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Abstract

This study implements a quantitative assessment survey to explore how experiences of students who participated in a conduct hearing process during the 2020 fall academic semester align with the conduct process learning outcomes of a private liberal arts institution located in northeast Florida (Northeast University). Survey descriptive statistics indicate Northeast University’s conduct process facilitated student understanding of university policies, understanding of their impact on the campus community, and facilitated a process that resulted in a student’s intention to no longer violate university policy again in the future. Data collected also presents trends for students held responsible for COVID-19 related policy violations. Students who were held responsible for a university COVID-19 policy violation and notified of a university policy violation decision without a conduct hearing, reported experiences with the conduct process that failed to achieve the first two learning outcomes but remained consistent in achieving the third and final learning outcome.

Unique to this study is the development of an assessment survey tool incorporating the institutions’ learning outcomes and a theoretical framework, Ajzen’s (1991) Theory of Planned Behavior. This study provides the assessment framework that will hopefully be adopted by institutions assessing areas of the student experience and the administration of the conduct process with a more learning outcomes related approach. An integrated approach to evaluating how students interact with a conduct process, which every institution in the country facilitates in some form, will only foster a more informed approach to holding students accountable for violating university policies and understanding the impact that process has on the success of students and the institution as a whole.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Non-academic experiences are an important part of the undergraduate student development process (Astin, 1984); These experiences contribute to the development of students’ world view, the construction of their personal values, and inform how they engage with others in the community. Successfully navigating these non-academic experiences can form the basis for students’ social integration—a known predictor important college outcomes including retention and persistence (Tinto, 1992). For many, successfully socially integrating may involve making choices related to alcohol and drug use, interactions with other members of the university community, as well as the use of university property (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). To address situations when a student’s decision making violates institutional policies and values, colleges and universities have established systems to hold students accountable for their actions (Waryold & Lancaster, 2008). In contemporary times, most colleges and universities’ student conduct process is not intended to be solely punitive but also to provide opportunity for student growth and development (Lipka, 2009).

Within the field of higher education, origins of early student conduct processes are well documented as part of colonial colleges, early dean models, and a rise in the 1980’s of a significantly more formalized approach to implementing conduct procedures (Dannells, 1988, Dannells & Lowery, 2004, Gerhing, 2006). In the modern era of student conduct administration, institutional leadership often works collaboratively with campus community stakeholders to establish policy criteria that outlines specific expectations regarding a student’s personal conduct (Swinton, 2008). With the development and implementation of these institutionally outlined personal conduct expectations, addressing instances where expectations are not met has become common practice at colleges and universities across the country (Nelson, 2017). The creation of
a student conduct adjudication process is the widely employed means for institutions to address violations of student conduct policies.

With the establishment of a student conduct adjudication (hearing) process, each institution must make decisions regarding conduct process structure, staff involved, and university responses (sanctions) as a result of a student violating a specific conduct policy. A majority of student conduct administrators agree that the conduct process itself should be developmental and educational (Howell, 2005). Further still, while limited, additional research has linked a student’s experience participating in conduct process to having an impact on their ultimate retention at the institution (Kompalla & McCarthy, 2001). Furthermore, Kompalla and McCarthy (2001) and Zacker (1996) point out that for the conduct process to impact a student’s retention, there must be identifiable learning goals established for the process. Despite the identified need for a formalized assessment guide for student conduct processes, the field has not specified recommended learning outcomes for a conduct process, nor explored best practices in measuring if learning outcomes were successfully experienced by participants (Howell, 2005; Karp & Sacks, 2014; Nelson, 2017).

A process that allows for the formation of learning outcomes for the participants of a student conduct hearing process best positions institutions to effectively adjudicate possible conduct policy violations (Howell, 2005). Clearly stating the conduct process learning outcomes allows for an institution to establish a direct relationship to the tangible assessment of the intended conduct process student outcomes (Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

**Problem Statement**

Student Affairs professionals in higher education have historically been charged with facilitating a university conduct hearing process that addresses student behavior which violates
STUDENT EXPERIENCE IN A CONDUCT PROCESS

university policies and expectations (Bracewell, 1997). However, there is a lack of understanding in how a university conduct process impacts its student participants, specifically if the process itself achieves its intended learning outcomes (Stimpson & Janosik, 2011; Stimpson & Stimpson 2008). An assessment of a conduct hearing’s process outcomes is essential to best understand whether the facilitation of the process achieves its intended student participant learning outcomes. As Student Affairs professionals are continually expected to facilitate the adjudication of college student behavior in relation to conduct policies, a clear presence of developmental and educational learning outcomes in the process, and the means to critically assess their achievement, is critical.

Purpose Statement

The design and population of the study provides a unique opportunity to thoroughly investigate a specifically designed conduct process at a regional small liberal arts institution (Northeast University). To better understand if intended learning outcomes for the conduct hearing process have been achieved, self-reported data of conduct hearing process experiences from recent student participants were collected. The research provides foundational context to better understand if the conduct hearing process learning outcomes have been successfully achieved, and what aspects of the conduct hearing process need to be re-evaluated to better facilitate intended learning outcomes. Specifically, does Northeast University’s conduct process facilitate a student experience in which student reports increased understanding of university policy, the impact of their behavior on the campus community, and an intention not to violate university policy in the future?
Research Questions

This study explores if the currently employed conduct hearing process at Northeast University achieves the intended learning outcomes. The study utilizes a quantitative assessment survey (Creswell, 2008) to gather feedback from students who participated in a university conduct hearing process. This study identifies whether student participants in a university conduct hearing process self-report experiences and outcomes that are consistent with the intended learning outcomes of the institution. If colleges and universities expect conduct hearing officers to facilitate a policy adjudication process that achieves its intended goals, and supports existing policies and student conduct expectations, it must also integrate a culture of a regular critical evaluation of its intended outcomes. With this dynamic in mind, it is critical to know if students who have participated in a university conduct hearing process self-report experiences that reflect the university’s intended learning outcomes.

The study examines the following research questions:

1. Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report an increased understanding of university policies?

2. Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report an increased understanding of how their behavior impacted the university community?

3. Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report they intend to change to their future behavior to adhere to university policy?

These research questions were examined through a quantitative assessment survey study. This method was selected to apply a set of specific quantitative survey questions aligned to provide
focused feedback on the intended university learning outcomes. The selected sample for the study are undergraduate students who participated in the university conduct process during the 2020 fall academic semester. Data was collected through Likert scale framed assessment survey (Creswell, 2008). Further detail of research design, methodology, and methods are presented in Chapter 3.

Overview of Theoretical Framework

The theoretical concept that frames this study is Icek Ajzen’s (1991) Theory of Planned Behavior and further informs the gathering of the self-reported experiences of the student participants within a conduct process. Through this theory, discovery is made as to if the participants in the study hold specific perceptions regarding their behaviors which violated university policy and go on to form new intended future behaviors after participating in a conduct process, while continuing to attend the institution.

Overview of Methodology

This study explores how an institution’s conduct process impacted the undergraduate students that participated in a university conduct hearing. A researcher designed quantitative assessment survey (Creswell & Creswell, 2017) is implemented in this study to gather information from the undergradatue students who participated in a conduct hearing process. The survey is designed specifically to explore if those students report experiences participating in the conduct process aligned with the conduct process learning outcomes of the institution. The nature of this specifically targeted evaluation, paired with the gap in existing academic literature,
serves the continued expectation for universities to hold college students accountable within a consistent format while further developing the context for implementing this research.

**Significance of the Research**

Benefits of this study include providing greater depth of understanding surrounding the relationship between student perceived learning outcomes and intended university learning outcomes of a conduct hearing process. Scholarship and research on student conduct in higher education is robust (Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008; Karp & Sacks, 2014; Nelson, 2017), but explicit focus on whether a conduct process achieves its intended learning outcomes is limited (Howell, 2005; Karp & Sacks, 2014; Nelson, 2017). The in-depth investigation of a student conduct process, and assessment of whether its intended learning outcomes are achieved provides the possibility of impactful growth for the site institution and for student conduct officers nationally. This impact also includes a practical significance for Northeast University specific to developing deeper insight into the effectiveness of their current conduct process. The study also presents the opportunity to contribute to scholarship through additional understanding into the process of developing a targeted evaluation tool utilized in a rigorous assessment of a conduct process. From a macro viewpoint the scholarly implementation of this study directly supports the practical growth and development of college students into a population of holistically educated future leaders.

Moving forward, it is critical to reflect upon the study construction and direction taken in this research. Through a targeted review of the literature, existing scholarly research of current conduct process assessment was thoroughly investigated. Data from this scholarship is synthesized to identify themes and theoretical models which foundationally inform this study. At the end of Chapter 2, the conceptual and theoretical framework for this study is presented and
explained. Next, Chapter 3 reviews the methods of quantitative survey assessment study (Creswell, 2008), highlighting the importance and purpose of implementing this study. In this chapter consideration for the study population is also given along with the purpose for selecting my specific institutional focus. Intended analysis procedures will be reviewed, as well as strengths and limitations for the study.

**Organization of the Study**

This study implements an assessment survey to explore how perceived experiences of undergradduate students who participated in a conduct hearing process align with the conduct process outcome objectives of Northeast University, a private liberal arts institution in northeast Florida. The assessment survey results are framed within the context of a conducted review of existing literature related to university student conduct. Utilizing the assessment survey, self-reported data is compiled from students who participated in a conduct hearing process during the 2020 fall academic semester. The 2020 fall academic semester was selected as the timeframe to identify possible survey participants to allow for a timely recollection of the events and their experiences.

Northeast University was selected as the site of the assessment survey in order to take advantage of the unique circumstances regarding access to conduct survey participants. As a former staff member, and university-level conduct hearing officer, at the institution from 2012-2018, I have the opportunity to partner with current staff to directly engage with students who have participated in the university conduct hearing process. The Dean of Students (Chief Conduct Officer) at Northeast University has also reported that an assessment of the effectiveness of the learning outcomes for the student conduct process has never taken place.
Chapter Summary

Non-academic experiences are an important part of the undergraduate student development process (Astin, 1984); These experiences contribute to the development of students’ world view, the construction of their personal values, and inform how they engage with others in the community. Successfully navigating these non-academic experiences can form the basis for students’ social integration—a known predictor important college outcomes including retention and persistence (Tinto, 1992). To address situations when a student’s decision making violates institutional policies and values, colleges and universities have established systems to hold students accountable for their actions (Waryold & Lancaster, 2008). Most colleges and universities’ student conduct process is not intended to be solely punitive but also to provide opportunity for student growth and development (Lipka, 2009).

A majority of student conduct administrators agree that the conduct process itself should be developmental and educational (Howell, 2005). Further still, while limited, additional research has linked a student’s experience participating in conduct process to having an impact on their ultimate retention at the institution (Kompalla & McCarthy, 2001). Furthermore, Kompalla and McCarthy (2001) and Zacker (1996) point out that for the conduct process to impact a student’s retention, there must be identifiable learning goals established for the process. Despite the identified need for a formalized assessment guide for student conduct processes, the field has not specified recommended learning outcomes for a conduct process, nor explored best practices in measuring if learning outcomes were successfully experienced by participants (Howell, 2005; Karp & Sacks, 2014; Nelson, 2017).

This study implements an assessment survey to explore how perceived experiences of undergradatue students who participated in a conduct hearing process align with the conduct
process outcome objectives of a private liberal arts institution located in northeast Florida. The assessment survey results are framed within the context of a conducted review of existing literature related to university student conduct. Utilizing the assessment survey, self-reported data is compiled from students who participated in a conduct hearing process during the 2020 fall academic semester to further explore if the institutions intended learning outcomes are achieved.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

In a defining book outlining the importance of further formalizing the role of student conduct administration in American higher education, Waryold and Lancaster (2008) declared conduct assessment “must be based on a set of questions or topics that accurately respond to the expectations the conduct office has established and the culture of the campus” (p. 292). Furthermore, the book advocates the development of assessable measures of individual and organizational effectiveness for student conduct on university campuses is critical. This work in student conduct practice highlights the important role student affairs professionals play in student conduct administration and the development of assessing its impact. This charge to develop further defined and targeted assessment within an institution’s adjudication of conduct issues aligns with the need for student conduct processes to support student success (Nelson, 2017).

Literature in three overarching areas is presented, providing the important framework for understanding a student conduct process in a university setting. This review includes research on the state of student conduct in higher education, assessment within the field, and the assessment of student participant reported experiences. The scholarship encompasses relevant insights to this study in three critical ways. First, it is necessary to understand the landscape of student conduct within higher education literature. Exploring the ways this fundamental part of university culture has developed and currently exists allows for a purposeful foundation to understanding the setting for this research. Second, this literature informs definitions and methods of theoretical analysis for the study. Finally, these articles contain data which outlines previously explored areas within student conduct and opportunities for further investigation and understanding.
Student Conduct Process, Existing Assessment, and Assessed Student Participation Data

The data to support the assessment and evaluation of student participants in a university conduct process, specific to their perceived experiences, does not present in one body of literature. Much like gathering and evaluating information as part of a conduct hearing process, both conduct process best practice scholarship was identified, as well as outcome and participant research, in various pieces of existing literature. Additionally, within research specifically focused on the experiences of conduct process participants, I explore the presence (or lack thereof) of participant experience data. Through this scholarship review, three themes emerged:


2. There is a lack of scholarship on the experiences of students participating in a university conduct process. (Howell, 2005; King, 2012; Karp & Sacks, 2014).

3. There is limited existing assessment of a student participant’s reported learning outcomes from an involvement in a university student conduct process. (Stimpson & Janosik, 2011; Kompalla, & McCarthy, 2001).

Limited Existing University Conduct Processes Literature

Not unlike the infamous “Dean Wormer” from the classic film Animal House (Landis, 1978), and his ambiguous conduct sanction of “double top-secret probation”, much of student conduct practices throughout the history of higher education were without formal assessment or tangibly articulated outcomes (Zacker, 1996). As is the case with any process that is not critically evaluated and assessed to best measure intended outcomes and impact, not until the late 20th century did the conversation surrounding the practice of student conduct begin to broach topics such as crafting a guiding a purpose for a conduct process (Dannells, 1997).
The role of conduct hearing officer and the university conduct process continues to exist with no distinct professional track, nor does the process itself look the same from one institution to the next (Dannells, 1997). The gaps in scholarship and inconsistent implementation in this area compounds the challenge in developing an assessment approach to identify effectiveness in achieving intended outcomes. The recent scholarship that is available covers or focuses on three specific and limited areas: defining a conduct process, conduct process best practices, and conduct process assessment. The defining of a conduct process helps outline or highlight the current shared practices and significant differences throughout the field. The conduct process best practices data delivers important information about what, in terms of conduct adjudication approaches, is currently accepted as appropriate and supported with the field of higher education. Finally, developing process outcomes examines how institutions articulate, assess, and communicate to their campus community the intended impact and outcomes of their implemented conduct process. Each of these areas of student conduct connect with the goal of the study to understand if an institution’s articulated conduct process outcomes are experienced by the students participating in the process.

