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Expected Outcome:
The Office of Student Conduct (OSC) will determine best practices associated with mission statements for offices of student conduct within the South Eastern Conference (SEC) in order to create its own best practice mission statement.

Brief Description of Expected Outcome:
The OSC will utilize the collected information to craft a best practice based mission statement for the Auburn University Office of Student Conduct.

Assessment Method, Brief Description:
Qualitative Document Analysis

Data were collected through a qualitative document analysis of the fourteen (N=14) SEC institutions’ web pages.

Assessment Method, Full Description:
The primary investigator, the Director of Student Development, utilized the CAS Standards for Student Conduct Programs as a guide for best practices when looking at each institution’s respective conduct office mission statement. A data collection matrix was developed based on the CAS Standards to aid in gathering the data. Fields within the matrix included: incorporation of student learning and development, enhancement of educational mission, consistent with mission of institution, consistent with CAS Standards, protection of rights of students, response to behavioral problems, encourages respect for a safe campus community, and utilizes educational activities to reduce violations. Data collection started in early March 2012 and culminated in late April 2012.

Findings:
Data analysis occurred in April 2012. Data were analyzed by using the constant comparative method, developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Each document was read and tentative categories were created and compared. Themes were developed from the categories. Analysis occurred simultaneously with data
collection, and a mix of manual organization and computer software were employed to manage and analyze the data. The majority of SEC institutions had some elements of the identified fields within their mission statements. None of the SEC institutions (N=14) had all of the elements identified by the CAS Standards.

**Use of Findings for Improvement:**
A best practice mission statement was developed for the Office of Student Conduct to guide office staff and optimize practices within the unit to enhance student learning, development, and success.

**Any Additional Comments?**
N/A
**Expected Outcome:**
The Office of Student Conduct will assess the utilization and activity of the Division of Student Affairs (DoSA) Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT) for fall 2011 in order to make data driven decisions.

**Brief Description of Expected Outcome:**
The DoSA tracks all critical incidents related to students. Calls are received by a CIRT team member via the emergency on-call phone. The phone is managed 24 hours a day by professional staff members in the DoSA. The critical incidents are then logged by months in an Excel spreadsheet.

**Assessment Method, Brief Description:**
Quantitative and Qualitative, Tracking
Both quantitative and qualitative methods were utilized to complete the assessment.

**Assessment Method, Full Description:**
Student related critical incident quantitative and qualitative data were entered into an Excel file by the chair of the DoSA CIRT. The incidents were reported to the DoSA CIRT Chair by the on-call staff members via email. The emergency phone was managed 24 hours a day for each week of the 2011 semester by seven (N=7) professional staff members from the DoSA. Qualitatively information shared during each call was logged including the recording the caller’s name, student’s date of birth, and a description of the incident. Qualitative responses were analyzed to understand the nature of the calls received. The Chair of the DoSA CIRT retrieved the applicable data from the Excel database.

**Findings:**
One hundred twenty-eight (N=128) critical incidents were managed and/or resolved by the DoSA CIRT from Aug 16, 2011 – Dec 31, 2011. The team received thirty-eight (N=38) calls between the hours of 4:45 PM- 7:45 AM. The majority of reported critical incidents related to emergency medical transport of students (N=36). The team also received eighteen (N=18) calls related to medical issues that did not require transportation to the hospital. The DoSA CIRT managed one (N=1) student death during the fall 2011 semester. Below is a monthly breakdown of the reported critical incidents.

*Table A: Critical Incidents for fall 2011 Semester*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th># of Critical Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August (16th-31st)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of Findings for Improvement:

The data collected from this assessment was utilized to develop a DoSA CIRT Resource Manual for on-call team members. The manual was created as a training tool for CIRT members. The manual provides information regarding basic critical incident response procedures and the types of calls typically received by the team.

Any Additional Comments?

N/A
**Expected Outcome:**
The Office of Student Conduct will assess the utilization and activity of the Division of Student Affairs (DoSA) Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT) for spring 2012 in order to make data-driven decisions.

**Brief Description of Expected Outcome:**
The DoSA tracks all critical incidents related to students. Calls are received by a CIRT team member via the emergency on-call phone. The phone is managed 24 hours a day by professional staff members in the DoSA. The critical incidents are then logged by months in an Excel spreadsheet.

**Assessment Method, Brief Description:**
Quantitative and Qualitative, Tracking
Both quantitative and qualitative methods were utilized to complete the assessment.

**Assessment Method, Full Description:**
Student related critical incident quantitative and qualitative data were entered into an Excel file by the Coordinator for Student Advocacy and Case Management of the DoSA CIRT. The incidents were reported to Coordinator by the on-call staff members via email or phone call. The emergency phone was managed 24 hours a day for each week of the 2012 semester by eight (N=8) professional staff members from the DoSA. Qualitatively information shared during each call was logged including the recording the caller’s name, student’s date of birth, and a description of the incident. Qualitative responses were analyzed to understand the nature of the calls received. The Coordinator for Student Advocacy and Case Management of the DoSA CIRT retrieved the applicable data from the Excel database.

