

## ***2009-10 CAS Executive Summary and Action Plan***

### ***Summary of the Self-Assessment Process:***

In 2009- 2010 a self-study of the Honor and Judicial Programs office was conducted according to the CAS (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education) Standards and Guidelines. The goal of the self-study was to review the strengths and deficiencies of the Office and to create an action plan to overcome any deficiencies and to enhance office services.

The members of the Review Committee included:

Dr. Anna Cox Assistant Professor of Art, Honor Board Advisor

Mr. Gus Hemmer Assistant Director of Campus Recreation

Ms. Samantha Jones Student Judicial Board Vice-Chair

The Review Committee members often had differing opinions on the CAS standards. The Committee believed that the standards sometimes did not fit well with Longwood University's disciplinary system, and were better applied to larger institutions that have full-time hearing officers on staff and less reliance on student-run disciplinary boards. As a result, discussion on some standards focused on whether the Boards, the Office, or both were meeting the standards. Overall, the Review Committee believed the Office of Honor and Judicial Programs met or exceeded standards with the exception of Financial Resources and Technology.

---

### ***Part 1: Mission Overview Questions***

*What is the program mission?*

The Office of Honor and Judicial Programs creates and enforces conduct standards designed to ensure each student's freedom to learn while protecting the fundamental rights of campus community members. Longwood University's historic tradition of a student administered Honor Code and Judicial process forms the foundation for our community-based standards. The aspiration is to provide students with the knowledge, skill and insight necessary to make mature behavioral decisions that will contribute to the campus community and society.

*How does the mission embrace student learning and development?*

Attempts to ensure a safe learning environment; foster and promote appropriate behavior in conduct of student body, and by providing opportunity for student leadership

*In what ways does the program mission complement the mission of the institution?*

Fostering citizen leaders through participation in standards creation, student boards, and student governance

### ***Part 2: Program Overview Questions***

*What are the primary elements of the program?*

Honor Code/Honor Board, Conduct Code/Judicial Board, disciplinary hearings, review of policy through the Community Standards Committee, Advising students, faculty and staff on the Honor and Conduct system, support of campus educational programming conducted by board members.

*What evidence exists to confirm that the program contributes to student learning and development?*

Assessment surveys and research on development of critical thinking among board members.

*What evidence is available to confirm program goals' achievement?*

Outcomes of surveys, program surveys, process surveys, SA goals assessment

### ***Part 3: Leadership Overview Questions***

*What leadership practices are used most often by the program director(s)?*

Student centered – places responsibility and decision/action on student leaders with support and background info

### ***Part 4: Human Resources Overview Questions***

*What are the pressing concerns related to staffing the program?*

There are no pressing concerns.

*In what ways are training and professional development, supervision, and evaluation of each staff member provided?*

Student board members attend a fall training prior to classes and attend at least two inservice training sessions each year. Board Chairs have a weekly meeting with the Director, and meet twice a semester as a group.

### ***Part 5: Ethics Overview Questions***

*What ethical principles, standards, statements, or codes guide the program and its staff members?*

The Association of Student Conduct Administration Statement of Ethical Standard and Conduct guides the program.

*What is the program's strategy for managing student and staff member confidentiality issues?*

Federal privacy law and confidentiality are reviewed during board training. Board members sign a behavioral contact.

***Part 6: Legal Responsibilities Overview Questions***

*What are the crucial legal issues faced by the program?*

Maintaining substantive due process, and coordination with Public Safety.

***Part 7: Equity and Access Overview Questions***

*How does the program insure non-discriminatory, fair, and equitable treatment to all constituents?*

Board members are elected by the student body. The Director has final authority to counteract any imbalances in disciplinary decisions.

*What policies and/or practices are in place to address imbalances in participation among selected categories of students and imbalances in staffing patterns among selected categories of staff members?*

The Office follows University non-discrimination policy.

***Part 8: Diversity Overview Questions***

*In what ways does the program contribute to the nurturing of diversity on campus?*

The Office does not directly program in this area.

*How does the program serve the needs of diverse populations?*

Objective and fair decision making based on the facts of a case.

***Part 9: Organization and Management Overview Questions***

*What are the institutional organizational structures that define, enable, or restrain the program?*

REC/Administrative Manuals, Student Handbook, Board By-laws, student board member manuals

*What protocols or processes are in place to insure effective management of the program?*

Procedures published in the student handbook, and manuals.

***Part 10: Campus and External Relations Overview Questions***

*With which relevant individuals, groups, campus offices, and external agencies must the program maintain effective relationships?*

University Faculty, Residential and Commuter Life, Dept of Public Safety.

*What evidence confirms effective relationships with program constituents?*

Academic pledge posted in each classroom, Faculty Honor Board Advisors, Faculty Attitudes survey, combined training with Residential Life

***Part 11: Financial Resources Overview Questions***

*What are the immediate concerns related to funding?*

Office is below base level of funding needed to operate.

