

Student Conduct Office

Student Conduct Conferences

2021-2022

Purpose of Assessment

The Student Conduct Office (SCO) wanted to assess students' experience with and the learning from their conduct conferences to continue to improve how their office works with students in the future. The Student Conduct Office previously used a national survey to assess students' experience, but the questions did not focus on the priorities identified by the unit. This is the second year Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research (SAPAR) assisted SCO in assessing the conduct conferences.

Key Findings with Recommendations

Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research identified several key findings and developed actionable recommendations that Student Conduct Office (SCO) staff may take based on the results. However, SCO staff may identify other findings using their knowledge and understanding of the conferences and their participants. Staff members are strongly encouraged to read all the results and qualitative comments to gain a fuller understanding of students' experiences.

- Generally, students were positive about their experience interacting with the Student Conduct Office with at least 80% reporting they strongly agreed or agreed with each aspect of engaging with the office. Additionally, students self-reported growth in all outcomes the Student Conduct Office identified. However, most areas assessed were rated lower this year when compared to last year.
 - The SCO staff might explore any changes that have been made this past year to see if something is contributing to the lower ratings. The delivery method of the conference last year was still virtual and this past year conferences were mostly in person. SCO may look to see if there are positive aspects of the virtual process that could be used for the in person conferences.
- While still positive, students rated receiving sufficient information about the conduct process to prepare for their conference and understanding how administrators arrived at their decision the lowest.
 - SCO staff may want to examine the information shared with students both before their conference and after decisions are reached. Reviewing information in charge letters and the Student Conduct website may help to find areas that could be explained more or provide definitions for concepts that may be confusing or unknown. Additionally, SCO staff may want to work with conduct panels to be clearer in their rationale for the decisions being made and take time after the conference is over to explain more about the decision and the concluding rationales.
 - It may be beneficial for SCO staff to work with staff and students outside of the Student Conduct Office to see if they can identify any aspects of the charge letter or website that are not as clear. Staff could also refer to the assessment by SAAHE students in spring 2021 for any information about their experience. Additionally, staff could take a few minutes when meeting with students prior to the conference to see if any specific part of the charge letter was confusing to them. This may help identify areas to change the wording.
- The Student Conduct Office is encouraged to share the results with stakeholders, such as all staff and student employees in the office, conduct panel members, and the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs.

Method and Sample

The electronic evaluation was developed in Qualtrics®, a software program that creates web-based surveys. Of the 33 questions (four fewer questions than last year), 30 were quantitative, two were qualitative, and one was demographic. Due to branching technology, not all students received all questions. Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research evaluated the quantitative data using SPSS®, a statistical software program, and the qualitative data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel®.

Staff in the Student Conduct Office administered the survey by providing the survey link to students at the end of their student conduct conference. It is unknown how many students received the survey; therefore, a response rate cannot be determined. While the survey was being administered between September 2021 through August 2022, 25 students responded to at least one question (51 fewer respondents than last year).

Results

Results include frequency percentages, means, and standard deviations (sd) for the number of people (n) who responded to the question. For ease of reading, frequency percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent, so totals may not add up to exactly 100%. Tables are in descending order for the 2021-2022 column unless otherwise stated. In addition, summary themes for the qualitative questions are contained within this report, while the full qualitative responses can be found in a separate document. Comparisons to last year are made where appropriate; however, some questions changed due to conferences being virtual last year.

