for growth and university wide support. Creed Week has been planned for almost a full year and occurred March 22-26, however, challenges remain in consistently making the Creed a part of campus life. Participation in Creed events by student organizations remains low and inconsistent.

Funding for these events, while proposed yearly by CJC students to SG and RHA, is meager and inconsistent, making it difficult to plan cornerstone events. This prevents growth potential. These circumstances usurp the ability of CJC members and the OAI/OSJP office to progress in making the Creed a recognized and respected foundation of the campus culture. The recommendation is for permanent university funding to support Creed programs and exposure.

Contributes to Division Goal: 2; Outcome A

**Initiative 5A:** To promote the Carolinian Creed the department along with the CJC is responsible for the implementation and promotion of Creed programs. Coordinate and implement Carolinian Creed Day 2009 and Creed Week 2010. Implement CJC Creed Week program as one of the cornerstone programs for the Week. Commit permanent university funding to the support of Carolinian Creed Week.

#### **5A. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- Four student organizations hosted events for Creed Week;
- 300 promotional event posters for Creed Day; 300 promotional event posters for Creed Week; 500 event flyers for Creed Day; 500 event flyers for Creed Week; 3 promotional advertisements in *Daily Gamecock* for Creed Day; 6 promotional advertisements in *Daily Gamecock* for Creed Week;
- Three programs hosted for Creed Day;
- Seven programs hosted for Creed Week;
- Funding for Creed Day and Creed Week were received from Student Government and Residence Hall Association. Overall funding has been consistent from both organizations, however the CJC and the department continues to work on receiving permanent institutional funding for these programs.

**Initiative 5B:** Provide presentations that promote awareness of the Carolinian Creed. The Office of Judicial Programs & Academic Integrity will promote a recognizable institutional presence to promote ethics through the use of the Carolinian Creed, Honor Code, and Carolina Judicial Council. Participate in New Student Orientation to promote and educate students and parents about the Carolinian Creed.

#### **5B. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- 49 presentations of “Top 10 Ways” reaching 1116 students;
- 13 presentations of “Cocky Never Cheats” reaching 275 students;
- 9 presentations of “Honesty Quiz” reaching 232 students;
- 550 Carolinian Creed cards distributed to students;
- 27 sessions were presented to parents at New Student Orientation about the Carolinian Creed

**Initiative 5C:** Recruit and train student and faculty/staff Carolina Judicial Council members to reflect the values of the Creed and uphold the integrity of the judicial and honor code processes.

Develop a coordinated effort to recruit high quality faculty and staff to participate on the Carolina Judicial Council. Increase the diversity of the student applicant pool and membership of the Carolina Judicial Council (CJC). Provide specific training on the history and purpose of the Carolinian Creed to Carolina Judicial Council student members.

### **5C. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- Due to the high number of faculty and staff members on the council no recruitment efforts were made this year.
- 18 new students participate on the council;
- The diversity of applicant pool is as follows:
  - Freshman – 8
  - Sophomore – 11
  - Junior – 4
  - Senior – 2
  
  - Female – 22
  - Male – 7
  
  - RM – 7
  - Greek – 1
  - Honors – 4
  - Capstone Scholars – 3
  
  - African-American – 8
  - Asian – 1
  - Caucasian – 14
  - Hispanic – 4

**Goal No. 6:** Develop and practice methods of research and assessment that guide improvements to the Office of Student Judicial Programs and the Office of Academic Integrity to enhance student success.

a. **Performance Blueprint Analysis of Goal Achievement:**

Our department has successfully developed learning outcomes for the training and services that our office provides. We have utilized these outcomes for the development and revision of assessment tools that have been launched this academic year. Outcomes from the Academic Integrity Workshop evaluation have guided content changes for the upcoming year to further contribute to students' future success in the classroom.

The student conduct assessment for adjudicated students was sent out on March 15th. The Honor Code process assessment for students and faculty was sent out at the end of April and again the first week of May. The use of the findings from other Student Voice assessments has aided in the identification of trends of student behaviors that can guide the development of tiered new educational sanctions. Further, assessment outcomes have been employed in the creation of national and regional conference programs by graduate

assistants as part of their professional development. Unfortunately, due to university wide travel constraints, benchmarking the staff's assessment outcomes and overall professional staff development has been hindered since 2007/08.

Contributes to Division Goal: 3; Outcome B

**Initiative 6A:** Develop learning outcomes for services in the Office of Academic Integrity and the Office of Student Judicial Programs. Develop learning outcomes for the student conduct process. Develop learning outcomes for the honor code process. Develop learning outcomes for the Academic Integrity Workshop. Develop learning outcomes for the Carolina Judicial Council new student member training.

#### **6A. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- Learning outcomes were developed for the student conduct process and are being evaluated through the use of the student conduct hearing assessment sent to students.
- Learning outcomes were developed for the honor code process and are being evaluated through the use of the honor code hearing assessment sent to students.
- Learning outcomes were developed for the Academic Integrity workshops and are being evaluated through the use of the workshop assessment given to students.
- Learning outcomes were developed for the Carolina Judicial Council new student member training and were evaluated upon the completion of the training in April 2010. 100 % of respondents agreed with the statement "After the training, I am confident that I have the tools to serve on a Council hearing." Overall, students reported positive feedback on individual sessions and training materials.

**Initiative 6B:** Develop and refine assessment tools used to measure effectiveness of programs and services. Implement and utilize Student Voice to support Division assessment efforts and connect to the Blueprint.

#### **6B. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- Student conduct surveys were administered through Student Voice from March 2010 to May 18<sup>th</sup> to 638 students. Honor code surveys were sent to 134 students in the process and 125 faculty who utilized the process in late April and again in May 2010 via Student Voice.
- 634 surveys of the CAAPS class regarding the class content were administered via the OSJP website.
- 559 surveys of the CAAPS class regarding behavioral changes were administered through Student Voice
- 13 housing hearing officers responded to a Housing Hearing officer training survey administered via Student Voice.

**Initiative 6C:** Review the effectiveness of the policies and processes within the Code of Conduct and Honor Code. Coordinate the Academic Integrity Advisory Committee to guide and

assess the functions of the Office of Academic Integrity. Coordinate a review process of the Student Code of Conduct.

### **6C. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- The Academic Integrity (AI) Advisory Committee met once in the fall semester and met once in the spring semester to review Office functions and Honor Code policies.
- Outreach to four campus offices were made regarding promotion of academic integrity through the Carolinian Creed as a result of AI Advisory Committee suggestions
- The Office of Academic Integrity revised its website for usability and content as a result of AI Advisory Committee suggestions
- A review of the student Code of Conduct has not yet been conducted and is in the planning stages.

**Initiative 6D:** Support the professional development of staff members to enhance services to students. Increase the number of professional staff members who complete the Individual Development Plans (IDP) process. Increase the number of individuals whose EPMS reviews are completed annually. Utilize the graduate assistant evaluation tool to measure their performance and professional development during the year. Utilize the graduate assistant evaluation tool to measure their performance and professional development during the year. Utilize available training and development opportunities through the division, the university, as well as through community, state, and national agencies.

### **6D. Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- Four training and development classes were attended by office manager, one development class was attended by Director;
- All 10 Student assistants were reviewed via an internal evaluation;
- All four graduate assistants were reviewed via an internal evaluation;
- All four professional staff members were reviewed via the EPMS process.