*What evidence exists to confirm fiscal responsibility and cost-effectiveness?*

University procurement and fiscal responsibility procedures.

***Part 12: Technology Overview Questions***

*What are the pressing concerns related to technology?*

Judicial Action student conduct incident database is outdated.

***Part 13: Facilities and Equipment Overview Questions***

*What are the immediate concerns related to facilities and equipment?*

There are no immediate concerns.

*What evidence exists to confirm facilities and equipment access, as well as health, safety, and security for all who are served by the program?*

University follows all ADA and other regulations regarding physical facilities.

***Part 14: Assessment and Evaluation Overview Questions***

*What are the assessment expectations for the program?*

Office professionalism and timeliness of system, Disciplinary statistics, Board member training, Board programming, Faculty and Student attitudes towards the system.

*What evidence exists to insure that the stated mission, program goals and objectives, and student learning and development outcomes are achieved?*

Internal survey on office professionalism and learning outcomes sent to disciplinary offenders via campus mail and email. Internal survey on attitudes towards the honor and judicial system sent to students and faculty via email. Research project regarding development of critical thinking skills of student board members.

*In what ways have assessment and evaluation results been used to revise and improve the quality of programs and services?*

Based on disciplinary statistics and feedback from student Judicial Board members, a third Judicial Board was formed to handle the number of cases and reduce board member fatigue. Disciplinary offender survey has been substantially revised with the goal of improving response rate. Focused discussions with Honor Board chairs regarding programming and sanctions resulted in collaboration with the Library on a plagiarism program that will be used as an alternative sanction for first time offenses.

---

### ***Identify areas of Program Strength***

#### ***Part 1: Mission Rating 3.81***

The office attempts to ensure a safe learning environment while providing opportunity for student leadership through participation in student boards, and student governance.

#### ***Part 2: Program Rating 3.84***

#### ***Part 3: Leadership Rating 3.88***

The student centered focus of a primarily student run system places responsibility and decision-making on student leaders with support and background from full-time staff. The student board members are described as highly involved, dedicated, and strong.

#### ***Part 4: Human Resources Rating 3.71***

#### ***Part 5: Ethics Rating 3.79***

#### ***Part 6: Legal Responsibilities Rating 3.78***

#### ***Part 7: Equity and Access Rating 3.76***

#### ***Part 8: Diversity Rating 3.71***

#### ***Part 9: Organization and Management Rating 4.00***

Raters commented that well written manuals and clear procedures contribute to the ability of the student boards to function on a high level.

***Part 10: Campus and External Relations Rating 3.83***

The raters list a number of instances where the office and student boards reach out to the campus community, including the New Faculty Dinner program, presentations at Longwood Seminar classes, and campus programming.

A major focus of the Office and Boards in the Fall 2010 semester will be the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Student Government Association and Honor Code. This past academic year, a steering committee composed of SGA, Honor Board and Judicial Board members, faculty and staff has planned and worked in the areas of programs and events, public relations, Longwood student governance history, and editing of the Honor Code. Advising and coordination of events will fall to the office and leadership of the Boards and SGA

***Part 13: Facilities and Equipment Rating 3.61***

***Part 14: Assessment Rating 3.70***

---

***Areas with Rating Discrepancy***

***Part 12.1 Technology Rating 2.33***

The Committee believed the Office and Boards satisfactorily meet standards in this section with the exception of having adequate technology to support mission and goals. The Board and Office workstation computers are adequate, however, the Judicial Action database program is outdated and cannot be upgraded as a new version of the program has superseded the version the office now uses.

Maintenance fees for the older version are approximately \$1200.00 higher than for the new version, and it is likely that support for the old version will be discontinued in the future.

Action: Request “one time expenditure” of \$9900.00 to convert to the new version of Judicial Action.

Resources: none needed.

Persons responsible: Chassey

Timeline: Spring 2010, or whenever “one time expenditure” requests are available.

---

***Areas of Program Weakness***

***Part 11.1 Financial Resources Rating: 2.90***

The Committee believed the Office and Boards satisfactorily set funding priorities, and demonstrate fiscal responsibility; however the Committee does not believe that either the Office or the Boards have adequate funding to accomplish mission and goals.

As examples: The Boards budget did not allow them to replace vital audio recording devices that broke down during the past year. The Office budget has used funds generated by fees imposed for the alcohol education sanction programs to cover software maintenance fees and training costs. These funds are supposed to be used in support of alcohol, tobacco and other drug education.

1) Action: Honor and Judicial Boards review funding procedures with the SGA Treasurer.

Resources: none needed.

Persons responsible: Board Chairs, Board Treasurers, Chassey

Timeline: Fall 2010

2) Action: Request full funding of Judicial Action maintenance fee.

Resources: none needed

Persons responsible: Chassey

Timeline: Spring 2010

---

APPENDICES: Please attach a copy of the Collective Ratings as an appendix to this document.