**Findings:**
One hundred forty-nine (N=149) critical incidents were managed and/or resolved by the DoSA CIRT from January 1, 2012 – May 16, 2012. The team received forty-three (N=43) calls between the hours of 4:45 PM- 7:45 AM. Thirty-three (N=33) calls were received by the CIRT that related to emergency medical transport of students, which resulted in 22% of the total calls received. The team also received twenty-eight (N=28) calls related to medical issues that did not require emergency medical service transportation to the hospital, which comprised 18% of the calls. Additionally, twenty-three (N=23) calls related to concerns regarding a student’s mental health, which resulted in 15% of the calls. The CIRT managed eight (N=8) incidents which related to the same student, and comprised 5% of the incidents over the entire semester. The DoSA CIRT managed three (N=3) student deaths during the spring 2012 semester. Below is a monthly breakdown of the reported critical incidents.
Table A: Critical Incidents for spring 2012 Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th># of Critical Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1-16th</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Findings for Improvement:

The data collected from this assessment was used to assist the CIRT with better preparation and response to student critical incidents and emergencies by expanding trainings for CIRT members, conducting after-action reviews following major critical incidents, and modifying staffing patterns based on “busy” times during the semester. The data also emphasized the need for collaboration within departments in the Division of Student Affairs. Specifically the Office of Student Conduct and Residence Life worked together to distinguish emergency vs. non-emergency incidents.

CIRT data from spring 2012 and past semesters was utilized to create a Division of Student Affairs Student Death Protocol. This protocol was created to ensure that all student deaths were managed the same manner and provided a guide for professional staff within the division to manage a student death in the event that the case manager was out of the office. CIRT members were trained on that protocol during summer 2012 after the CIRT is restructured.

Any Additional Comments?

N/A
Expected Outcome:
The Office of Student Conduct will compare the number of code violations for students and student organizations from fall 2010 to fall 2011 in order to determine optimum staffing levels.

Brief Description of Expected Outcome:
The Office of Student Conduct adjudicates all Code of Student Discipline and Student Organization Code of Conduct violations. OSC staff meets with student and student organizations to resolve disciplinary code infractions on campus.

Assessment Method, Brief Description:
Quantitative, Tracking
Quantitative methods were utilized to complete the assessment.

Assessment Method, Full Description:
Student and student organization disciplinary code infraction data were counted and entered into an Excel file by the Director of Student Conduct and a graduate assistant for the office. Each violation that occurred in fall 2010 and fall 2011 were assessed by comparing the frequency of every violation. Student and student organization complaints can only be submitted by university students, faculty, and staff. The graduate assistant for the office retrieved the applicable code infraction data from the Excel database.

Findings:
The number of total violations for fall 2011 (N=129) decreased by 84 violations from the fall 2010 semester (N=213). The decreased number of student game day stadium alcohol violations from the fall 2010 football season (N=165) to the fall 2011 (N=90) football season is the primary cause for the decrease in number of total violations between the fall 2010 and fall 2011 semesters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Students</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Violations Fall 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Findings for Improvement:
Based on the high number of code violations occurring during the fall semester, the data collected from this assessment was used to benchmark Office of Student Conduct staff sizes at other Southeastern Conference (SEC) institutions. Auburn University had the lowest staff size in student conduct. This data was used to advocate for a larger staff size in relation to peer institutions in the SEC.
Any Additional Comments?

In a new departmental initiative to enhance the campus learning environment and to promote positive citizenship, the Office of Student Conduct staff conducted 37 educational outreach meetings during the fall 2011 semester with Auburn University students. These supportive conversations related to topics of concern (i.e., off-campus driving under the influence (DUI) arrests, off-campus vandalism, off-campus disorderly conduct, etc…) that fell beyond the jurisdiction of the Code of Student Conduct.
Expected Outcome:
The Office of Student Conduct will compare the number of code violations for student and student organization from fall 2011 to spring 2012 in order to determine the need for a new staff position.

Brief Description of Expected Outcome:
The Office of Student Conduct adjudicates all Code of Student Discipline and Student Organization Code of Conduct violations. OSC staff meets with students and student organizations to resolve disciplinary code infractions on campus.

Assessment Method, Brief Description:
Quantitative, Tracking
Quantitative methods were utilized to complete the assessment.

Assessment Method, Full Description:
Student and student organization disciplinary code infraction data were counted and entered into an Excel file by the Director of Student Conduct and a graduate assistant for the office. Each violation that occurred in fall 2011 and spring 2012 were assessed by comparing the frequency of every violation. Student and student organization complaints can only be submitted by university students, faculty, and staff. The graduate assistant for the office retrieved the applicable code infraction data from the Excel database.

Findings:
The number of total violations for spring 2012 (N=22) decreased by 107 violations from fall 2011 (N=129). The decreased number of violations from the fall 2011 is due to less Code violations occurring during football season.

Table A: Code of Student Discipline/Student Organization Code of Conduct Violations Spring 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduct Violation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Students</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Violations Spring 2012</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Findings for Improvement:
The data collected from this assessment was used to create a new position in the OSC. The new position was Coordinator for Student Conduct. The Coordinator is responsible for adjudicating all student and student organization violations for the office. Additionally, the Coordinator is responsible for the management of the conduct table at all home football games.

Any Additional Comments?
N/A