

Honor and Judicial Programs  
CAS Assessment  
2004-2005

In 2004 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. Alix Fink	Assistant Professor of Biology, University Disciplinary Board Member
Dr. Eric Laws	Assistant Professor of Psychology, Honor Board Advisor
Mr. Charles Lowe	Director of Public Safety and Chief of Police
Ms. Laura Soulsby	Student Judicial Board Vice-Chair
Ms. Jennifer Dize	Student Honor 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 Board, the Office, or both were meeting the standards.

**Program**

The Review Committee had some lengthy discussion on which of these standards applied to Honor and Judicial Programs. Once decided, the committee believed the Office/Boards did a satisfactory job of meeting the standards. However, the Committee believed that outcomes could be better documented.

Action: Tally types of educational sanctions assigned.

Resources: This action can be easily accomplished with the new software package

Persons responsible: Chassey, Whitaker

Timeline: begin next year.

### **Leadership**

Overall, the Review Committee believed the Office and Boards are meeting the standards, however, better communication of the “vision” would be helpful.

1) Office:

Action: Work with Academic Affairs to establish a new faculty orientation session on the Honor Code.

Resources: None needed

Person responsible: Chassey

Timeline: Summer 2005 and Fall 2005

2) Boards:

Action: Expand offerings of educational programs to RCL and campus

Resources: Board funding requests have been made to SGA

Persons responsible: Board Chairs, Chassey

Timeline: Fall 2005, Spring 2006

### **Organization and Management**

The Committee believed the Office satisfactorily met all the standards, but strongly recommended the Boards review and revise their constitutions and bylaws.

Action: Honor and Judicial Boards review and revise their constitutions and bylaws.

Resources: none needed.

Persons responsible: Board Chairs, Chassey

Timeline: Fall 2005

### **Financial Resources**

The Committee believed the Office satisfactorily met all the standards, but strongly recommended the Boards review their funding with SGA.

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

Resources: none needed.

Persons responsible: Board Chairs, Board Treasurers, Chassey

Timeline: Fall 2005

### **Assessment and Evaluation**

The Committee recognized the ongoing assessment, but suggested collecting more qualitative data, collecting data from faculty, and communicating assessment results

#### Actions

1) Talk with Board Chairs regarding feasibility of distributing outcome surveys at the end of the hearings.

Resources: None

Person Responsible: Chassey

Timeline: Immediate

2) Review educational assignments for qualitative evidence of learning.

Resources: None

Person Responsible: Chassey

Timeline: Fall 2005

3) Survey faculty opinions on the Honor and Judicial system every two years.

Resources: None

Person Responsible: Chassey

Timeline: Fall 2005

4) Publicize location of disciplinary statistics and assessment to faculty and staff.

Resources: None

Person Responsible: Chassey

Timeline: Fall 2005