**Defining a Conduct Process.** The Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA), the premier organization focused on the advancement of the student conduct profession (Association for Student Conduct Administration, 2017), defines the student conduct process as one “should be accomplished in a manner that protects the rights, health, and safety of members of the campus community so that they may pursue their educational goals without undue interference” (p.1). ASCA goes on to further expand upon this definition by including that student conduct professionals are charged to support institutional and educational missions (Association for Student Conduct Administration, 2017). The student conduct process provides
professionals with detailed published literature outlining best practices for process procedures and administrative organization, while also openly acknowledging that research analyzing the student experience within a conduct process is lacking (Dannells, 1997). This assertion is further supported in the work of Stimpson and Stimpson (2008), as they highlighted the impact and effectiveness of a conduct process is best understood through clear and direct evaluation of the process and its participants.

**Conduct Process Best Practices.** ASCA states student conduct professionals are charged to support institutional and educational missions. The ASCA further articulates expectations of the student conduct professional in a published Principles and Practices document highlighting best practices in the field. Best practices advocated within the student conduct process place an emphasis on (Association for Student Conduct Administration, 2017):

- **Autonomy:** Responsibility for one’s own behavior, freedom of choice, and decision making imply that the individual is at liberty to choose their own course of action. (p. 2)
- **Non-Malfeasance:** (Student conduct professionals) should pledge to avoid causing harm to others. (p. 2)
- **Beneficence:** Contributing to the welfare of others, even where such contributions must be balanced with potential discomfort is a critical part of student growth and conduct administration. (p.3)
- **Justice:** Members support adherence to community standards and the necessity of disciplinary interventions when those standards are violated. Such interventions should be just and fundamentally fair while contributing to the educational and personal growth of the student. (p. 3)
**Fidelity**: There must be a commitment to fidelity resulting in trust in the individual administrator who is to resolve such conflicts. Essentially, without trust or fidelity in professional relationships, growth and development cannot occur. (p. 4)

To further highlight the importance of these principles, King’s (2012) research exploring the relationship between perceived fairness and educational value in a conduct process also articulated the importance of utilizing guiding tenets to facilitate a conduct process. King (2012) is also one of only several researchers who specifically investigated the relationship between the student and the conduct process experience (Howell, 2005; Karp & Sacks, 2014; Stimpson & Janosik, 2011; Swinton, 2008). King identified that there was a direct positive correlation between the student’s perceived educational value within the conduct process and the perceived fairness within that same experience. Further highlighting the importance of the student conduct professional to continue to lead in identifying areas of the conduct experience that can be facilitated in accordance with articulated best practices.

**University Conduct Process Data.** Five published studies (Howell, 2005; Karp & Sacks, 2014; King, 2012; Stimpson & Janosik, 2011; Swinton, 2008) focus significantly on the conduct process student participants’ experience. This limited exploration into understanding university conduct process outcomes and their impact on student participants leaves considerable opportunity for further research. The studies available offer insight and direction into institutional level process structure, the student conduct professional experience including the expected preparation needed to serve in the field, and the purpose for the process itself. This scholarship assists in framing the purpose of the study in extending concepts identified by
previous research to consider the experiences students participating in a university conduct process, specific to the intuitions’ articulated process outcomes.

A qualitative study on the meaning students take from their interactions with university conduct processes was the first research to specifically focus on self-reported student data specific to their student perceived experience (Howell, 2005). Using a multiple case study approach, the study explored student’s perceived learning and anticipated future behaviors as a result of their interaction with the conduct process. The fact that this research is only 15 years old, highlights that scholarship in this area began relatively recently, with the largest hole in existing scholarship being that student participant experiences were virtually non-existent in the research literature. Howell (2005) went on to state “the actual outcome, educational or otherwise, for students who violate institutional policies and then progress through the campus judicial system remains largely unknown” (p. 3). For decades student conduct scholars produced literature focused on the on the student conduct process. However, a research emphasis on the students impacted by the conduct process remains a new and understudied area within higher education (Howell, 2005; King, 2012).

Howell (2005) investigated two areas involving conduct process student participants: 1) What, if anything, do students believe they have learned after completing the process?; 2) In what ways do students believe their interaction with the campus judicial process will affect their future behavior? The reported experiences of the conduct process student participants were grouped into three main themes: 1) Learning; 2) Effects on Future Behavior; 3) Advice. Howell’s (2005) research in this area is directly focused on the student experience and does not include additional investigation into the self-reported student experiences and if they have any relationship to the institution’s articulated conduct process outcomes. Lastly, Howell’s (2005)
A qualitative study involved interviews with ten students who participated in the student conduct process, which make this a modest sample size. To explore this topic purposefully, a more in-depth investigation of student conduct outcomes and their direct connection to the experiences of the student participants is needed. To further highlight this need, this section will further evaluate the subsequent available literature.

Stimpson and Janosik (2011) took a larger scale approach in researching student conduct process learning outcomes. Their quantitative study involved invitation outreach to 1671 students with ultimate participation of 510 students (30.6% overall response rate) from 5 different public and private institutions of varying size. In a quantitative evaluation process, the researchers found a significant disparity in the amount of reported learning by female compared to male students. Specifically, female students were “more likely to report greater learning related to understanding the consequences of their behavior and greater learning related to their likelihood of not violating university policy in the future than men” (Stimpson & Janosik, p.7). This gender dynamic represents one of the key findings of the study, leading the researchers to suggest that male students are more highly represented as repeat offenders in the conduct process due to learning less about the consequences of their behavior. This data and the resulting conduct process gender dynamic led the researchers to urge campus conduct professionals to consider additional process and programmatic components such as specific learning outcomes centered on community standards and increasing understanding of the consequences of behavior. Further recommendations focused specifically on ensuring that conduct professionals refocus their attention on the development of learning outcomes for students who participate in their conduct systems.
This data continues to highlight the experience for both conduct professionals and the students they interact with on campus across the country. Until recently, published literature has been absent of findings were any meaningful information on student learning that occurs because of the student conduct process (Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008). The current literature fuel questions which call for leaders of campus conduct processes to consider their currently articulated learning outcomes and thoroughly investigate reported learning outcomes from student participants. A more detailed understanding of self-reported student participant perceptions of the process and their experienced learning, in comparison to the university’s stated outcomes, is critical for meaningful continued growth within the field of student conduct.

**Conduct Process Assessment**

Thorough evaluations of current assessment literature within student conduct processes have occurred with multiple researchers (Howell, 2005; King, 2012; Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008; Swinton, 2008), although with few exceptions, historically research and assessment of the student conduct process has been specifically comprised of “at least eight themes focusing on: administration, assessment, characteristics of student offenders, history of the student conduct field, mediation, sanctioning, student development, and training” (Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008, p. 2). As the current conduct process landscape exists on the national level, no distinct professional literature provides guidance in the development of institutional specific conduct process learning outcomes that take into account reported student learning based on those outcomes. Meanwhile, conduct process professionals continue to navigate their role as a continually complex endeavor. The lack of scholarship in this area compounds this challenge. The existing areas of scholarship help frame context, describe boundaries, and outline best practices within the field. Finally, the majority of the existing conduct process scholarship
examines how institutions and those who serve as conduct professionals in the field structure and administer their respective processes (Howell, 2005; Karp & Saks, 2014; King, 2012; Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Upon investigation into the published research pertaining to this area of higher education administration, the disproportionate existence of published literature from the university and conduct professional’s experience becomes clear. This absence of research further highlights the need for additional scholarship connecting the study of the conduct process with the goal to understand if and what students report learning as having participated in the process.

**Existing Areas of Assessment**

In examining the existing literature, current conduct process assessment exists in two separate areas, the evaluation of historical institutional based process (Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008; Swinton, 2008) or student reported data from conduct process participants (Howell, 2005; Karp & Saks, 2014; King, 2012; Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). In 2008, scholars Stimpson and Stimpson conducted a thorough review of existing literature in the field of student conduct administration, which explored 27 years of published literature from higher education conduct professionals. The review, which focused on literature published in peer reviewed journals or books from 1980 to 2007, identified multiple areas of published scholarship. Specific to this study, the reviewed literature identified published conduct assessments which outline a conduct process that administrators can follow. In addition to navigating challenges with assessment collection and review, as well as identifying time to conduct a timely and relevant assessment process, the literature review also identified that student conduct professionals face additional challenges in engaging their profession in an in-depth fashion, such as limited exposure to formalized training and serving in multiple institutional roles outside of a conduct process capacity (Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008). It is important to note that as of the time of this research
no literature review like Stimpson & Stimpson’s (2008) has comprehensively reviewed published literature from higher education conduct professionals from 2008 to the present. While not representative of a complete picture due to the date with which it was published, the findings provided in Stimpson and Stimpson’s (2008) review highlights a critical lack of research in respect to student learning. Additional research and investigation as part of this literature review identified a limited number of related published scholarship (Karp & Sacks, 2014; King, 2012; Lipka, 2009; Nelson, 2017; Stimpson, & Janosik, 2011) since Stimpson’s and Stimpson’s (2008) distillation of existing work. The lack of student experiential focus in the research emphasizes the need for literature examining student learning within a conduct process. Which leads to a larger question: Do institutions employ a formalized process for developing conduct process outcomes?

**Student Perceived Learning Within the Conduct Process.** Student conduct professionals have access to literature with established policies and protocols which inform the structure and adjudication process of conduct cases (Howell, 2005; Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008). Available research also provides a small sample of data sets outlining reported experiences from student participants (Karp & Saks, 2014; King, 2012; Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). While the landscape of student conduct process literature has produced a robust set of offerings in several areas there is an additional, albeit limited, set of literature exploring a students’ perceived learning from engaging in an institutions’ conduct system (Howell, 2005; King, 2012). Howell’s (2005) research, while impactful within the field, is limited by the small pool of case study participants (n = 10) paired with an evaluation approach that involved student’s reported learning. Howell (2005) did explore with significant depth the reported experiences of those students that participated in the conduct process. First, students confirmed that some learning did
occur as a result of their experience in the conduct process. Furthermore, most participants did at least modify some of their behavior. Lastly, students discussed their motivations for “accepting responsibility” for a conduct policy violation were largely informed by perceived risks versus rewards regarding a potential outcome. While student focused, the study lacked a direct connection to institutional learning outcomes for the conduct process.

Seven years after Howell’s (2005) targeted research regarding student learning from a conduct process, King (2012) explored in greater depth and breadth the student experience within the conduct process. Specifically, King’s (2012) study involved 1,884 student participants from three different large state institutions. King utilized an assessment survey consisting of 40 items and addressing categories such as value of sanctions, educational value and fairness, and demographic data. Significant findings from the study included a correlation between students’ perceived fairness in the conduct process and reported educational value in the process. The value students assigned to the conduct process, specifically the conduct hearing itself, best predicted the degree to which they believed their involvement in the conduct process would cause them to avoid violations of university policy in the future and change their behavior. Differences in students’ perceptions emerged pertaining to age, gender, and GPA, among other characteristics (King, 2012).

**Areas Lacking Assessment Attention.** Two studies (Howell, 2005; King, 2012) specifically focus on students’ reported learning from participating in a conduct process. This targeted exploration into understanding the experience of student participants in a conduct process leaves ample opportunity for further direction in research. The studies available offer direction for further understanding the institution’s intent and the student outcome of the conduct process experience, including a students’ intention to modify their future behavior after
participating in the conduct process, the formation of institution developed conduct process learning outcomes, and the connection between those outcomes and student reported learning from the process. This scholarship assists in framing the purpose of the study by extending concepts identified by previous research to consider a more in-depth evaluation of student experiences during conduct process adjudication in direct relation to the intended outcomes articulated by their campus conduct professionals (Howell, 2005; King, 2012).

Howell (2005) conducted a qualitative study on the learning that student participants take away from their experiences in a campus conduct process. It was one of the earliest research studies specifically focused on the self-reported experiences of the 10 student participants themselves – notably the research did not address how the student learning related to intended conduct process outcomes. The research sheds light on a gaping hole in the scholarship, Student self-reported learning, as participants in the process, were virtually non-existent in the research literature. Student participants were represented as statistical trends of research studies and conceptual articles but rarely represented through their own experiences as participants (Swinton & Swinton, 2008). For decades campus conduct process practitioners and scholars have produced literature on the conduct process. However, as stated in Swinton & Swinton’s (2008) review of existing literature in the field “the most disheartening aspect of the literature reviewed in this section is the lack of emphasis on student learning” (p. 4).

As noted earlier, King (2012) introduced a significantly more in-depth and expansive investigation of the student experience within a campus conduct process then previously published literature on the subject. King identified a significant gap in existing scholarship between self-reported student learning from participation in a campus conduct process and any relationship that may exist to campus conduct process learning outcomes. Highlighting the need
for further research in this area, King (2012) went on to state: “Investigation into what college students believe they should learn through involvement in disciplinary proceedings would help to identify how their perspectives compare to what practitioners believe students should gain” (p. 17).

This underrepresented area within campus conduct process research one of the key findings of the study, indicates that at the very least campus conduct professionals have operated within their role assuming that the intended process and learning outcomes have the intended impact on the students they engage with regularly. As campus conduct process adjudication will continue to be an ongoing component to student life on college campuses, more and more campus conduct professionals will be expected to have an acute understanding of the impact their institution’s response to conduct policy violations have on those who participate in the process. Where will these professionals receive access to this additional insight and how can they ensure their conduct process is being applied and operating effectively? These questions link directly to the need for further research in campus conduct processes and how they impact students.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical concept that frames this study is Icek Ajzen’s (1991) Theory of Planned Behavior and further informs the gathering of the self-reported experiences of the student participants within a conduct process. Through this theory, discovery is made as to if the participants in the study hold specific perceptions regarding their behaviors which violated university policy and go on to form new intended future behaviors after participating in a conduct process, while continuing to attend the institution.
Theory of Planned Behavior. The Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) states that one's beliefs and intentions directly inform one’s behavior. The theory further outlines that intention toward attitude, subject norms, and perceived behavioral control, together shape an individual's behavioral intentions and actual behaviors. This theory connects to the study by formalizing a connection between a student’s intended behavior and actual behavior that occurred. Additionally, the theory posits that a behavior is more likely to occur if a student’s intention is in line with behavioral action. This theory and the subsequent behavioral dimensions outlined below add additional context to the research, framing what individuals do and learn regarding their experience participating in a campus conduct process.