Students were asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement on a series of questions about their experience with the Student Conduct Office. Table 1, on the following page, shows students were generally in agreement with all statements. Students rated being greeted when entering the office and being informed about the procedures for reviewing files the highest. While still positive, understanding how administrators reached their decision and students' overall satisfaction with their interactions with the SCO were rated the lowest. Furthermore, disaggregated data for the question about students' overall satisfaction with their interactions with the SCO can be found in a separate document. However, due to the low number of respondents, it is difficult to make any meaningful conclusions, as several times 100% of respondents in one demographic area agreed or disagreed, but that represented one respondent.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	21-22 Mean (sd) [n]	20-21 Mean (sd) [n]
Upon entering the office, I was greeted and assisted by the front office staff.	67%	29%	--	--	5%	4.52 (.93) [21]	↑
The SCO staff informed me of the procedures for reviewing my and answered any follow-up questions I had.	62%	33%	--	--	5%	4.48 (.93) [21]	↑
The Student Conduct Office staff treated me with respect.	71%	14%	5%	5%	5%	4.43 (1.12) [21]	4.68 (.78) [63]
The Student Conduct Office staff were clear and professional in their communication with me.	62%	24%	5%	5%	5%	4.33 (1.11) [21]	4.74 (.71) [61]
The administrator(s) in my meeting listened to my perspective on the incident(s).	62%	24%	5%	--	10%	4.29 (1.23) [21]	4.70 (.75) [63]
Within 5-10 minutes of my appointment time, my administrator(s) introduced themselves to me.*	57%	29%	5%	5%	5%	4.29 (1.10) [21]	4.75 (.65) [63]
I received sufficient information about the conduct process from my charge letter (and the included links) to prepare for my conference.**	48%	33%	14%	--	5%	4.19 (1.03) [21]	4.44 (.93) [63]
I understand how the administrator(s) arrived at their decision and the rationale for that decision. This does not necessarily indicate an agreement with the decision.	48%	33%	5%	10%	5%	4.10 (1.18) [21]	4.63 (.85) [63]
Overall, I am satisfied with my interactions with the Student Conduct Office staff.	48%	33%	10%	--	10%	4.10 (1.22) [21]	4.59 (.91) [63]

Table 1: Experience with the Student Conduct Office

(↑ Question not asked)

*Last year the question was written as "Within 5 minutes of my appointment time, my administrator(s) admitted me to the Zoom meeting."

**Last year the question was written as "I received sufficient information about the conduct process to prepare for my conference."

Students who disagreed or strongly disagreed with any of the statements from Table 1 were asked a follow-up question to explain what they disagreed with or provide an example of why they disagreed. Two students provided comments. One student described the conduct system including the investigation as being broken, that they were not heard, and that one individual on the panel was unprofessional. The other student did not feel there was a reason why specific sanctions were selected.

When asked if they contacted the Student Conduct Office with questions prior to their conference, 19% of the 21 respondents reported they had and 81% said they had not contacted SCO. Students who contacted the Student Conduct Office before their conference (n=4) were asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement with two follow-up questions. Table 2 demonstrates that most students were in agreement with both statements. However, students rated both at a lower rate than last year. Note that one respondent represents 25% due to the low number of responses.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	21-22 Mean (sd) [n=4]	21-22 Mean (sd) [n=9]
My question(s) was answered adequately.	75%	--	--	--	25%	4.00 (2.00)	4.44 (.73)
I received a response to my question(s) within one business day.	50%	25%	--	--	25%	3.75 (1.89)	4.44 (.73)

Table 2: Asking Questions to the Student Conduct Office

The next section asked students to rate a series of statements related to the learning outcomes the Student Conduct Office identified. Students were asked to rate all statements on how they felt before attending their conference and after completing the conduct conference. Table 3, in descending “after” mean order below and on the next page, illustrates students reported growth in all areas listed from before to after their conduct conference. Similar to last year, the statement about students’ likelihood to reflect on their values before making future decisions rated the highest after their conduct conference. Overall, students noted the most growth in their awareness of the University’s expectations regarding student conduct. When compared to last year, most statements were lower.

Statement	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)	21-22 Mean (sd) [n]	20-21 Mean (sd) [n]
The likelihood that I will reflect on my personal values before making future decisions. (BEFORE)	50%	25%	15%	--	10%	4.05 (1.28) [20]	4.35 (.81) [62]
The likelihood that I will reflect on my personal values before making future decisions. (AFTER)	68%	16%	5%	--	11%	4.32 (1.29) [19]	4.76 (.51) [54]
My understanding of the University’s concerns regarding the behavior involved in my incident(s). (BEFORE)	30%	25%	20%	15%	10%	3.50 (1.36) [20]	3.84 (.97) [61]
My understanding of the University’s concerns regarding the behavior involved in my incident(s). (AFTER)	70%	10%	10%	--	10%	4.30 (1.30) [20]	4.63 (.68) [54]
My understanding of the actual or potential impacts (academic, professional, physical, emotional, legal, and/or financial) of the behaviors on myself. (BEFORE)	40%	35%	5%	10%	10%	3.85 (1.35) [20]	3.77 (1.13) [61]
My understanding of the actual or potential impacts (academic, professional, physical, emotional, legal, and/or financial) of the behaviors on myself. (AFTER)	60%	30%	--	--	10%	4.30 (1.22) [20]	4.67 (.58) [54]

