Student Judicial Affairs Data (Goal 1,2,3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Cheating or Plagiarism</th>
<th>Physical Abuse</th>
<th>Computer Misuse</th>
<th>Alcohol</th>
<th>Forgery</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Vandalism or Damage</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Breakdown of Conduct Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note the significant increase in the number of violations committed by female students in 2002-2, up an additional 14 percent from 2001-02.
Academic Dishonesty Cases
Reported to Student Judicial Affairs 2002-03

Total Cases 63

Sanctions
Formal Written Reprimand 7
Disciplinary Probation 47
Suspension 2 (one had prior referral for academic dishonesty)
Incidents 3 (not formally sanctioned but one was dismissed
from graduate program)
Holds 3 (have not met with Coordinator but can’t register
for classes until situation resolved)
Pending 1 Student Discipline Hearing Scheduled

Cases Involving Plagiarism
Plagiarized paper or assignment (19)
Downloaded paper or information from Internet Source (21)
Submitted paper that was substantially the same as another student (8)
Copied section of text (1)
Copied from magazine source (1)
Submitted paper without required digital file (1)
Cut and pasted paper from different documents and/or sources (1)
Submitted paper that used similar words as another student (2)
Did not write Code in programming course (1)

Cases Involving Cheating During Examinations or Quizzes
Looking at another student’s test during a quiz or examination (1)
Looked at other student’s test and own notes during examination (2)
Submitted exam was identical to another student (2)
Used textbook instead of allowed personal “cheat sheet” that could contain helpful format (1)
Used cheat with equations that were supposed to be memorized (1)
Changed graded and returned coursework and resubmitted it to instructor saying there was error (1)

Note: Eleven of these cases involved some form of collaboration with another student.
Academic Dishonesty Cases
Reported to Student Judicial Affairs 2001-02

Total Cases 72*
(*4 cases were pending at the time analysis was completed)

Sanctions
- Formal Written Reprimand 9
- Disciplinary Probation 41
- Stayed Suspension 2
- Suspension 2
- Incidents (not formally sanctioned) 14

Cases Involving Plagiarism
- Downloading 2 Papers from Internet Source for 2 Different Classes (1)
- Downloading Papers from Internet Source (3)
- Download Portions from Different Sources and Cut and Paste (1)
- Plagiarized Papers (most from Internet Sources) (7)
- Suspected Plagiarized Paper (3)
- Plagiarized Portions of Paper (5)
- Plagiarized Speech (1)
- Failure to Cite References (1)
- Used another Student’s Paper without their Knowledge (2)
- Identical Paper as other Student (2)
- Copied Material from Website for Paper (2)
- Copied Paper from another student on computer (2)
- Wrote Paper for 2 different classes and plagiarized portion of it (1)

Cases Involving Cheating During Examinations or Quizzes
- Looking at Another Student’s Paper during Examination (4)
- Had another student turn in assignment (1)
- Took Computer Program from another Student (1)
- Copied another student’s coursework (2)
- Turned in previous semester’s coursework from another Student (1)
- Answers on Examination were same as Other Students (3)
- Used “cheat sheet” during examination (1)
- Bought Blue Book In with Notes Written in It (1)
- Changed exam after returned to attempt to gain points (1)
**Other Cheating**

Allowing other Student to Copy their Coursework (2)
Fabricate Interview for Paper (1)
Fabricate Observation of Class Session for Paper (1)
Wrote same Paper for 2 Different Classes (1)
Took quiz for other student and let them copy their video guide (1)
Put Name on other Student’s Database and turned it in as own (1)
Copied work on take home exam and homework assignments (1)
Lent Disk to Other Student During Lab (1)
Same Computer Program as other Student (2)
Let other student use their paper (2)
Turned in same project/paper as other students (3)
Student’s copied from each other and turned in same assignment (6)

*23 of these cases involved some form of collaboration with other students.*

*2 of these cases involved cheating in groups.*
Breakdown of Alcohol and Drug Violations

The alcohol violations reflect all persons listed on Incident Reports for situations where alcohol was present. Students are held accountable if they are in the room where a violation occurs. The marijuana violations include incidents where marijuana is seen or where two staff members have independently confirmed the smell of marijuana. These numbers reflect residence hall or campus violations and not necessarily violations of state or federal law.

### Residence Hall Policy Violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999-00</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Campus Violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999-00</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Judicial Affairs Data (Goal 1,2,3)

#### Sanctions for Violations of Title 5, California Code of Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Reprimand</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Stayed</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>Expulsion</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Denial</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sanctions:**
- Formal
- Written
- Reprimand
- Probation
- Stayed Suspension
- Suspension
- Expulsion
- Settlement Agreement
- Admission
- Denial
- TOTAL

**Graph:**
- Bar chart showing the distribution of sanctions for different years (2002-03 to 1999-00) for formal, written, reprimand, probation, stayed suspension, suspension, expulsion, settlement agreement, admission, denial, and total categories.
Recidivism

Recidivism rates were reviewed during 2002-03 to track the number of students who violated the alcohol or drug policies during the time they were on a sanction for the same offense. For first-time alcohol offenses, students are normally placed on Formal Written Reprimand. For first-time drug offenses, students are normally placed on Disciplinary Probation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-time Violations of Alcohol Policy</th>
<th>Number of Students Who Violated Policy Again while on Formal Written</th>
<th>Number of Students Who Violated Policy for Third Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12 Percent)</td>
<td>(1 Percent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Repeat Offenders for Alcohol Violations

(Students Initially Placed on Formal Written Reprimand)

- **First-time Violations of Alcohol Policy**: 407
- **Number of Students Who Violated Policy Again while on Formal Written**: 48
- **Number of Students Who Violated Policy for Third Time**: 4

![Bar chart showing the number of students](chart.png)

- **407**: First-time Violations of Alcohol Policy
- **48**: Number of Students Who Violated Policy Again while on Formal Written
- **4**: Number of Students Who Violated Policy for Third Time
It is interesting to note the comparison between recidivism rates for alcohol and drug violation offenders. On the surface, it appears the sanctioning approach used for alcohol is more successful in terms of recidivism than the sanctioning approach used for drugs. Students who violate the alcohol policy in the residence halls are placed on Formal Written Reprimand through their Residence Community Coordinators (RCC). Therefore they have established a relationship with a member of the residence life staff and discussed the policies and consequences of any further violations. The student meets again with the RCC on the second offense before being referred to the Coordinator for Student Discipline. The amount of interaction with live-in staff may explain the difference in the recidivism rates. However, other factors may be involved, i.e. personality differences between alcohol and drug offenders.

In 2003-04, students who are referred to the Alcohol Education Class or the Substance Abuse Seminar will be required to pay a fee. At the end of this academic year, we will be assessing whether this has made a difference in the number of alcohol referrals.
There were 4 requests for formal Student Grievance Hearings during the 2002-03 academic year but only one hearing was held. One student withdrew from the University during the middle of the hearing process. The case involved an extraordinary amount of staff time. One of the cases was resolved informally and one student’s request was denied because according to the Student Grievance Procedures, the initial grievance was not filed within the required timeline.

TRENDS TO WATCH

In 2001-02, there was an upsurge in the number of complaints filed or student discipline cases involving registered disabled students. In 2002-03, the number of Student Judicial Affairs cases involving registered disabled students did not vary greatly from the previous year. Once again, some of these cases began with the student grievance process and reverted to student discipline. Some of these cases require an extraordinary amount of staff time and in fact, one case from 2002-03 is still on going.

Total Cases Involving DSS Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999-00</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>