**Attitude.** Attitude is identified as “the attitude toward the behavior and refers to the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question” (Azjen, 1991, p. 10). This behavioral dimension highlights that a person’s personal perception of an experience frames their relation to it. This study seeks to understand the conduct process through analysis of the student participant’s perception of the process itself. What was their perception of the process in direct relation to their reported intention?

**Subject Norms.** Subject Norms refers to the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior (Azjen, 1991). This behavioral dimension creates a space in which a direct relationship between established expectations and the experiences of an individual participant can be explored. Among other pieces the study seeks to understand the conduct process through analysis of the student participant’s understanding of expectations related to their behavior. What was the student’s perception of their ability to engage in specific decision making?

**Perceived Behavioral Control.** Perceived Behavioral Control refers to the perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behavior and it is assumed to reflect past experience as well as
anticipated impediments and obstacles. Perceived Behavioral Control remains critical to the
development of planned behavior (Azjen, 1991). The study explores all three of Azjen’s (1991)
behavioral factors outlined in this section, as well as their relation to the conduct process of a
specific campus. Are students able to articulate their own experience through a campus conduct
process? Do they have an experience in the conduct process which informs their intended future
behavior?

While majority of institutions of higher education across the country do employ a formal
a conduct process for their students, current literature highlights a lack of consistency in process
and articulated outcomes. A conduct process that allows for the student to reflect on and process
through their behavior and create space to further evaluate intended future behavior not only
operates within Ajzen’s (1991) theoretical framework but allows for direct assessment of the
student’s perceived experiences and possible impact.

The literature supports that universities have taken steps to formalize their respective
campus conduct processes (Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008), unfortunately it is unclear if they engage in
assessment to determine if intended student outcomes are actively being achieved. Waryold &
Lancaster (2008) identified that the development of assessable measures of individual and
organizational effectiveness for student conduct on university campuses is critical. Furthermore,
Ajzen (1991) noted: the stronger the intention to engage in a behavior, the more likely for that
behavior to be performed. In an effort to link assessment practices with the identification of
student reported behavioral outcomes, the study investigates if there exists student reported
intended behaviors from conduct process participants related to intended conduct process
behavioral outcomes.
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for the study is structured on three principles: 1) The prohibited conduct is unacceptable on campus 2) The prohibited conduct can effectively be prevented or deterred and 3) Reliable and fair measures of enforcement are available to the institution. This framework is based upon the work of David Hoekema (1994) entitled “Campus Rules and Moral Community”. The framework is set within the context of a campus conduct process and focuses on the intention of an institution implementing its conduct process along with the experiences of students involved with conduct policy adjudication process.

Chapter Summary

In the review of existing literature Twenty-seven years of student conduct literature: Implications for practice, scholarship (Swinton & Swinton, 2008), the authors directly identify the lack of assessment regarding student learning with college and university conduct processes, going so far to urge conduct process professionals into further and timely action:

The most disheartening aspect of the literature reviewed in this section is the lack of emphasis on student learning. With the exception of one article (Howell, 2005) no study that we found focused on the learning that occurs as a result of student conduct processes. While the focus of other studies is important, a renewed emphasis on student learning must occur (Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008, p. 18).

It is time to place a crucial lens to the experience of students who take part in the adjudication process of established campus conduct systems. Higher education can no longer afford to ignore the need to further investigate and better understand a students’ conduct process experience, and in turn better understand if conduct professional are achieving the goals they regularly set out to accomplish each time they meet with a student. Student affairs conduct
professionals will be able to better serve their respective student populations as they have a clearer understanding of the impact the very process they facilitate has on a larger systemic level.

The campus conduct process and student affairs literature create insightful direction for this study. Additionally, the theoretical framework of the theory of planned behavior (Azjen, 1991) provides grounding for the investigation. The conceptual framework informed by the ethical principles outlined by Hoekema (1994) provides a context for how the study takes shape. The findings from reviewing the literature align with the intended exploration of the research questions. The landscape of student perceived learning resulting from participation in a student conduct process clearly requires further investigation. Furthermore, the existing literature provides a clear path for how the study to employs the previously outlined methods to investigate the research questions at hand.
Chapter 3: Methodology

A researcher designed assessment survey (Creswell & Creswell, 2017) is implemented in this study to determine if undergraduate students who participated in a conduct hearing process report outcomes aligned with the conduct process outcome objectives of a regional small private liberal arts institution in northeast Florida (Northeast University).

Research Design

The design for this research uses a quantitative outcomes assessment survey approach, in which self-reported experiences and perceptions of a sample of student conduct hearing participants provides the opportunity to generalize collected data for the larger overall university population (Schuh, 2016; Creswell, 2014). Targeted assessment of student conduct participants from a specific academic year allows for a timely and in-depth analysis of feedback from a variety of student conduct hearing experiences.

Assessment Survey Research

Assessment data is collected by coordinating the implementation of a survey of a specific population or extracting variables from and existing database (Schuh, 2016; Creswell, 2014). In this study a survey is employed to gather information from a specific undergraduate population. Therefore, it is important to further articulate the multiple factors defining the instrument.

Quantitative Assessment. Quantitative data is typically used to describe trends or explore relationships between variables (Creswell, 2008). Specific to this study, data is collected using a quantitative pre-experimental design approach (Creswell & Creswell, 2017) to data collection and evaluation. Collecting data in this manner facilitated a direct assessment of an existing student conduct process and the level of effectiveness reported from student participants in achieving desired learning outcomes.
**Research Parameters.** When establishing the scope of an assessment tool specific attentions and consideration given to clearly defining what components are to be included as part of the assessment survey is critical (Vogt, 2007). Northeast University conduct process learning outcomes inform the scope of the specific survey assessment questions posed to the survey participants. Each survey question is designed with the intent to explore one of the three university learning outcomes:

1. Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report an increased understanding of university policies?
2. Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report an increased understanding of how their behavior impacted the university community?
3. Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report they intend to change to their future behavior to adhere to university policy?

All three of the university conduct process learning outcomes are further explored later in this document. Within this research, the assessment survey is administered to undergraduate students who participated in the university conduct process during the 2020 fall academic semester.

**Designed Assessment Survey.** The study utilizes a quantitative assessment survey (see Appendix D) (Creswell & Creswell, 2017) designed to explore the relationship between reported conduct hearing participant experiences and identified institutional conduct process learning outcomes. The primary topic of interest in this study is the intended intervention of the student conduct process specific to behavior that violates the student code of conduct and the comparison of students’ experiences related to the conduct learning outcomes of the university. The exploration of how that specific population perceives their experience in relation to intended outcomes as defined by the institution highlights the assessment lens with which this study is
framed. Survey questions such as “Any questions I may have had related to university policy and/or my conduct violation were answered in my conduct hearing” are included in the assessment to clearly establish the student’s perception of their conduct process experience.

**Research Questions**

Utilizing the assessment survey, the study compiles student conduct process participant experiences during the fall 2020 semester to answer the following research questions:

- Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report an increased understanding of university policies?
- Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report an increased understanding of how their behavior impacted the university community?
- Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report they intend to change to their future behavior to adhere to university policy?

**Strengths and Limitations of Research Design**

The limitations of the quantitative assessment survey approach to this research includes the lack of participants ability to provide additional feedback in a qualitative format (Vogt, 2007), and the limited potential for generalizability of the assessment research outside the institution given the intentionally specific scope of the research sample.

Strengths of this assessment survey research approach include specifically developed quantitative survey tool designed to gather focused feedback on relevant university learning outcomes (Creswell, 2008). That survey construction approach is highlighted in the survey example questions listed below such as “I was given the opportunity to discuss my decision-making process related to my actions and the resulting policy violation during my conduct hearing”. Additionally, this survey is developed to serve as a potential continued resource for the
participating institution with opportunities to gain further insight as to the effectiveness of conduct process learning outcomes with the further assessment of implemented policy interventions with future conduct hearing populations.

Study limitations include the voluntary nature of the survey response. While all students who participated in the conduct process were contacted for participation, a low response rate to the survey presented a challenge. While limitations to this study design do exist, the quantitative assessment survey employed in this research is the most appropriate for the targeted, outcomes based, exploration of intended learning outcomes.

**Context**

Northeast University was selected as the site of my assessment. Successful assessment studies require access and rapport with key stakeholders and gatekeepers at the institution (Schuh, Biddix, Dean, & Kinzie, 2016). As a former staff member at the institution having served as one of the university-level conduct hearing officers, and through existing relationships with former colleagues this study will have the opportunity to directly engage with students who have participated in the university conduct hearing process. In conversation with the Dean of Students at Northeast University (NU) an assessment of the effectiveness of the learning outcomes for the student conduct process has never taken place. Specifically, there has never been an investigation as to whether students who participated in a conduct hearing reported learning outcomes in line with the university’s goals and objectives for the process. NU maintains a student conduct database with information including their documented violations, and sanctions. With approval from the Dean of Students, students who were involved in a
conducted hearing for a documented university policy violation during the most recently completed 2020 fall academic semester received outreach to complete a conduct process survey assessment.

Sample

The participants of this study are a sample of students that were involved in the NU Student Conduct Process, and were held responsible for a policy violation, during the 2020 fall academic semester. The 2020 fall academic semester was selected as the timeframe to identify possible survey participants. Providing the assessment survey to students that participated in the process during this time frame further established the construct validity of the instrument by allowing for those most recently involved in the current conduct process report their experiences (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Design and Data Collection

The study utilizes a quantitative assessment survey to determine effectiveness of institutional conduct process learning outcomes. The study employs a quantitative data collection method focused on student participants who participated in a conduct hearing and were held responsible for a university policy violation during the 2020 fall academic semester. In order to effectively collect student’s self-reported perceived outcomes from their conduct process experience, and assess the relationship between perceived student outcomes and articulated university conduct process learning outcomes, a quantitative pre-experimental design approach. A pre-experimental research design investigates a single group of participants involved in an intervention of some type, intended to cause change. Pre-experimental designs also do not include a pretest, or a control/comparison group (Creswell & Creswell, 2017), which given the characteristics of the research sample population outlined in the previous section, was identified as the most appropriate approach to data collection.
Conduct Policy Analysis

The analysis of current Northeast University conduct policies, specifically its stated learning outcomes, serves as a data collection framework to further explore the institution’s behavioral expectations of its students. The review of these policies provides context for the university’s intended impact on a students’ future behavior, and the intended impact a conduct response for student may also have on the larger university community. Review of these policies occurred by requesting access by from the university’s Dean of Students (Chief Conduct Officer).

The 2019-2021 COVID-19 global pandemic had a significant impact on the operation of colleges and universities across the country. The student conduct adjudication process was not exempt from COVID-19 related adjustments in process and procedure at Northeast University. The significant procedural impacts to existing conduct processes for the 2020-2021 academic year were as follows:

- All student conduct hearings between conduct hearing officers and student participants were held virtually.
- In specific COVID-19 related instances the Dean of Students office chose to impose university conduct sanctions without holding a formal conduct hearing.
  - This approach was used by the university for COVID-19 related policy violations involving a high number of students, such as parties or unauthorized group gatherings.

Each of these COVID-19 informed adjustments and additions to university policy impacted the conduct adjudication process and created a unique set of behavioral expectations and engagement with the conduct process that currently exist solely within the 2020-2021 academic
year. Further implications related to COVID-19 impacts on survey data collection and results analysis will be discussed in detail in Chapters 4 and 5.

University Learning Outcomes

To ensure a full understanding of the intended university learning outcomes imbedded in the student conduct process an in-depth policy review with the university’s Dean of Students (Chief Conduct Officer) was employed. In addition to a more thorough understanding of expected student conduct, the anticipated level of impact on future behavior, and university response to impacts on the university community; the policy review with the Dean of Students also provided tangible additional context of the learning outcomes which were incorporated into the development of the assessment survey which is employed in this study.

The learning outcomes for the university conduct process are as follows:

- Participating in the University Conduct Hearing process will provide a student with an increased understanding of university policies.
- Participating in the University Conduct Hearing process will provide a student with an increased understanding of how their behavior impacted the university community.
- Participating in the University Conduct Hearing process will facilitate a positive change in a student's behavior.

Survey

A quantitative survey was sent to all students who participated in the university conduct process during the 2020 fall academic semester. The survey questions (see Appendix D) seek quantitative, Likert scale framed, responses in which participants are asked about their perceptions of the various experiences they navigated while participating in the university conduct process.
Based on the number of documented conduct cases over the fall 2020 academic semester, the survey encompassed a total of 122 invited participants. After completion of the email communication plan outlined below, a total of 14 completed survey responses were received from student respondents (11.5 % response rate). A full outline of the impact that COVID-19 had on this study is presented in Chapter 5. It is important to note here that due to factors such as remote learning for students not physically on campus as well as virtual classes and meetings for those students still residing in university housing, Northeast University experienced lower student engagement and responsiveness to university outreach. This trend experienced by “NU” staff and faculty was one of the challenges of COVID-19 that institutions across the country navigated throughout the course of the 2020-21 academic year. Unfortunately, the lack of student responsiveness to “NU” communication and outreach also extended to the university’s requests for student participants in this study.

The survey was emailed to the students through the Northeast University email system on February 15th, 2021, the beginning of the fourth week of the spring semester, with email survey reminders sent on February 22nd, February 28th, and March 1st. Student participants received the final email reminder on March 1st encouraging completion of the survey by March 8th, 2020. In review of initial survey responses, one more survey request email was sent to Northeast University students on April 12th, 2020 to collect additional survey responses, encouraging completion of the survey by April 19th. The emailed survey link including the invitation emails sent on February 15th, 22nd, and March 1st, 2020 is outlined in Appendix A, the follow-up email sent on April 12th, 2020 is outlined in Appendix B.

