Overview & Response Rate: Provide the methods used to administer the assessment and the timeline. Identify demographics of respondents; include the number mailed or interviewed and the number completed.

This assessment involved providing a satisfaction survey to students adjudicated in fall 2010 and spring 2011 for Code of Student Conduct violations. Approximately 209 surveys were handed out in fall 2010; 148 of them were completed and returned for a response rate of 71%. For spring 2011, the response rate is expected to be higher as at the time of this review, the number of returned surveys (95) surpassed the number of cases reflecting finalization in our database; this is a reflection of the fact that surveys were tallied ahead of finalization entries being made to the database.

Distribution: List groups that will receive reports (oral or written) from this assessment. Include timeline for when presented.

The results are primarily intended for internal office use for purposes of assessment, improvement and strategic planning. They will also be used to provide information to the Vice President for Student Affairs as part of end-of-year reports submitted in summer 2011.

Summary of Findings: Include executive summary, table and figures, if applicable. What did you learn?
Overall satisfaction with the Student Justice process remains positive. The findings show that the total survey average improved rating 1.36 in fall and 1.40 in spring compared to 1.48 in the previous period assessed. While the percentage of students who gave the lowest marks (survey average of 4) increased to 3% (5 in fall and 3 in spring) this period compared to less than 1% (one student) in the preceding period, the number of students who gave the highest marks (survey average of 1) increased significantly to 61 (41%) in fall from 23% the previous assessment period, which in turn was an improvement from 20% in the period before that. Though, in spring, the percent was 28 (27), still an improvement from the previous assessment period, but more modest.

By question, the negative responses (scores of 3 or 4) ranged from 6-12% in fall and 6-17% in spring, and therefore, in each question the positive responses (scores of 1 or 2) ranged from 88-94% in fall and 83-94% in spring. The question averages ranged from 1.28 to 1.55 in fall and 1.27 to 1.67 in spring, also an improvement from the last period’s range of 1.29-1.74. As with past assessments, the question with the least satisfaction was regarding the timeliness of the adjudication process. The questions with the highest satisfaction were regarding their agreement that they were treated with courtesy, respect, and professionalism and that they were given the opportunity to explain their behavior and informed of their options.

Link to Strategic Plan: List the strategic plan supported by this assessment. Specifically identify the results which relate to strategic initiative(s).

Not linked in Initial Assessment Report

Link to Learning Outcomes: List the learning outcome supported by this assessment. Specifically identify the results which provide evidence of learning.

Students who utilize the services offered through the Student Justice process will be satisfied with services received and will demonstrate their knowledge of behaviors the university considers inappropriate and the consequences of engaging in unacceptable conduct.

Of all surveys completed, 91% in fall and 89% in spring averaged a positive response (1-2) compared to the remained with negative assessment averages of 2.1-4. All question averages were positive with the least satisfactory responded question (1a) averaging 1.55 in fall and 1.67 in spring. Questions/statements gauging learning included, “My experience with the discipline process and Student Justice will positively influence future choices I make concerning my behavior as a student” and “has had a positive impact on my values and attitudes.” The average for these two questions over the two semesters ranged from 1.36 to 1.57.

Recommendations/Action Plan: Describe specific actions or programmatic changes you will make resulting from this assessment. Include semester(s) of implementation and proposed follow up assessment.

Consistently from the time this survey was first administered, the questions with the least satisfactory responses related to the timeliness of the adjudication process (first contact from the time of the incident and the time students waited in the lobby to be seen for their appointment). Yes, delays occur from the time incidents occur and when a student appointment runs late, it can delay with a domino effect subsequent appointments. As the student population has steadily increased, the number of staff dedicated to the adjudication and review of alleged violations of the Code of Student Conduct has remained constant – 1. The Dean of Students office is exploring options to increase this number, ideally through the addition of a full-time staff member, but if necessary, through the use of a graduate level student employee/intern/research assistant.

Return completed form to VPSA Office, 980 J.C. Kellam, before the end of the semester in which the assessment was conducted.