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Overview

• What is the Code of Conduct?
• Scope and Purpose
• Process Review
• Overview of Changes
• Community Feedback
• Q & A
What is the Code of Conduct

- Foundational document within the student experience
- Values-oriented
- Code of conduct outlines:
  - Minimum expectations for students inside and outside the classroom
  - Procedures followed when a violation may have occurred
  - Range of outcomes that can happen if a student is responsible for a violation.

Scope and Purpose of Review

**Purpose**
- Clarity
- Consistency
- Support student safety and University mission
- Align code with best practices
- Comprehensive student handbook (long-term)

**Scope**
- Undergraduate Code of Conduct
  - Introduction
  - Expectations
  - Sanctions
  - Procedures
- Policies outside scope
  - Honor code
  - Appeals
  - Medical amnesty
  - Alcohol policy
What should we minimally expect of undergraduate students?

**Process Review**

**Initial Draft**
- Model codes
- Institutional comparison

**Committee**
- Broad-based review group
- Refined code

**Legal Review**
- Expertise from within and outside WFU
- Model code
Current Sanction Framework

- Largely presumptive in nature
- Not oriented toward learning
- Use of fines is not a socially just practice
- Presumptive use of community service without a clear restorative connection is counter to the educational philosophy of Pro Humanitate and harmful to key university partnerships
Examples of presumptive sanctions

- Alcohol misuse - $125 fine, 20 hours community service
- Drugs - $200 fine, 20 hours
- Failure to comply - $75-$100 fine, 30-40 hours
- Verbal abuse/harassment - $100 fine, 30 hours
- Possession of false ID - $150 fine, 50 hours
- Copyright violations - $75 fine, 20 hours

Sanction Benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Published list of all available sanctions</th>
<th>Sanctions divided into major categories</th>
<th>Suggested or presumptive sanctions by charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University (^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sanction Benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Published list of all available sanctions</th>
<th>Sanctions divided into major categories</th>
<th>Suggested or presumptive sanctions by charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tufts University¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-Chapel Hill²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington and Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goals of the Conduct Process

- Reaffirm University expectations
- Guide future decision-making
- Increase learning related to the incident
- Repair individual or community-related harm
- Change behavior
Learning Outcomes

As a result of participating in the Student Conduct process, students will:

• be able to communicate new knowledge on a specific topic or social issue. *(Content Knowledge)*
• be able to articulate a set of values that influence their decision making, describe how those values relate to the ethical standards of the campus community, and develop strategies for aligning future decisions with individual and community values. *(Self-awareness)*
• be able to describe how your behavior and decision-making affected or could have affected you and others within the community. *(Personal responsibility)*
• be able to examine how you interact with your communities, how others interact, and how you can constructively engage as an ethical, committed community member. *(Social engagement)*
• be able to articulate why the University is concerned about a safe educational environment and how the observed behavior does not align with the mission of the institution. *(University expectations)*

Sanction Options

• Behavioral Requirement or Educational Program
• Community Service
• Restitution
• Restorative Actions
• Activities suspension
• Disciplinary probation
• University Housing Probation
• University Housing Reassignment
• University Housing Suspension or Expulsion
• On-campus Living Requirement
• Residency Requirement Extension
• Suspension Withheld
• Suspension
• Expulsion
**Alcohol and Other Drug Sanctions**

**AlcoholEdu for Sanctions**: An online interactive alcohol and drug education program developed by Everfi.

**BASICS Group**: A group-based intervention for alcohol and other drugs using a multi-faceted individual feedback report to inform behavior modification and goal-setting.

**BASICS 1:1**: A single-session, individualized intervention based in Motivational Interviewing for alcohol and other drugs using a multi-faceted individual feedback report to inform behavior modification and goal-setting.

**BASICS+**: A four-session, individualized intervention based in Motivational Interviewing for alcohol and other drugs using a multi-faceted individual feedback report to inform behavior modification and goal-setting.

**Formal AOD Assessment**: Formal assessment conducted by trained, licensed clinical staff regarding problematic use of alcohol and/or other drugs. Includes referral to additional services/resources as indicated.

**Outcome-based reflection**: An opportunity for a student to demonstrating learning through a clear, well-developed response that demonstrates that the student has thought about all aspects of the issue/decision/behavior that resulted in their entry into the Student Conduct System.