The survey, outlined in Appendix C, explores participants’ experiences and perceived learning outcomes related to the university conduct process. The survey consists of 15 Likert
scale framed questions focused on the participant’s conduct process experiences, in addition to nine demographic questions. The inclusion of individual demographic questions allows for an analysis based demographic breakdown of reported participant outcome experiences. The survey itself was conducted through the use of the electronic survey software Qualtrics, which allowed for anonymous completion of surveys, with user-friendly completion for the participants and easy data extraction for research analysis. See Appendices A thru C for a copy of the participation invitation emails and the full survey assessment tool. Examples of survey questions include:

Any questions I may have had related to the university conduct process were answered in my conduct hearing.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

I have an increased understanding of the university’s policies and the conduct process after my conduct hearing.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

The actions which resulted in my violation of university policy were discussed as part of my participation in the conduct process.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

During the conduct process I was given the opportunity to discuss my decision-making process specific to the actions resulting in my policy violation.
During my conduct meeting, how the policy violation could have a negative impact on me was discussed.

**Strengths and Limitations of Data Collection**

The approach of utilizing a quantitative survey exhibits both strengths and limitations. The survey instrument questions provide strong construction for the quantitative analysis of the conduct process’ learning outcomes: inquiring about the participants’ perceived experience and learning as a participant in a conduct hearing. However, the lack of opportunity for participants to further share and expand upon their experiences outside of a Likert scale framed response to the survey questions is a limitation of the data collection.

**Validity**

Creswell (2014) identifies a major form of survey instrument validity as “content validity”. He goes on to define survey instrument content validity as “do the items measure the content they were intended to measure?” (Creswell, 2014). The section below taken to ensure content validity is high within the data collected.

**Content Validity**

To ensure content validity, this study has utilized two main approaches. The first of which consisted of a series of in-depth review meetings with two of the primary conduct hearing
officers at the university. As stated previously, a meeting was held with the Dean of Students who also serves as the Chief Conduct Hearing Officer, to discuss institutional learning outcomes and the general structure for survey questions. From those conversations, the identified conduct process learning outcomes were utilized to develop the three research questions for the study. A meeting was also held with Associate Dean of Students who is a University Level Conduct Hearing Officer. In that meeting further discussion of the conduct process and the construction survey assessment occurred. Specifically, ensuring that learning outcomes and structure of the survey questions provided the ability to identify the intended outcome data. Based on those conversations, several pieces of feedback were incorporated to the survey assessment. Those additional pieces feedback related to specific question structure changes and survey question ordering were implemented to best gather feedback data most relevant to participant experiences and the stated university learning outcomes.

Analysis

This study employs a survey data collection process informed by a pre-experimental design approach to the student provided feedback. SPSS software was used to analyze the data. Utilizing SPSS software provided the opportunity to explore in-depth the relationship between the various self-reported outcome data collected in the assessment survey and the individual student demographic data. As discussed earlier in this chapter, factors related to COVID-19 had a negative impact on the collection of student responses to the research survey. Due the level of survey responses received (14 total responses) a multilevel regression analyses to better understand if participation in the conduct processes is predictive of the desired student learning outcomes was unable to be conducted as originally intended. To present the collected data
effectively, the data sample was analyzed through descriptive statistics including frequency counts and survey response trends.

**Strengths and Limitations of Analysis**

There are several strengths and some limitations in this study. The study includes a specifically targeted method of data collection. The topic of the assessment is timely and relevant to Northeast University’s need to develop a better understanding of student participants’ perception of the conduct hearing process and reported learning outcomes.

A study challenge is the sample population, which offers a limited scope in the research, as the conduct hearing participants being studied are only from one institution. However, the omission of incorporating participants from other institutions is intentional. The unique situation of utilizing conduct hearing participants, as students who participated in a conduct process with institutionally specific intended learning outcomes, is an intrinsic and integral component of the research. The inclusion of another set of conduct process participants from a different institution would not provide the elements of similarity (facilitated structure of the conduct process, as well as intended learning outcomes) that create the foundation of this research. Additional perspectives provided from students at other institutions might dilute the opportunity for specific insight within this institutionally specific assessment context.

**Chapter Summary**

Based on the literature to date, university conduct hearing officers routinely serve in their roles with little to no research-based insight as to what impact the process they facilitate has on their undergraduate student population (Waryold & Lancaster, 2008). This functional “blind spot” is perpetuated by an emphasis within the field of implementing a theory-driven hearing and sanctioning model, while regularly overlooking the importance of assessing intended learning
outcomes (Dannells, 1997). With significant differences in hearing structures and sanctioning from one university to another, few conduct hearing officers are presented with the time and resources to assess the learning outcomes of their specific conduct model.

This study explores how one institution’s conduct process impacted the undergraduate students that participated in a university conduct hearing. Using a university’s intended conduct process learning outcomes as the lens to frame an assessment survey, can prove advantageous to conduct offices’ ability to support the development and assessment of conduct policy learning outcomes on their respective campuses. This study, through a quantitative assessment survey, provides additional insight into an area that conduct hearing officers do not regularly investigate in a formal capacity (King, 2012). The nature of this specifically targeted evaluation, paired with the gap in existing academic literature, serves the continued expectation for universities to hold college students accountable within a consistent format while further developing the context for implementing this research.

So, what happens when students are documented for violating a conduct policy, participate in a conduct hearing, and receive a conduct sanction? Do they feel better informed as to the university’s expectations of their behavior? Do they recognize how their behavior may have impacted the community? And do they report that they intend to stop the behavior that was of concern? This study examined these questions, with two aims: to investigate if students reported conduct process learning outcomes consistent with the intent of the university; and if a student’s perception of the conduct hearing process are in alignment with articulated institutional learning outcomes.
Chapter 4: Results

The research questions for this study were informed by the stated conduct process learning outcomes outlined by Northeast University. As such, this research study and the survey tool utilized to gather information was considered to be an investigative effort to determine if relationships existed between stated institutional student conduct process learning outcomes and self-reported experiences from students who participated in the conduct process during the Fall 2020 semester, informed by the theory of planned behavior (Azjen, 1991). This chapter presents the results of the conduct survey analysis specific to each university learning outcome and corresponding research questions, including implications of each finding.

Conduct Survey Results

As outlined in Chapter Three, the potential for a low survey response rate was a concern for this study. Each survey question was mapped directly to one of three specific research questions in the development of this survey study. Descriptive statistics, including survey response frequencies and histogram charting for each research question linked survey questions sets are outlined in the sections below. Response details for survey question sets linked to research question number one are listed in Tables 4.1 and 4.2. Response details of survey question sets linked to research question number two are listed in Tables 4.3 and 4.4. Response details of survey question sets linked to research question number three are listed in Tables 4.5, 4.6, 4.7 and Table 4.8. To further communicate survey response details, frequency response tables have also been supplemented by individual histogram survey response charts.

Increased Policy Understanding. To best represent the data provided by these student participants, frequency data is presented to articulate response trends related to research question one, also identified as “Increased Understanding” in relation to the response data presented. The
label “Increased Understanding” reflects the intention of research question number one (and the corresponding survey questions) to explore the student participant’s experience related to knowledge of university policies post-participation in the conduct process. To further present this information effectively, all six survey questions directly related to research question one have been compiled and represented in the descriptive statistics tables as one variable representation.

The set of survey results outlined in table 4.1 and figure 4.2 are represented by a cumulative numeric value associated with the individual numeric value assigned to all possible 1-5 Likert scale-based survey responses. The cumulative variable scale ranges from a minimum score of six to a maximum score 30. In review of the range of responses, it is notable that 71.4 % of respondents to the survey provided responses with cumulative response score of a 19 or higher. Conversely, 21.4 % of respondents to the survey provided responses with cumulative response score of 6, representative of the minimum possible cumulative score.

The relationship between survey respondent’s data ranging from cumulative numerical responses of 19 to 30 (71.4 %) highlight a majority of survey participants providing self-reported survey responses that support an agreement with the policy related outcome-based survey questions. This also strongly indicates that a majority of students who participated in the university’s student conduct process believed they were afforded the opportunity to better understand the university policy implications specific to their behavior and decision making. This response data also presents a positive relationship in addressing research question number one, which is specifically framed by Northeast University’s conduct process objective of facilitating a process that increases a student’s understanding of university policy.
Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics: Survey responses directly linked to research question 1. Reported in response score (cumulative numeric survey response values), frequency (number of respondents), percent (individual percentage of total sample), and cumulative percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2 Increased Understanding. This figure details the survey responses directly linked to research question 1. Reported in response score ranges (cumulative numeric survey response values), frequency (number of respondents).

Finally, a minority of survey respondents (21.4%) provided self-reported survey responses with a cumulative numerical response of six. This score represents the lowest possible numerical response and highlights that these students reported a consistent level of disagreement with the policy related outcome-based survey questions. This highlighted response data presents a negative relationship to research question number one, which is framed by Northeast
University’s learning objective of facilitating a process that increases a student’s understanding of university policy. The 21.4% of survey respondents (a total of 3 students) that responded with the lowest possible score to Research Question 1 related survey questions, were all held responsible for a COVID-19 university policy violation and did not meet with a conduct hearing officer as part of their conduct process experience. These students represent an opportunity presented by the institutional impacts of COVID-19 on the conduct hearing process, and collection conduct hearing data, that was not originally intended as part of this study.

Further highlighting the “Increased Understanding” data presented in table 4.1 a total of four respondents completed the student conduct survey and indicated that they were held responsible for a “COVID-19 Policy Violation”. Recognizing the limited sample size, this data strongly indicates that a majority of students (75%) who were held responsible for a university COVID-19 policy violation did not agree that they were afforded the opportunity to better understand the university policy implications specific to their behavior and decision making. This response data presents a negative relationship in addressing research question number one, which is specifically framed by Northeast University’s conduct process objective of facilitating a process that increases a student’s understanding of university policy. Detailed discussion outlining the importance of this unanticipated data set is outlined in Chapter 5.

**Community Impact.** To best represent the data provided by these student participants, frequency data is presented to articulate response trends related to research question two, also identified as “Community Impact” in relation to the response data presented. The label “Community Impact” reflects the intention of research question number two (and the corresponding survey questions) to explore the student participant’s perception that were provided the opportunity to reflect on their decision-making process and better understand the
university policy implication’s specific impact to themselves as community members as well as the larger community as a whole. To further present this information effectively, all seven survey questions directly related to research question two have been compiled and represented in the descriptive statistics tables as one variable representation.

Table 4.3 Descriptive statistics of survey responses directly linked to research question 2. Reported in response score (cumulative numeric survey response values), frequency (number of respondents), percent (individual percentage of total sample), and cumulative percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4 Community Impact. This figure details the survey responses directly linked to research question 2. Reported in response score ranges (cumulative numeric survey response values), frequency (number of respondents).

The set of survey results outlined in table 4.3 and figure 4.4 are represented by a cumulative numeric value associated with the individual numeric value assigned to all possible 1-5 Likert
scale-based survey responses. The cumulative variable scale ranges from a minimum score of seven to a maximum score 35. In review of the range of responses, it is notable that 64.3 % of respondents to the survey provided responses with cumulative response score of a 23 or higher. Conversely, 21.4 % of respondents to the survey provided responses with cumulative response score of 7, representative of the minimum possible cumulative score for this set of research question variables.

The relationship between survey respondent’s data ranging from cumulative numerical responses of 23 to 35 highlight a majority of survey participants (64.3 %) provided self-reported survey responses that support an agreement with the policy related outcome-based survey questions. This also strongly indicates that a majority of students who participated in the university’s student conduct process believed they were provided the opportunity to reflect on their decision-making process and better understand the university policy implications specific to themselves as community members as well as the larger campus community. This response data also presents a positive relationship in addressing research question number two, which is specifically framed by Northeast University’s conduct process objective of facilitating a process that increases a student’s understanding of the impact their university policy violation had on the campus community.

Finally, a minority of survey respondents (21.4 %) provided self-reported survey responses with a cumulative numerical response of seven. This score represents the lowest possible numerical response and highlights that these students reported a consistent level of disagreement with the policy related outcome-based survey questions. This highlighted response data presents a negative relationship to research question number two, which is framed by Northeast University’s learning objective of facilitating a process that increases a student’s
understanding of the community impact of their policy violation. The 21.4% of survey respondents (a total of 3 students) that responded with the lowest possible score to Research Question 2 related survey questions, are the same students that responded with the lowest possible score to Research Question 1 related survey questions. Continuing to highlight that the 3 student survey respondents who were held responsible for a COVID-19 university policy violation and did not meet with a conduct hearing officer were also the only student respondents to the survey to provide self-reported experience data that presented a negative relationship to Research Questions 1 and 2.

Further highlighting the “Community Impact” data specific to respondents who completed the student conduct survey and indicated that they were held responsible for a “COVID-19 Policy Violation”. Acknowledging the same sample size implications outlined in the previous section, this data strongly indicates that the same majority of students (75%) identified in the previous section who were held responsible for a university COVID-19 policy violation did not agree that they were afforded the opportunity to reflect on their decision-making process and better understand the university policy implications specific impact to themselves as community members as well as the larger community as a whole. This response data also presents a negative relationship in addressing research question number two, which is specifically framed by Northeast University’s conduct process objective of facilitating a process that increases a student’s understanding of the impact their university policy violation had on the campus community. As will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 5, these students represent an opportunity to investigate impacts of COVID-19 on the conduct hearing process, and collection conduct hearing data, that was not originally intended as part of this study.
**Future Behavior.** To best represent the data provided by these student participants, frequency data for survey question 23 and 24 are presented to articulate response trends related to research question three, also identified as “Future Behavior” in relation to the response data presented. The label “Future Behavior” reflects the intention of research question number three (and the corresponding survey questions) to explore the student participant’s experience related to the conduct process and their intention to violate university policies in the future. To further present this information effectively, both survey questions 23 and 24, which are directly related to research question three, have been compiled and represented in the respective individual descriptive statistics tables separately. Acknowledging that the survey data is presented in this specific format, the data is also analyzed for response trends in this individual context.

**Table 4.5 Descriptive statistics of survey question 23.** Directly linked to research question 3. Reported in survey response, frequency (number of respondents), percent (individual percentage of total sample), and cumulative percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Disagree nor Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.6 Future Behavior. This figure details the survey responses from survey question 23, which is directly linked to research question 3. Reported in response score ranges (cumulative numeric survey response values), frequency (number of respondents).

Table 4.7 Descriptive statistics of survey question 24. Directly linked to research question 3. Reported in survey response, frequency (number of respondents), percent (individual percentage of total sample), and cumulative percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Disagree nor Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.8 Future Behavior. This figure details the survey responses from survey question 24, which is directly linked to research question 3. Reported in response score ranges (cumulative numeric survey response values), frequency (number of respondents).