Statement	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)	21-22 Mean (sd) [n]	20-21 Mean (sd) [n]
My knowledge of one or more strategies to help me avoid engaging in any potential student rule violation in the future. (BEFORE)	45%	35%	5%	5%	10%	4.00 (1.30) [20]	4.06 (.85) [62]
My knowledge of one or more strategies to help me avoid engaging in any potential student rule violation in the future. (AFTER)	60%	30%	--	--	10%	4.30 (1.22) [20]	4.54 (.69) [54]
My sense of responsibility to consider the potential impacts of my behavior on myself and others before making decisions. (BEFORE)	50%	35%	5%	--	10%	4.15 (1.23) [20]	4.11 (.96) [62]
My sense of responsibility to consider the potential impacts of my behavior on myself and others before making decisions. (AFTER)	55%	35%	--	--	10%	4.25 (1.21) [20]	4.74 (.65) [54]
My understanding of the potential impacts of the behavior on others. (BEFORE)	45%	30%	10%	5%	10%	3.95 (1.32) [20]	3.92 (1.06) [62]
My understanding of the potential impacts of the behavior on others. (AFTER)	55%	35%	--	--	10%	4.25 (1.21) [20]	4.69 (.70) [54]
My awareness of the University's expectations regarding student conduct. (BEFORE)	--	30%	20%	5%	45%	2.35 (1.35) [20]	3.77 (.98) [62]
My awareness of the University's expectations regarding student conduct. (AFTER)	60%	25%	5%	--	10%	4.25 (1.25) [20]	4.69 (.54) [54]
The likelihood that I will reflect on the University's Core Values before making future decisions. (BEFORE)	45%	25%	10%	10%	10%	3.85 (1.39) [20]	4.16 (.94) [62]
The likelihood that I will reflect on the University's Core Values before making future decisions. (AFTER)	60%	20%	5%	5%	10%	4.15 (1.35) [20]	4.62 (.69) [53]

Table 3: Learning Before and After Conduct Conferences

Students who responded to both the before and after their conduct conference statements were analyzed to determine how many students reported growth for individual statements. Table 4, on the following page, in descending order by the "Increased By 1" column, presents the level of growth the students indicated through their rating before and after attending their conduct conference. Students who did not rate themselves in both the before and after statements were not included. It is also worth noting that some items with a smaller percent of students reporting an increase are partly because those items were rated very high on the "before" statement, so it was not possible for a large number to improve in that category by the "after" statement. Furthermore, mean values were compared for the before and after of each statement. The difference in means was statistically significant between the before and after for students' awareness of the university's expectations related to student conduct, students' understanding of the university's concern regarding behavior, students' understanding of impacts of the behavior on themselves, and students' likelihood of reflecting on the university's core values before making future decisions.

Before and After Attending Conduct Conference Rating Change	Increased By 1	Increased By 2	Increased By 3	Increased By 4	Stayed the Same	Decreased By 1
*My understanding of the actual or potential impacts (academic, professional, physical, emotional, legal, and/or financial) of the behaviors on myself.	25%	5%	5%	--	60%	5%
The likelihood that I will reflect on my personal values before making future decisions.	21%	5%	--	--	68%	5%
My understanding of the potential impacts of the behavior on others.	20%	10%	--	--	60%	10%
*The likelihood that I will reflect on the University's Core Values before making future decisions.	20%	5%	--	--	75%	--
My sense of responsibility to consider the potential impacts of my behavior on myself and others before making decisions.	20%	--	--	--	70%	10%
*My understanding of the University's concerns regarding the behavior involved in my incident(s).	15%	20%	10%	--	50%	5%
*My awareness of the University's expectations regarding student conduct.	15%	20%	5%	30%	30%	--
My knowledge of one or more strategies to help me avoid engaging in any potential student rule violation in the future.	15%	--	5%	--	80%	--