**Parental Notification**: In all instances of alcohol and other drug violations, a student’s parents will be contacted by mail and/or phone.
Alcohol and Other Drug Sanctions

**Low-level**
- Simple alcohol or marijuana possession
- Empty container
- Public display

- AlcoholEdu
- BASICS Group

**Mid-level**
- Hospitalization or alcohol misuse
- Repeat marijuana use

- BASICS 1:1
- BASICS+

**High-level**
- Multiple hospitalizations
- DWI or other severe complications

- BASICS+
- Formal AOD Assessment

Purpose? Students receive immediate medical attention and follow-up interventions designed to reduce likelihood of future harm.

Who receives it? Students in need of care and students seeking medical attention for their friends.

Who gives it? The Office of the Dean of Students, upon review of the incident and discussion with the student, decides if medical amnesty is applicable in a given scenario.

Anything else? A student still needs to complete requirements to receive amnesty, such as educational interventions.

Medical Amnesty

Medical amnesty was used 62 times in 2016-2017
Outcomes

AY2016-17 BASICS Sessions were offered from September 9th 2016 to May 3rd 2017

BASICS Sessions Provided:
BASICS Group Sessions: 22
BASICS 1:1 Sessions: 203
BASICS Plus Sessions: 64
Total Sessions: 289
Total No show: 16

Unique Students Served:
Unique Students in Group: 28
Unique Students in 1:1: 140
Unique Students in Plus: 16
Unique Students Total: 184

Referral Sources:
Conduct: 152
Medical: 67
Self*: 0
Other*: 0

*There were 4 Self-referred and 1 Other-referred students who presented to the Office of Wellbeing for confidential support in managing AOD use issues, but elected not to participate in the BASICS process. Instead, these students received motivational interviewing interventions from the Assistant Director of Wellbeing – Alcohol and Substance Abuse Preventions.

Outcomes: Participant Experience

“I found [my basics provider] very personable and comfortable to talk to. I think she really did an excellent job at making the session comfortable and useful.”

“[My basics provider] was absolutely amazing, I really appreciated talking to her.”

“[My basics provider] is one of the most encouraging people I’ve ever met. I left that session feeling better about myself than I had in months.”

“[My basics provider] is one of the most kind, compassionate people I’ve ever met!”

“It was good.”

In thinking about your BASICS facilitator, to what degree to you agree with the following statements? I felt like my BASICS facilitator... (Mean responses)

...made an attempt to understand my situation 6.83
...made me feel comfortable 6.83
...cared about me 6.75
...listened to me 6.92
In thinking about your BASICS session(s), to what degree do you agree with the following statements?
My BASICS session(s)...
(Mean responses)

- is something I would recommend to a friend...
- was what I expected it to be...
- helped me set goals...
- helped me to think about ways to change...

In thinking about your drinking and/or drug use since participating in BASICS, to what degree do you agree with the following statements?
(Mean responses)

- I have a better understanding of how...
- I continue to use...strategies that I...
- helped me reduce the amount of...use
- changed the way I think about...use

---

BASICS participants complete an online pre-assessment and a (voluntary) 6-week post assessment regarding their substance use and related behaviors and consequences. The following statistically significant effects were observed when comparing pre-test to post-test:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>p value (t-test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol - have used, not in past 30 days</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>p=.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol - have used, in past 30 days</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-18.3%</td>
<td>p=.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Drink Limit – Using this strategy regularly</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>p=.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace Drinks - Using this strategy regularly</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>p&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Shots - Using this strategy regularly</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>p=.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Track of Drinks - Using this strategy regularly</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>p=.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes: Repeat Offenders

The overall repeat offender rate for BASICS for AY1617 was 9/189 or 4.8%. While there is no longitudinal data for repeat offenders in BASICS (first year of program) following is overall conduct recidivism data for incidents related to alcohol and marijuana:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Misuse</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-Underage Possession &amp;/or Consumption</td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Paraphernalia</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs-Marijuana</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Feedback

1. What objective is this policy/procedure trying to meet? How does it fail to do so?
2. Can you suggest an alternative to the language proposed?
3. How would the alternative language meet the same objective or be more effective?

Please note: comments will be moderated for posting to the website.
The Student Code of Conduct will be posted online for feedback from students, faculty, and staff. Those interested may attend any of the above sessions in Pugh Auditorium to learn more about the proposed changes. Comments may be submitted at go.wfu.edu/codereview.

Questions