The two sets of remaining survey results for survey questions 23 and 24 outlined in tables 4.5 and 4.7 and figures 4.6 and 4.8 are a direct representation of survey responses of a possible 1-5 ("strongly disagree" – “strongly agree”) Likert scale. In review of the range of responses for survey question 23, it is notable and significant that 92.9 % of respondents to survey question 23 provided responses of 4 (agree) or higher. Alternatively, one of the 14 respondents (7.1 %) to survey question 23 provided a response of 3 (neither agree or disagree). In review of the range of responses to survey question 24, it is notable and significant that all 100 % of respondents to survey question 24 provided responses of 4 (agree) or higher.

Survey respondent’s data from survey question 23 highlight a majority of survey participants (92.9 %) provided self-reported survey responses that support an agreement with the corresponding policy related outcome-based survey questions. This also strongly indicates that a majority of students involved in this survey process reported they intended not to violate the
same university policy which they were held responsible for violating via Northeast University’s student conduct process. This response data to survey question 23 also presents a positive relationship in collected student survey data and exploring research question number three, which is specifically framed by Northeast University’s conduct process objective of facilitating a process in which participating students intend not to violate the same university policy again in the future.

Survey respondent data from survey question 24 highlights all survey participants (n=14) provided self-reported survey responses that support an agreement with the corresponding policy related outcome-based survey questions. This also clearly indicates a majority of students involved in this survey process reported they intended not to violate any other university policy after participating in Northeast University’s student conduct process. This response data to survey question 24 also presents a positive relationship in collected student survey data and exploring research question number three, which is specifically framed by Northeast University’s conduct process objective of facilitating a process in which students intend not to violate the same university policy again in the future.

Interpretation of Results

The survey results outlined by the descriptive statistics tables in the sections above confirmed a positive relationship between the student survey responses and the research questions exploring conduct process objectives “University Policy”, “community impact”, and “future behavior”. Both the “university policy” and “community impact” related survey responses were presented on composite variable format, framing a positive survey response relationship with research questions one and two. While there was a positive relationship between student responses to survey questions 23 and 24 and research question three which
explored “future behavior”, both sets of descriptive statistics for each survey questions were presented separately. The framing of questions 23 and 24 targeted different aspects of research question three and did not allow for both questions to be combined in a composite variable approach such as the survey responses to research questions one and two. However, despite the difference in survey response data compilation and presentation, the student survey response data to all three related research questions (research question three included) clearly confirmed a positive relationship to each of the three research questions.

The patterns emerging from the first two survey response samples the two descriptive statistics data sets were similar: student participation in the student conduct process and a subsequent self-reported experience reported an increased understanding of university policy and the impact that the student’s behavior created within the campus community. This data strongly supports the successful achievement of the university’s first two learning outcomes which seeks to provide student participants the opportunity to reflect and articulate on their decision making, and their role within the university community. The third and final set of survey response samples (survey questions 23 and 24) highlighted in two separate descriptive statistics data sets present a strong survey response data set: students’ participation in the student conduct process and a subsequent self-reported participant experience reported an intention not to violate the same university policy, or any other university policy, in the future. The participant response data compiled from the two corresponding survey questions (23&24) strongly supports the successful achievement of the university’s third learning outcome which seeks to provide student participants the opportunity to reflect on their decision making and choose to change their behavior in the future.
Descriptive Statistics. An overall high level of population gender homogeneity was present in this collection sample, specifically a male response of 71.4 %. Which is reflective of the institution’s conduct process participant pool (71 % percent male students and 29 % percent female students). In the survey sample, 64.3 % identified as white, 14.3 % identified as Hispanic or Latino, and the remaining 21.3 % of respondents identified as Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino & White, or preferred not to identify their race/ethnicity. Comparatively, institutional reported student demographic population percentages for the same groups are as follows; 53.8 % identify as white, 10.9 % identify as Hispanic or Latino, and 26.1 % of students identify as Black or African American, two or more races, or prefer not to identify their race/ethnicity. Thirty-five point seven percent of survey respondents identified their policy violation type as “Alcohol Policy Violation”, 28.6 % of survey respondents identified their policy violation type as “COVID-19 Policy Violation”, 21.4 % of survey respondents identified their policy violation type as “Drug Policy Violation”, 14.3 % of survey respondents identified their policy violation type as “Other”. Sixty-four point three percent of survey respondents identified their conduct hearing type as “Participated in a conduct hearing with a conduct hearing officer”, 35.7 % of survey respondents identified their conduct hearing type as “Notified of a university policy violation decision without a conduct hearing”.

Summary

This chapter presented descriptive statistics, cumulative variable scale survey results, and histogram models of survey response trends. As a review of the overall survey response data was presented, a relationship between multiple demographic factors and research question related survey questions was identified. Additionally, given the number of survey responses (n=14) the
reporting of survey response data in a descriptive statistics and histogram format was the best choice to present survey data.

Descriptive statistics indicated a number of students that self-reported an increase in understanding of university policy, the impact their action created on themselves and the greater campus community, and the intention not to violation the same or any other university policy in the future. Consistent with the objectives of a conduct process outlined in the literature, Northeast University increased student participant understanding of the university conduct process, created an understanding of their impact and standing within the larger campus community, and facilitated a conduct process experience that resulted in a student’s intention to no longer violate any university policy again in the future. The outcomes represented in these data sets closely align with the intuition’s articulated learning outcomes for the student conduct process.
Chapter 5: Discussion & Conclusion

The final chapter will provide a review of the study and a discussion of the results from Chapter Four. This chapter will also discuss the contributions this study has made to the literature as well as the implications and areas for future research.

Review of the Study

The purpose of this study was to understand if student participants in a university conduct process reported experiences that were in-line with the institution’s articulated learning outcomes for said conduct process. Although institutions across the country employ some version of a conduct process to adjudicate violations of college or university policy, after a review of the existing literature, the question remained if student participants in the conduct process were experiencing the intended university outcomes. One of the main barriers to the large-scale collection of conduct process outcome data has been the unique set of policies, adjudication structure, and articulated learning outcomes that exist at each institution (Howell, 2005; Karp & Saks, 2014; King, 2012; Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). While higher education has a wealth of research targeting a variety of institutional practices and procedural impacts, existing research within the field has specifically targeted areas of the conduct process such as process administration (Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008), best practices (Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008; Swinton, 2008), and specifically target student experience research (Howell, 2005; King, 2012). Scholars have called for additional research into the student experience specific to their involvement in the conduct process (Howell, 2005; King, 2012); however, no known study to date has examined if an institution’s conduct process learning outcomes were being achieved,
specifically evaluating the learning outcome achievement based on the experiences reported from the student participants that engaged in the conduct process itself.

As a specifically targeted study, the methods and sample employed were not intended or able to establish overall generalizability from the unique data collected. However, relationships between the data collected and the research questions that informed this study would indicate a need for continued, institutional specific, examination of conduct processes at other institutions. The following research questions were investigated:

- Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report an increased understanding of university policies?
- Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report an increased understanding of how their behavior impacted the university community?
- Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report they intend to change to their future behavior to adhere to university policy?

The overall anchoring of the relationship between institutional conduct process learning outcomes and the self-reported experiences of student participants within that process was employed to identify if students who violated university policy experienced the adjudication process as the institution intended.

To explore these research questions, a theoretical framework based on Azjen’s (1991) Theory of Planned Behavior informed the research survey that was developed and employed (see Appendix C). This research survey considered an institutional context couched within existing policies and process learning outcomes, which were detailed in Chapter Three. As presented in
Chapter Four, descriptive statistics, including survey response frequencies and histogram charting for each research question related set of survey questions were individually outlined.

**Discussion of Findings**

This study found positive patterns between student survey response data and all three research questions. A majority of survey respondents reported experiencing a university conduct process that allowed them to better understand university policy, the impact their actions had on themselves and the campus community, and how the process positively impacted their intention to violate university policy again in the future. Male participants in the conduct process responded to the research survey at a higher rate (71.4 %) compared to female participants (28.6 %). This gender response rate is reflective of the overall conduct process participant pool of 71 % percent male students and 29 % percent female students. While the findings to all three of the study’s research questions also supported Northeast University’s institutional learning outcomes for their conduct process, there are multiple considerations of these findings which warrant discussion.

**Survey Population Implications.** Comparing the overall conduct process population demographics with that of the demographic profile of the survey respondents provided for consistency in the sample as well as a notable challenge in the demographic data points. Specifically, as stated previously the survey respondent population gender contained a notably higher percentage of male respondents (71.4 %) compared to female respondents (28.6 %). Compared to the gender demographics of the overall participant population (71 % male, 29 % female), the relationship between the overall population and the respondent demographic percentages highlights a consistency in gender population percentages between the two groups.
The gender demographic alignment between the existing conduct process population sample size and the survey respondents provides an additional level of confidence that collected survey responses are representative of total institutional gender demographic engagement with the conduct process.

Additional analysis of responses from the remaining participant demographic populations would provide further insight into the existing response trends outlined in tables highlighted in Chapter 4. Further demographic response insight from the larger conduct participant population would allow for additional analysis to confirm if current response trends remained consistent or if additional reporting trends emerged. This research data implication directly relates to the limitation of the conduct survey implementation referenced in Chapter 3, which noted a limitation of a low survey response rate.

**Survey Question Response Trends.** As outlined in Chapter 4, while survey responses directly related to research questions one and two provided a strong positive pattern, a level of variability in the survey responses did exist. Specifically highlighting the survey responses related to research question three, a lower level of variability (little to none) is notable. With the exception of one survey response of “neither agree or disagree” to question 23 (see table 4.5), all remaining survey responses to survey questions 23 and 24 (see tables 4.5 and 4.7) were either “agree” or “strongly agree”. Both survey questions directly related to research question 3, which specifically addressed the institution’s intend outcome in the conduct process to impact future decision making and prevent students from violating university policies again in the future. The response trends to survey questions 23 and 24 articulate a student experience within the conduct process that supports the successful achievement of Northeast University’s third learning
outcome. What is most notable in the survey responses to these questions was the near lack variability in student response. The positive responses of survey respondents to the final research question warrants further examination in future research, specifically regarding the experiences within the conduct process that may impact the students’ perception of achieving individual learning outcomes in drastically different ways, such as an individual conduct hearing officers’ impact on conduct process administration variables. A possible approach to future research in this area could involve a qualitative investigation into the different aspects of the conduct process to gain further insight into how each process step affects student intention.

To further assess the impact that the structure of the conduct process or the interactions of conduct hearing officers have on the perceptions and intended future decision making of the conduct process participants would require additional targeted analysis. Furthermore, an exploration of those two conduct process components would allow for the additional research, which does not currently exist, to bridge the institutional outcome data of a conduct process with an analysis of the contributing internal processes. With a larger sample size of survey respondents, the additional response data would allow for in-depth interrogation of learning outcome data trends specifically linked to hearing officers and how each hearing officer may serve as variable that impacts the experience a student reports from having participated in a conduct hearing. While institutional culture within conduct process administration has historically focused on published research highlighting administrative process best practices and conduct sanctioning outcomes, further research in this area would create space within the field to explore the interpersonal dynamics that impact the effectives of an adjudicated conduct policy violation.
COVID-19 Impacts on Survey Question Response Trends. As stated previously, the 2019-2021 COVID-19 global pandemic had an unforeseen and significant impact on the operation of colleges and universities across the country. Specific to the focus of this research study, the student conduct adjudication process at Northeast University experienced COVID-19 related adjustments. The significant procedural impacts to the institution’s existing conduct processes for the 2020-2021 academic year were as follows:

- All student conduct hearings between conduct hearing officers and student participants were held virtually
- In specific COVID-19 related instances the Dean of Students office chose to impose university conduct sanctions without holding a formal conduct hearing.
  - The approach used by the university for COVID-19 related policy violations involving a high number of students, such as parties or unauthorized group gatherings.

Unlike previous academic years students had the potential to be held responsible for university policy violations related to COVID-19 protocol (see Appendix E). Each of these COVID-19 informed adjustments, additions to university policy, and the conduct adjudication process created a unique set of behavioral expectations and engagement with the conduct process that currently exist solely within the 2020-2021 academic year.

Of the collected student survey responses, a total of four (28.6 %) identified as being held responsible for a COVID-19 related university policy violation. As discussed in Chapter 4, 3 student survey responses identified a COVID-19 related university policy violation also identified that they received a conduct decision related to their university policy violation
without participating in a conduct hearing. The fourth student survey response that identified a COVID-19 related university policy violation did identify that they participated in a conduct hearing with a conduct hearing officer. Northeast University did confirm that all students who received this COVID-19 policy violation (all related to a single event involving large unauthorized student gathering) received notification of their conduct decision without participating in a conduct hearing. Students were afforded the opportunity to meet with a conduct hearing officer if they chose to appeal the initial conduct decision.

Given the COVID-19 impacts on Northeast University’s conduct process, the research survey data collected provides a unique opportunity to analyze any differences or similarities in reported conduct process experiences. In line with the overall intent of this research study, the data collected at Northeast University has the ability to provide insight into the implemented conduct process, but it also could provide a template for other institutions to investigate their own COVID-19 related procedures and generalize related data on a larger scale.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the “Increased Understanding” and “Community Impact” data presented in tables 4.1 and 4.3, a total of four respondents completed the student conduct survey and indicated that they were held responsible for a “COVID-19 Policy Violation”. Recognizing the limited sample size, this data strongly indicates that a majority of students (75%) who were held responsible for a university COVID-19 policy violation did not agree that they were afforded the opportunity to better understand the university policy implications specific to their behavior and decision making. This response data presents a negative relationship in addressing research questions one and two, framed by Northeast University’s conduct process objective as facilitating a process that increases a student’s understanding of university policy
and the impact to themselves as community members as well as the larger community as a whole.

The survey data collected that addresses research questions number one and two provide a clear picture; when the opportunity for students to engage in a conduct hearing process prior to receiving notification of a policy violation decision was removed, students reported an experience that failed to achieve the first two learning outcomes for Northeast University’s conduct process (facilitating a process that increases a student’s understanding of university policy and an increased understanding of how their behavior impacted the university community). Lastly, it is noteworthy that the one survey respondent who was held responsible for a COVID-19 policy violation, initially notified of a policy violation decision without meeting with a hearing officer, and who then met with a conduct hearing officer in an appeal capacity, responded that they “strongly agreed” with all survey questions and successfully achieved the first two learning outcomes for Northeast University’s conduct process. The data collected from this student further highlights that the removal of direct interaction with a conduct hearing officer as part of the conduct process has an impact on whether the institution is able to facilitate a process that successfully achieves student learning and understanding of university policy.