Table 4: Learning Before and After Growth

*Statistically Significant Growth Observed

Students were asked about their likelihood of participating in the same behavior involved with their incident or any other student rule violation. Table 5 reveals a majority of the students felt it was unlikely that they would engage in any potential student rule violation in the future or in the same behavior involved in their incident. Note that a low mean score is more positive.

Statement	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)	21-22 Mean (sd) [n]	20-21 Mean (sd) [n]
The likelihood that I will engage in any potential student rule violation in the future.	5%	5%	--	--	90%	1.37 (1.12) [19]	1.61 (1.28) [54]
The likelihood that I will engage in the same behavior(s) involved in my incident(s) again.	5%	5%	11%	--	79%	1.58 (1.22) [19]	1.55 (1.19) [53]

Table 5: Likelihood of Future Behavior

The last question provided students the opportunity to share any additional comments they had regarding their experience. A wide range of ideas was shared by the seven respondents. About half of them were positive

comments about the process, feeling heard, being respected, and having questions answered. There were a few comments about the meetings; one student would have liked it scheduled quicker and another would not like there to be joint meetings or having a panel for two students at the same time. One student indicated it was difficult to hear when in a private meeting on Zoom due to the echo in the room. Another student expressed frustration about the perceived inconsistency related to hazing within the Corps.

Students provided their Universal Identification Number (UIN), which enabled demographics to be retrieved through the university student database for valid UINs. Table 6, in descending order for each category, provides the demographics for the survey respondents. Participants most frequently were sophomore, male, white, and not first-generation students, which is similar to last year.

Demographic Data	2021-2022 Survey Respondents Percentage [n=20]	2020-2021 Survey Respondents Percentage [n=66]
Classification		
Sophomore	35%	38%
Freshman	25%	36%
Junior	25%	14%
Senior	10%	9%
Doctoral	5%	--
Masters	--	3%
Sex		
Male	65%	71%
Female	35%	29%
Ethnicity		
White	55%	70%
Black	20%	--
Hispanic or Latino of any race	10%	24%
Asian	5%	3%
Multi-racial excluding Black	5%	3%
International	5%	--
First Generation Status		
Not First Generation	75%	86%
First Generation	20%	11%
Unknown	5%	3%
College		
Engineering	25%	26%
Architecture	15%	3%
General Studies	10%	15%
Education and Human Development	10%	8%
Veterinary Medicine	10%	5%
Agriculture and Life Sciences	10%	3%
Mays Business School	5%	18%
Liberal Arts	5%	17%
Science	5%	3%
Public Health	5%	2%
Geosciences	--	2%

Table 6: Demographics

Background

According to its website (<https://studentconduct.tamu.edu/>), the Student Conduct Office “encourages the development and well-being of all students. This is accomplished by promoting reflection, fostering accountability, and educating students and campus partners on individual rights and responsibilities within the University community.” The student conduct process is designed to be an educational experience with a focus to determine whether University standards of conduct have been violated.

Project Details

Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research provides quality assessment services, resources, and assessment training for departments in the Texas A&M University Division of Student Affairs and student organizations. Services by Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research are funded, in part, by the Texas A&M University Advancement Fee. Results of this project and other assessment projects done through Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research can be found at <https://sapar.tamu.edu/results/>. Additionally, anyone can follow Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research Facebook.

To work with Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research for future assessment projects, please fill out the Assessment Questionnaire at <https://sapar.tamu.edu/aqform/>.

Report Prepared for: Jaclyn Upshaw-Brown, Student Conduct Office
Report Prepared by: Kelly Cox, Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research
Report Prepared on: August 23, 2022
Analysis Prepared by: Judith Barrera, Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research
Survey Created by: Kelly Cox, Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research