Finally, is the isolation of the remaining survey results for questions 23 and 24 that focus on data specific to respondents who completed the student conduct survey and indicated that they were held responsible for a “COVID-19 Policy Violation”. The scale for these specific set of survey questions range from a possible 1-5 (“strongly disagree” – “strongly agree”) Likert scale. In review of the range of responses for survey question 23, it is notable that 100 percent of respondents to survey question 23 provided responses of 4 (agree) or higher. In review of the
range of responses to survey question 24, it is notable that all 100 percent of respondents to
survey question provided responses of 4 (agree) or higher. This isolated response data to both
survey questions 23 and 24 presents a positive relationship in addressing research question
number three, which is specifically framed by Northeast University’s conduct process objective
of facilitating a process in which students intend not to violate university policy again in the
future.

This highlighted set within the data sample presents an opportunity to further explore
contrasting trends comparative data trends for those students held responsible for a COVID-19
policy violation. In specific relationship to each set of research question related survey results,
the data trends highlighted above demonstrate that students who were held responsible for a
university COVID-19 policy violation and also notified of a university policy violation decision
without a conduct hearing reported experiences with the conduct process that failed to achieve
the first two learning outcomes but remained consistent in achieving the third and final research
question outcome.

**Institutional Uniqueness of Conduct Policies, Procedures, and Outcomes.** In
considering the data collected from this research survey, it is important to be mindful of the
institution and population specificity from which the data was collected. As outlined in Chapter
3, Northeast University is a small private regional institution located in northeast Florida. The
research survey directly took into consideration factors such as institutional specific conduct
process policies, procedures, and learning outcomes in the construction and implementation of
the survey tool. The ultimate goal of this survey tool was always to serve a dual purpose; to exist
as an effective institutionally specific research data collection tool along with providing a
template for other institutions of higher education to also evaluate the student experience within
their conduct process. In the event that a college or university conducts similar research, this
survey is intended to provide a framework to review their specific process outcomes and edit
survey questions to create an institutionally specific and relevant survey that evaluates consistent
student reported learning outcome framed data.

**Contributions to the Literature**

**Connecting Student Experience and Conduct Process Success.** A number of studies
have investigated student experiences within a conduct process. Furthermore, there is wealth of
academic literature that explores institutional conduct processes, procedures, and the facilitation
of the conduct process by administrators (Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008; Swinton, 2008). This
study was the first to research self-reported student experiences within a conduct process to
directly evaluate conduct process learning outcomes. That is, did student participants in a
university conduct process report experiences that supported the successful execution on long
held learning outcomes for the adjudication of university policy violations?

The findings from this study add to the literature in two areas related to the learning
outcomes of a conduct process. First, students involved in the conduct process and who
participated in a conduct hearing with a hearing officer reported experiences in alignment with
the successful achievement of all articulated university learning outcomes; a process that
increases a student’s understanding of university policy, a process that increases a student’s
understanding of their behavioral impact on the community, and a process in which students
intend not to violate university policy again in the future. While the experiences reported by
students certainly included more factors than those explored by the research tool, the research foundation created by this data set allows for a launching pad to further explore how students engage with a conduct process and what additional factors may also contribute to the successful achievement of learning outcomes.

Second, students involved in the conduct process and who were notified of a university policy violation decision without participating in a conduct hearing reported experiences in contradiction to the successful achievement of the first two articulated university learning outcomes; a process that increases a student’s understanding of university policy and a process that increases a student’s understanding of their behavioral impact on the community. While experiences reported by students in this specific population reported negative experiences related to the first two learning outcomes, those same students also reported experiences unanimously in alignment with the successful achievement of the third articulated university learning outcome: a process in which students intend not to violate university policy again in the future. The unanticipated, yet important, research findings in this study establish an academic literature base highlighting the positive impact meeting with a conduct hearing officer has on successfully achieving student learning outcomes targeting learning and understanding. The research foundation created by this data set also allows for further future exploration into students who report a negative relationship with achieving learning outcomes related to learning and understanding but still report the successful achievement of a learning outcome targeting a change of intended future behavior.

**Theory Informed Construction of a Conduct Assessment Tool.** As outlined previously in Chapter 2, conduct process assessments exist in a variety of forms and have focused on many
different aspects of the college and university conduct process (Howell, 2005; Karp & Sacks, 2014; Nelson, 2017; Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008). Unique to this study is the development of an assessment survey tool incorporating not only the institutions’ learning outcomes (see Chapter 1), but the theoretical framework for the study, as well. Also discussed in Chapter 2, the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) states that one's beliefs and intentions directly inform one’s behavior. Specifically, the theory presents three dimensions; “Attitude toward the behavior” which refers to the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question, “Subject Norms” which refers to the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior, and “Perceived Behavioral Control” which refers to the perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behavior and it is assumed to reflect past experience as well as anticipated impediments and obstacles (Azjen, 1991).

The theoretical framework used in this study further supported the data collection approach to gaining insight into a student’s perceptions of their intended behavior, their actual behavior that occurred, and their intended behavior in the future regarding university policy. In addressing research questions one and two, the linked survey questions were also framed by the three theory dimensions of the theory of planned behavior (Azjen, 1991), with the final two survey questions (see Appendix C) not only addressing research question three but also the ultimate questions asked by Azjen’s theory (1991): what is the student’s intended future behavior? As outlined in Chapter 3, discussions and feedback from Northeast University’s subject experts, both senior conduct hearing officers, regarding process learning outcomes and the ultimate structure for survey questions facilitated a high level of confidence in the construct validity of the survey tool and also directly informed the development the three research
questions for the study. As a unique contribution to academic literature, this study provides an assessment survey tool with a designed approach to data collection informed by not only institutional learning outcomes but a closely aligned theoretical framework. Implications on how this survey can provide direction to other institutions on how they can conduct a similar assessment of their conduct process are outlined in the next section.

**Implications**

While a wealth of existing research and academic literature have explored, at varying levels, students reported experiences within a conduct process and separately institutional conduct policies and procedures, this research responds to a long-awaited call from the field (Howell, 2005; King, 2012) to explore the relationship between the two and how students’ reported experiences inform a successful achievement of articulated outcomes. Although the data collected from this research is far from exhaustive, these findings cement that student experience is a critical component to evaluating the successful adjudication of a university conduct process. As stated earlier, the findings from this study have two major implications, and can inform several areas of continued future research.

**A Call for More Data.** Although this was an in-depth targeted study, there were data limitations. As noted previously, the size of the survey response population did provide the opportunity for an overall analysis of the respondent data, specifically in response to the collected survey data’s relationship to Northeast University’s articulated learning outcomes. Ultimately, additional measures are needed to further assess and investigate the variation and nuance within the population of students who positively respond to and engage with the conduct process (and those who do not) and the institutional conduct processes that facilitate intended
learning outcomes (and those that do not). Additionally, a larger sample of respondent data would allow for continued investigation into the reliability of the developed survey tool. With the limited survey response rate, and necessity to present the collected data in a descriptive statistics format, it is acknowledged that the originally intended regression analysis of a larger data sample would have addressed the issues of survey reliability.

Conduct process administrators must consistently and formally engage with the students they adjudicate in an assessment capacity after the conduct hearing and decision notification process has concluded. While additional procedural and administrative resources will almost certainly require allocation to meet this expectation, it is an imperative step for colleges and universities to take if they are to truly understand how they are interacting with, supporting, and impacting (positively and adversely) the students they adjudicate. The elevated success of colleges and universities, and more pointedly their students, are at stake.

**Expand Application and Generalizability of Survey Assessment.** Outlined earlier in this chapter, upon completion of this research, the survey tool was intended to provide a framework for other colleges and universities to review their specific process outcomes. Expanding the relevancy and impact of this research by institutions adopting this assessment tool and in doing so creating a campus-specific survey would facilitate the collection of institutionally relevant data. Preserving the original framework of the survey tool and investigating the student experience within the conduct process in relation to university learning outcomes, will allow for the establishment of a generalizable collection of data on which a larger and effectively baselined point of review and evaluation can occur. Within the field of conduct policy and process administration, a cross-institution data set would allow for the evaluation and
in-depth investigation of student experiences within the conduct process, identify trends, and support the further evolution of accepted best practices.

**Future Research**

This study has opened the gate for an expansive line of future research. First, with a larger future survey sample size, deeper exploration of learning outcome-based response trends in specific relation to a number of student demographic and process related factors should be further investigated. As noted in this chapter, while the survey tool was effective in collecting data for analysis in this research study, the collection of additional survey responses could be applied to gain additional specific student and process insight in future research. If an analysis with a larger sample size were to occur, individual level demographic characteristics may also be able to be considered for further analysis such as gender, race/ethnicity, campus residency status, or policy violation type. This also includes considering the relationships between variables such as experiences reported from students that met with different conduct hearing officers.

Secondly, when expanding the data sample size in future implementation of this survey tool, incorporating an analysis of academic performance, along with institutional retention and persistence data should all be considered. As colleges and universities continue to expand their undergraduate retention efforts, aligning the student reported experiential data from the conduct process with institutional research and effectiveness retention/persistence data may help institutions understand the relationship between the student’s experience with the conduct process and successful retention and graduation from the institution.
Concluding Comments

Student conduct policies and the adjudication of violations of those polices have a long-standing history within institutions of higher education (Dannells, 1988, Dannells & Lowery, 2004, Gerhing, 2006). As has been highlighted previously in this research study, extensive literature and documentation exists (Kompalla & McCarthy, 2001; Nelson, 2017; Swinton, 2008; Zacker, 1996) outlining and advocating best practices in the field of student conduct administration. Additionally, there is impactful and relevant research focusing on a variety of student’s experiences within a conduct process (Howell, 2005; Karp & Sacks, 2014; Nelson, 2017). A third element that factors either overtly or covertly into every conduct process is the institution’s intended outcomes for the process they facilitate.

This study provided the framework for what will hopefully be the beginning of institutions evaluating and assessing historically separated areas of the student experience and the administration of the conduct process in a more directly learning outcomes related approach. As higher education has grown and evolved, disparities in critical analysis of the regular processes that institutions engage in still remain. A more integrated approach to evaluating how students interact with an experience, such as the conduct process, which every institution of higher education in the country facilitates in some form will only foster a more informed approach to holding students accountable for violation university policies and understanding the impact that process has on the success of students and the institution as a whole.

The act of outlining expectations for student behavior, adjudicating violations of those expectations, and imposing university sanctions as a result of behavior that violates those
expectations, should no longer exist without consideration of whether students believe they experienced a process that accomplished the outcomes the institution says it will facilitate.
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Appendix A

Hello,

My name is Luke Morrill and I am a doctoral student at the University of North Florida. I am conducting a research study on Jacksonville University’s conduct process. Specifically, this research is designed to gather information to better understand the experiences of students who participated in the Jacksonville University conduct process.

Jacksonville University is supporting my research study by agreeing to send this communication to students who meet the research study criteria. Specifically, students who participated in the university’s conduct process in the fall 2020 semester. As a UNF doctoral student, and not a JU employee, this communication approach prevents me from having any access to any identifiable student information.

If you decide to take part in my research, you will complete the survey in the link below. Participation in this study will take about 10-15 minutes of your time to complete the research survey. Your responses to the survey will be completely anonymous. All information collected by the electronic survey will be collected anonymously as part of the design of the survey tool. No information or survey responses collected from participants will be able to be identified by anyone, including Jacksonville University employees.

Although there are no direct benefits to or compensation for taking part in this study, others may benefit from the information we learn from the results of this study. Additionally, there are no foreseeable risks for taking part in this project. Participation is voluntary and there are no penalties for electing not to participate or withdrawing your participation. Thus, you may choose not to participate or to withdraw from this study with no penalty or loss of benefits you would otherwise be entitled to receive as a student enrolled at Jacksonville University.

If you have any questions or concerns about this project, please contact me at n00966106@unf.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the University of North Florida’s Institutional Review Board at irb@unf.edu or 904.620.2498

If you have any questions or concerns regarding your involvement in Jacksonville University’s conduct process, please contact the Office of Student Life at studentlife@ju.edu or 904.256.7067

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Luke Morrill
UNF Doctoral Candidate
Email:

Clicking the survey link below shall serve as your consent to participate in this research study and that you are at least 18 years of age.

Follow this link to the Survey:

http://unf.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_eFisgCindeCWVX8
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Hello,

My name is Luke Morrill and I am a doctoral student at the University of North Florida. I am conducting a research study on Jacksonville University’s conduct process. Specifically, this research is designed to gather information to better understand the experiences of students who participated in the Jacksonville University conduct process. Earlier in the semester you received several emails making you aware of the opportunity to participate in this research study. If you have not yet completed the research survey, you can still do so. The collection of survey data is in the final stages, and the survey link will remain open until April 19th, 2021. Each completed survey contributes significantly to the impact that this research will have. Thank you to all students who choose to participate.

Jacksonville University is supporting my research study by agreeing to send this communication to students who meet the research study criteria. Specifically, students who participated in the university’s conduct process in the fall 2020 semester. As a UNF doctoral student, and not a JU employee, this communication approach prevents me from having any access to any identifiable student information.

If you decide to take part in my research, you will complete the survey in the link below. Participation in this study will take about 10-15 minutes of your time to complete the research survey. Your responses to the survey will be completely anonymous. All information collected by the electronic survey will be collected anonymously as part of the design of the survey tool. No information or survey responses collected from participants will be able to be identified by anyone, including Jacksonville University employees.

Although there are no direct benefits to or compensation for taking part in this study, others may benefit from the information we learn from the results of this study. Additionally, there are no foreseeable risks for taking part in this project. Participation is voluntary and there are no penalties for electing not to participate or withdrawing your participation. Thus, you may choose not to participate or to withdraw from this study with no penalty or loss of benefits you would otherwise be entitled to receive as a student enrolled at Jacksonville University.

If you have any questions or concerns about this project, please contact me at

If you have questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the University of North Florida’s Institutional Review Board at irb@unf.edu or 904.620.2498

If you have any questions or concerns regarding your involvement in Jacksonville University’s conduct process, please contact the Office of Student Life at studentlife@ju.edu or 904.256.7067

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Luke Morrill
UNF Doctoral Candidate
Email:

Clicking the survey link below shall serve as your consent to participate in this research study and that you are at least 18 years of age.

Follow this link to the Survey:
http://unf.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_efisgCindcCWVX8
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Survey Demographic Questions

1. Age

2. Gender
   - Male
   - Female
   - Non-binary/ third gender
   - Prefer not to say

3. Race/Ethnicity (Please select all that apply)
   - American Indian or Alaskan Native
   - Asian
   - Black or African American
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   - White
   - Prefer not to say

4. Class Standing
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior

5. Campus Residency
   - On-Campus Resident
   - Off-Campus Resident

6. Student Status
   - Domestic Student
   - International Student

7. Policy Violation Type
   - Alcohol Policy Violation
   - Drug Policy Violation
   - COVID-19 Policy Violation
   - Other

8. Conduct Hearing Format
   - Participated in a conduct hearing with a conduct hearing officer
- Notified of a university policy violation decision without a conduct hearing

9. Conduct Hearing Officer (Please select the individual(s) that you met with regarding your policy violation)
- Conduct Hearing Officer “A” - Student Life Office
- Conduct Hearing Officer “B” - Residential Life
- Conduct Hearing Officer “C” - Student Life Office
- Conduct Hearing Officer “D” - Residential Life
- Conduct Hearing Officer “E” - Residential Life
- Conduct Hearing Officer “F” - Residential Life
- Conduct Hearing Officer “G” - Residential Life
- Conduct Hearing Officer “H” - Residential Life
- Conduct Hearing Officer “I” - Residential Life
- Not Sure
- Did not meet with a Conduct Hearing Officer

Survey Assessment Questions

10. The university policy/policies related to my conduct violation were discussed in my conduct hearing.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

11. The reason why the university policy/policies exist(s) were discussed in my conduct hearing.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

12. Any questions I may have had related to university policy and/or my conduct violation were answered in my conduct hearing.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

13. Any questions I may have had related to the university conduct process were answered in my conduct hearing.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

14. I have an increased understanding of the university’s policies and the conduct process after my participation in the conduct process.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

15. The actions which resulted in my violation of university policy were discussed as part of my participation in the conduct process.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

16. During the conduct process I was given the opportunity to discuss my decision-making process specific to the actions resulting in my policy violation.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

17. During my conduct meeting, how the policy violation could have a negative impact on me was discussed.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

18. During my conduct meeting, how the policy violation could have a negative impact on others was discussed.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

19. After my participation in the conduct process I have an increased understanding of the university’s expectations regarding my behavior.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

20. After my conduct hearing I have an increased understanding of how my behavior impacted the university community.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

21. The conduct hearing process was carried out appropriately to address my university policy violation.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

22. I agree with the decision made by the conduct hearing officer to hold me responsible for violating university policy.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

23. After my participation in the conduct process, I do not intend to violate the same university policy in the future.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

24. After my participation in the conduct process, I do not intend to violate other university policies in the future.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree
Appendix D

Research Study Question 1

Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report an increased understanding of university policies?

Linked Theoretical Framework Dimension

*Attitude Toward the Behavior*: The degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question.

Linked Survey Questions

The university policy/policies related to my conduct violation were discussed in my conduct hearing.

6) Strongly Disagree
7) Disagree
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree
9) Agree
10) Strongly Agree

The reason why the university policy/policies exist(s) were discussed in my conduct hearing.

6) Strongly Disagree
7) Disagree
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree
9) Agree
10) Strongly Agree

Any questions I may have had related to university policy and/or my conduct violation were answered in my conduct hearing.

6) Strongly Disagree
7) Disagree
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree
9) Agree
10) Strongly Agree

Any questions I may have had related to the university conduct process were answered in my conduct hearing.

6) Strongly Disagree
I have an increased understanding of the university’s policies and the conduct process after my participation in the conduct process.

6) Strongly Disagree
7) Disagree
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree
9) Agree
10) Strongly Agree

The conduct hearing process was carried out appropriately to address my university policy violation.

6) Strongly Disagree
7) Disagree
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree
9) Agree

Research Study Question 2

Does a student who participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report an increased understanding of how their behavior impacted the university community?

Linked Theoretical Framework Dimension
Subject Norms: The perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior.

Linked Survey Questions

The actions which resulted in my violation of university policy were discussed as part of my participation in the conduct process.

6) Strongly Disagree
7) Disagree
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree
9) Agree
10) Strongly Agree
During the conduct process I was given the opportunity to discuss my decision-making process specific to the actions resulting in my policy violation.

6) Strongly Disagree  
7) Disagree  
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree  
9) Agree  
10) Strongly Agree

During my conduct meeting, how the policy violation could have a negative impact on me was discussed.

6) Strongly Disagree  
7) Disagree  
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree  
9) Agree  
10) Strongly Agree

During my conduct meeting, how the policy violation could have a negative impact on others was discussed.

6) Strongly Disagree  
7) Disagree  
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree  
9) Agree  
10) Strongly Agree

After my participation in the conduct process I have an increased understanding of the university’s expectations regarding my behavior.

6) Strongly Disagree  
7) Disagree  
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree  
9) Agree  
10) Strongly Agree

After my participation in the conduct process I have an increased understanding of how my behavior impacted the university community.

6) Strongly Disagree  
7) Disagree  
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree  
9) Agree  
10) Strongly Agree
I agree with the decision made by the conduct hearing officer to hold me responsible for violating university policy.

6) Strongly Disagree
7) Disagree
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree
9) Agree
10) Strongly Agree

**Research Study Question 3**

Does a student participated in the University Conduct Hearing process report they intend to change to their future behavior to adhere to university policy?

**Linked Theoretical Framework Dimension**

*Perceived Behavioral Control*: The perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behavior and it is assumed to reflect past experience as well as anticipated impediments and obstacles.

**Linked Survey Questions**

After my participation in the conduct process, I do not intend to violate the same university policy in the future.

6) Strongly Disagree
7) Disagree
8) Neither Disagree nor Agree
9) Agree
10) Strongly Agree

After my participation in the conduct process, I do not intend to violate other university policies in the future.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Disagree nor Agree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree
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INTRODUCTION

Jacksonville University is excited to welcome students back to live, learn and grow on our campus for the Fall 2020 semester. In order to do that safely, every member of our campus community must do their part. Living, learning and working together this fall will require more respect and responsibility from each of us.

The policies and guidelines in this document have been developed based on a close review of published guidelines and recommendations produced by the CDC, OSHA, WHO, ACHA, and the FDOH, in addition to outside consultation with both our legal counsel and Public Health experts from Mayo Clinic’s Infectious Disease Unit. These policies are subject to change as we learn new information about COVID-19 and adjust to updated guidance. We will update this document and add new announcements as decisions are made.

ACADEMICS

- Courses that were previously delivered solely through face-to-face instruction will be delivered in a synchronous, hybrid education format using a combination of methods appropriate to the course to ensure that faculty have the flexibility they need to offer students the best experience possible. This could include:
  - Offering in-classroom instruction with applicable social distancing rules and necessary signage regarding classroom capacity
  - Splitting the class to allow students to alternate between physical and virtual attendance in order to comply with social distancing rules
  - Conducting lessons via live streaming to allow lectures and discussion to happen at a distance yet also in real time
  - Offering virtual office hours as well as in-person office hours
    - Providing online content where appropriate for assignments, project work, and group work
- The academic calendar has been adjusted to minimize student travel, especially during the holidays and flu season.
  - The fall semester will start on August 17, 2020, and end on November 24, 2020.
  - Classes will be taught on Labor Day (September 7, 2020) and Veterans Day (November 11, 2020).
    - Labor Day and Veterans Day are eliminated as paid holidays for all employees.
  - This adjusted schedule meets the requirements of our accrediting body (SACSCOC).
○ In the event of a significant disruption of coursework, the fall semester could be extended, or Saturday classes could be held.
● New sections of classes will be added during the MWF 12:00 period and the Tuesday-Thursday lunch hour, both to help stagger lunch traffic and to reduce demand for other class sections.

Technology & Requirements

● All current and incoming students are required to have possession of or access to a laptop computer and/or other appropriate technology to adequately support access to virtual and hybrid courses.
● Classrooms throughout the University will receive technology upgrades to allow faculty to live stream their classes to students attending virtually while also having students physically in the classroom. The upgrades will allow virtual students to see, hear, and speak to the faculty and students in the physical room.

Laboratory Courses

● Instructors have the option to front load in-person lab work during the early part of the semester and offer additional lab times in the event that social distancing rules limit students’ lab time. Additional lab times may be offered throughout the day, including evenings and Saturday as needed.
● Enrollment caps will be reduced for laboratory sections
● PPE will be provided to laboratory instructors
● Students will be required to wear cloth face coverings in classroom and laboratory environments. Additional PPE will be provided if deemed necessary for particular lab or fieldwork experiences.

Experiential Learning

● Service-Learning classes will be allowed in situations where social distancing can be followed
● Internship classes will be allowed in situations in which the agency is willing to allow JU students into the facility and where social distancing guidelines can be followed
● Applied classes (e.g. Fine Arts and Health Sciences classes) will be allowed as long as social distancing and University policies are followed.
FACILITIES & CAMPUS OPERATIONS

Cleaning & Sanitizing

- Aramark custodial will increase their services to reflect a heightened disinfection level across campus, including additional cleaning throughout each day of bathrooms, common area spaces, and high touchpoint surfaces.
- Implement hand sanitizing stations throughout campus buildings at main entrances, in elevator lobby areas, and in reception areas.
- Implement disinfectant wipe dispensing stations for surface disinfecting in classrooms, computer labs, areas of lounge-style or communal-style seating, and residential hall bathrooms.
- Sanitizer wipe canisters will be available for use as needed by employees in shared copy rooms, break rooms, and for personal office disinfecting.
  - Work surfaces should be disinfected upon arrival and prior to leaving for the day.
- HVAC systems have been verified to be working as designed. A team of outside engineers have been contacted to assess building systems identified as operating with a lower percentage of Outside Air. This additional evaluation will assist us in determining if there is a need to make system updates. Timeline for completion is TBD. We are also working with Mayo's Infectious Disease unit in researching Outside Air percentage minimums needed.
  - Aramark Facilities has added a "COVID 19 Response" option to their Work Order system. For faculty or staff that have concerns about air flow in their specific classroom or office space, they can enter it into the system and Aramark Facilities will look into it further.

Social Distancing

- Building entryways: The first entry point into our buildings will have clear signage and communications to emphasize the importance of distancing, hygiene and sanitation. This includes the placement of hand sanitizer dispensers at main building entrances.
- Elevators: Capacities will be reduced to two (2) people. Use of stairs will be recommended for those without physical limitations. Elevator lobby areas will feature distancing reminder floor decals and a hand sanitizing station.
- Furniture in lobbies and reception areas will be removed and rearranged to ensure 6’ of physical distance is possible.
- Non-essential touch items like magazines, pamphlets, etc. will be removed from public areas.
● Desktop reception shields and distancing reminder floor signage will be implemented where appropriate
● Meeting spaces and conference rooms will reduce capacity by at least 50% to ensure physical distancing is feasible within the space
● We have enhanced and expanded outdoor seating areas, including:
  ○ North Hall: addition of a hammock village to supplement the picnic tables and Adirondack chairs already in place
  ○ Oak Hall: addition of a shade structure and outdoor dining furniture behind Oak hall
  ○ Williams Circle: addition of outdoor seating around the grassy circle; placement of seating under shaded tree areas; replacement of the two older model picnic table rounds/benches currently on concrete pads
  ○ Williams Hall: addition of two (2) hammock villages in the shaded area behind Williams Hall
● Hygiene guidelines will be placed in all restrooms throughout campus to remind our community that proper handwashing reduces the spread of germs.
● Group sizes will be limited based on distancing capabilities. Learn more about groups, gatherings, and events.
● In classrooms, for group activities requiring students to be closer than 6’ for more than 5 minutes, we recommend the implementation of the following practices:
  ○ Minimize groups to pairs
  ○ Keep each pair of students at least 6’ away from all other pairs of students
  ○ Maximize distance between students within each pair
    ○ In applied academic settings, the wearing of a plastic face shield over the cloth face covering may be implemented

Classroom Space Considerations

● Most classroom capacities will be reduced by at least 50% of the stated capacity while social distancing measures are in place. Theater-style auditoriums will be reduced to 25% of the stated capacity.
● Faculty will work with the Office of the Registrar to request classroom changes. Priority will be given to sections that exceed the 50% cap.
● Space may be managed in the following ways:
  ○ Move larger sections to larger rooms.
    ○ Split sections into smaller groups and alter the class schedule to accommodate smaller sections.
  ○ Use outdoor spaces on an ad hoc basis as determined by the faculty member teaching the course.
  ○ Utilize conference rooms and student activity spaces.
○ Re-purpose office, Orthodontic, and office and laboratory space in Lazzara.

Shared Offices and Workspaces

In work areas where the office setup does not permit 6’ of physical distance from others:

● All individuals must wear cloth face coverings when more than one staff member is present
● A reception shield is not an adequate mitigation supply in this environment
● If workplace medical accommodations are needed as a result of this policy, contact Human Resources at hr@ju.org.

Meetings

● All meetings must offer a remote attendance option (either video or phone). Meetings should be completely remote when possible.
● Avoid holding meetings in spaces where 6’ of physical distance cannot be maintained. This includes small offices. Alternate space arrangements could include a conference room for a one-on-one meeting, a classroom for office hours, or outdoor space when appropriate.
● Cloth face coverings should be worn when possible even with 6’ of physical distance.
● If in-office student meetings must occur and physical distance cannot be maintained, all attendees must wear cloth face coverings. Other mitigation strategies, like reception shields, are not necessary as long as both individuals are wearing cloth face coverings.

HEALTH STRATEGY

Personal Protective Equipment

● N95 masks, surgical masks, gloves, shoe covers, and gowns are not for general academic use.
  ○ N95 masks are required for Student Health Center and Orthodontics program use
  ○ Surgical masks will be available for Student Health Center, Orthodontics, and Athletic Training program use
  ○ Gloves will be available as a regular operating expense of the Student Health Center and Orthodontics program
Applied programs can require students to wash hands prior to entering class if there are concerns with passing equipment between students
  ○ Orthodontics will use additional PPE when dictated by the American Dental Association.

- Plastic face shields
  ○ In applied academic settings where activities are conducted within 6’ of each other for at least 5 minutes, it is recommended faculty and students wear a plastic face shield over their required cloth face covering
  ○ It will be the faculty member’s discretion to implement this recommendation based on the specifics of their applied academic environment

**Cloth Face Coverings**

- Multi-layer cloth face coverings are required indoors and in any space where social distancing is not possible.
- Students will receive educational material on proper use of and cleaning of cloth face coverings
- The University Bookstore will also have face coverings available for purchase at a minimal cost

**Testing & Medical History**

- Employees and students should complete a Return to Campus medical statement, which asks them to:
  ○ Self-monitor their health for two weeks prior to their return to campus
    ○ Look for COVID signs and symptoms
    ○ Take their temperature twice per day
    ○ If they experience COVID symptoms, get tested
      ■ If test positive, employees must contact Human Resources for medical accommodations
      ■ If test positive, students must contact the Office of Disability Support Services for medical accommodations
- Students should complete a medical history form within the Student Health Center’s Electronic Medical Records to help the SHC identify high-risk students
- COVID exposure and positive test statements will be added to immunization forms
- Guests to the University will need to complete a University disclosure statement. This disclosure statement includes:
  ○ Taking their temperature before arrival on campus (and rescheduling their visit if a fever is present), and
  ○ The requirement to wear a face covering on campus when 6’ physical distance cannot be maintained
○ The University reserves the right to temperature check guests upon arrival

Health Monitoring & Education

- Students will be instructed to self-monitor their health daily and should not go to class if they have a fever, in which case they should stay home and contact the Student Health Center at (904) 256-8080 immediately to make an appointment. They should default to their professor’s instructions on reporting an absence due to COVID symptoms.
- All residential students will receive a “welcome kit” including a temperature card from the Student Health Center, a cloth face covering, a personal sized gel hand sanitizer bottle, and educational material pertaining to COVID topics (including the importance of social distancing, cloth face covering care, and personal hand hygiene).
- Signage throughout campus will reflect social distancing guidelines.

Medical Accommodations & Support Services

- Students or parents/guardians with requests for or questions about accommodations and/or supportive services should email Disability Support Services Office at dss@ju.edu.
- Any student who needs medical housing accommodations may apply for those through the Medical Housing Accommodations process.

Isolation & Quarantine

- Processes for symptomatic residential students depend on where the student lives
  - Students who live in Oak Hall or Village Apartments
    - The symptomatic student will get tested at the Student Health Center and move to isolation in one of the reserved Village Apartments while they wait for test results, typically about 24 hours
    - Suitemates of the symptomatic student will quarantine in their current apartment (if they live in Village) or suite (if they live in Oak)
    - If the symptomatic student’s test is negative, they will move back to their room, and quarantine will end for them and for their suitemates
    - If the symptomatic student’s test is positive, they will be treated in isolation (which may include going home or to a hospital for care), and their suitemates will remain in quarantine for 14 days
  - Students who live in North, Botts, or Williams Halls
    - The symptomatic student will get tested at the Student Health Center and move to isolation in one of the reserved Village Apartments while they wait for test results, typically about 24 hours

The symptomatic student’s roommate will be quarantined in one of the rooms in the reserved wing of Oak Hall.

If the symptomatic student’s test is negative, they will move back to their room, and quarantine will end for them and for their roommate.

If the symptomatic student’s test is positive, they will be treated in isolation (which may include going home or to a hospital for care), and their roommate will remain in quarantine for 14 days.

In all cases:

- The symptomatic student will be transported to isolation on an 8-seat golf cart by a trained staff member in protective equipment.
- The affected students will receive masks, gloves, and a thermometer to help them monitor their temperature for presence of fever.
- While the symptomatic student and their roommate are in quarantine, meals will be delivered to them.
- Symptomatic students will be monitored by the Student Health Center, and all students in quarantine will be monitored by Student Affairs.
- Any student in quarantine who develops symptoms of COVID-19 should contact the Student Health Center immediately for testing and to be moved to isolation.
- Students will be able to continue their classes online and will be connected to virtual support systems.

**CAMPUS LIFE**

**Housing**

- Residential students had the opportunity to purchase single-occupancy rooms. A handful of these rooms are still available on a first-come, first-serve basis.
- Any student who needs medical housing accommodations may apply for those through the Medical Housing Accommodations process.
- Space has been set aside on campus for quarantine and isolation.
- One Village apartment will be taken offline for temporary isolation space. Dolphin Pointe will be used for ongoing isolation and treatment for students not returning home for care.
  - Individuals who are not JU students are not permitted in the residential communities.
- Residential hall front desks have been outfitted with reception shields, floor decals, hand sanitizer stations, and disinfectant wipe stations.
- All residential hall entrances have hand sanitizer dispensers.
- Lobbies and Common Spaces display social distancing and hand washing education, as well as disinfectant wipe stations.
- Community Bathrooms include hand washing education and disinfectant wipe stations.
- Residential Staff have been provided with cloth face coverings and appropriate training for responding to symptomatic students.

**Moving In**

- All new and returning students will select a check-in time slot through the Housing Portal. In July, Residential Life will email students a link and more details on the check-in process, including guidance on physical distancing and face coverings.
  - New Students will select time slots between Wednesday, August 12 - Friday, August 14.
  - Returning Students will select time slots between Thursday, August 13 - Saturday, August 15.
- Guests at move-in are limited to 2 per student.
- Move-in assistance will not be provided. We will have cart checkout available as an option for any students who need it.
- High-risk students are eligible for early move-in. You’ll receive more information about this from Residential Life.

**Dining**

- Procedures for guest areas (front of house) as prescribed by Aramark
  - Dining Hall and All Locations will have an adjusted allowable capacity pending all current Local, State & Federal guidelines.
  - Dining Hall and All Locations will have an adjusted Guest Flow pending all current Local, State & Federal guidelines to assist in safely navigating the dining locations to ensure safety and speed of service.
  - Dining Room Attendant sanitizes high touch points with increased frequency, to include, but not limited to tables, chairs, door knobs, counter top areas, cart handles, cashier stations, chairs, tables, etc.
  - Sections of the dining rooms will be closed at appropriate times for additional sanitation.
  - Additional locations (Pub & Waves) available to accept student meal plan swipes.
  - Additional Grab n Go Meal Options at the dining hall to assist with safety and convenience.
  - Meal Kit add on option for students to cook at their residence.
  - Each table will be equipped with signage to verify it has been sanitized.
  - Floors are cleaned twice daily or more throughout the day based on volume and needs specific to traffic, weather, etc.
  - Food Service Stations redesigned, currently offering as many pre packed items as possible, no self-serve buffets, all full service, including beverages and condiments.
○ Service wares – Cups, Plates & Silverware etc. are all washed twice thru a high temp dish machine.
○ Additional plexiglass separators installed around all stations.
○ Non-Contact Meal Plan Swipe procedure for admission into Dining Hall.
○ New Protocol for handing cash/credit cards to ensure safety of both parties.
  ○ PPE for our employees – all employees will receive 5 face coverings and are required to wear them at all times inside.
  ○ Food Trucks Partners, vetted for safety, to assist with social distancing and convenience and they will accept student Flex.
  ○ Additional seating indoor and outdoor to increase overall capacity within the guidelines of proper social distancing.
  ○ Additional Pop Up Culinary stations outdoors to assist with safety and convenience

● Procedures for kitchen areas (back of house) as prescribed by Aramark
  ○ Immediately upon arriving to work, employees will pass through our temperature check Supervisor at the sanitation station before entering any kitchens or service areas.
  ○ Employees will not be allowed to work with any illness, symptoms or temperature.
  ○ Employees are required to wash hands every 20 minutes.
  ○ Refresh/Change Sanitizer solution every hour.
    ○ Culinary team cleans/sanitizes the kitchen between meal periods, between team members changing shifts and between tasks.
  ○ Plexiglass has been installed to separate work stations.
    ○ Service wares – Serving Utensils, Pots & Pans etc. are all washed twice thru a high temp dish machine.
    ○ Ongoing employee training on policies, procedures and best practices – via Aramark’s daily updates. Prior to each semester start date.
    ○ Executive Chef, 4 sous chefs & Food Service Director are all Serve Safe Certified – All employees receive Safe Food Handler training upon being hired and twice annually (prior to each semester start)
    ○ Additional enhanced employee training, twice annually to all employees and to each new hire PRIOR to their first shift.
    ○ Additional staff hired to increase the level of sanitation required to ensure safety.
      ○ Staggering Schedules for all employees to aid in Social Distancing throughout an employee’s entire shift

Recreation & Wellness

● Fall intramural activities will include low contact options that can be mostly done outdoors, like spike ball, beach volleyball, and corn hole
The Esports Game Room will have a soft opening, with a grand opening to come later.

Esports lounge and Buccaneer Room will operate between 25-40% capacity.

Fitness Center will open at 25-40% capacity with same operating hours:
- Will host orientation for students planning to use the center
- Implementing a reservation system with 1 hour time slots and 30 minutes between workout time blocks to allow staff to sanitize equipment
- Cycling classes will be offered with 8 reservation slots
- Fitness classes will be offered outside.
  - Yoga class
  - Body Sculpt HIIT class
- Cloth face coverings not required of fitness center users
- Cloth face coverings required of staff working in space
  - Will be deep cleaned one time per day by Facility Services, to be completed at end of day once closed or early morning prior to opening

Pool will operate at 50% capacity with sunbathers lounge chairs set 6’ apart.

Travel
- Travel must be approved by a Senior Vice President.

UNIVERSITY EVENTS/GATHERINGS

- Student group gatherings and events are limited to 10 individuals or fewer.
- External guests -- individuals who are not students, faculty, or staff of Jacksonville University -- are not permitted at student events.
- Organizations must offer alternative meeting formats to accommodate anyone who is uncomfortable meeting in person.
- Meetings should be conducted outdoors when possible.
- Student leaders will be notified in the Virtual Student Organization meeting at the start of the year. Registered organizations are required to participate.
- Students have access to Blackboard Collaborate, Skype for Business, and Microsoft Teams, both of which may be used to host meetings virtually.

Specific Events
- Matriculation has been cancelled this year.
- Tailgating will not be permitted until Homecoming & Family Weekend.
- Information regarding changes to pinning ceremonies will be emailed directly to students.
• The Faculty Conference will be offered virtually
• Orientation will be hosted virtually this summer. Learn more about orientation at Jacksonville University.
• Homecoming & Family Weekend: A committee is hard at work planning Homecoming with a priority on the safety and well-being of all attendees, and with consideration for CDC guidelines and the fluid nature of the pandemic.
• Fraternity and sorority recruitment will move forward. Their national organizations have provided information and processes to host hybrid or fully virtual recruitment.

VISITORS TO CAMPUS

Medical Disclosure Statement

Visitors with members of their household who have tested positive for COVID-19 in the past 14 days or who are exhibiting symptoms of illness such as fever, cough or shortness of breath are not permitted on campus. Please perform a self-health check and take your temperature prior to arriving on campus to ensure you are not exhibiting COVID-19 symptoms and your temperature reading is below 100 degrees F. Please note Jacksonville University reserves the right to temperature check visitors upon arrival to campus.

All visitors must abide by University policies on social distancing and cloth face covering requirements. Those unwilling to comply will be asked to leave campus.

Welcome Center / Admissions

• Admissions will send the Medical Disclosure Statement to all prospective students and their families visiting campus
• Admissions should perform spot temperature checks of guests upon arrival
• Admissions will provide guests with a JU-branded cloth face covering upon arrival
• The number of guests that can accompany the prospective student will be limited based on facility capacity
• Ambassadors and admissions officers must wear cloth face coverings during guest interactions if 6’ physical distance cannot be maintained
• Tour group sizes will be limited to accommodate physical distancing standards
Guests of Students

- Outside of move-in and move-out processes, individuals who are not JU students are not permitted in the residential halls.
- Athletic recruits may not stay overnight in the residential halls through fall semester. We will reevaluate this for spring.
- External guests -- individuals who are not students, faculty, or staff of Jacksonville University -- are not permitted at student events.
- Guests may gather outside in communal outdoor areas.

Guests of Faculty

- Disclosure statement must be provided to any expected guest.
- Guests must bring their own cloth face covering, as they are required in classroom buildings and any time 6’ of physical distance between persons cannot be maintained. Faculty should have one available and on standby if they do not bring one. Virtual connection ability must be available and ready to go if needed.

Guests of Staff

- Disclosure statement must be provided to any expected guest.
- Guests must bring their own cloth face covering, as they are required in classroom buildings and any time 6’ of physical distance between persons cannot be maintained. Faculty should have one available and on standby if they do not bring one.
- Virtual connection ability must be available and ready to go if needed.

Vendors / Contractors Performing Work on Campus

- Vendors or contractors performing work on campus through Aramark Facilities must comply with Aramark Facilities standards for updated check-in and health and safety protocols. These protocols are currently being established.
- Vendors or contractors performing work on campus through Jacksonville University (capital projects, etc) must have their safety disclosure statement and procedures approved by the University to ensure their efforts are in line with University mitigation strategies.
- At a minimum, health screenings and temperature checks should be a part of daily requirements. Additionally, cloth face coverings should be worn while working in any
public, indoor setting and at all times while working with others where 6’ physical
distance cannot be maintained.

ATHLETICS

● Resocialization of student athletes will follow a phased approach:
  ○ Phase I: June 15 - July 24
    ■ Men’s and women’s basketball student-athletes and essential personnel
      report
    ■ Essential personnel arrive 1 week prior to student-athletes, not prior to
      June 15
  ○ Phase II: July 27 - August 2
    ■ Men’s and women’s soccer, volleyball, and men’s and women’s cross
      country and essential personnel report
    ■ Essential personnel arrive 1 week prior to student-athletes, not prior to
      July 27
  ○ Phase III: August 3 - End of Fall 2020 Term
    ■ All Athletics Department personnel return
      ■ Student-athletes living on campus report on dates assigned by
        Residential Life staff
      ■ Student-athletes living off-campus report by no later than Friday,
        August 14, 2020
● All student-athletes will be tested for COVID-19 using the NCAA Point of Care Test
  recommended by the NCAA Sports Science Institute
● Athletics staff will supplement the cleaning performed by Aramark with frequent
  cleaning of the athletics facilities based on frequency of use and volume of traffic
● Until further notice, no spectators/guests will be permitted at any games or events. Only
  essential gameday personnel will be allowed into the venue.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

● Students whose families have been affected by the pandemic may contact Student
  Financial Services to ask for reconsideration of the information reported on their FAFSA.
● Flexible payment plan options have been expanded.