

Washington State University
An External Review of Practices, Policies and Procedures
October 16 &17, 2017

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the findings and recommendations of the External Review Team invited to the Washington State University (WSU) campus October 16-17, 2017. The purpose of the review was to evaluate the Office of Student Conduct's practices and policies, its staffing model, and identify strengths and opportunities for growth in order to provide recommendations for consideration based upon established professional practices.

Throughout the review process, the entire WSU staff exhibited the utmost level of professionalism, hospitality and openness. Review Coordinator Dr. Kathleen MacKay and her staff provided the reviewers with voluminous amounts of materials preceding the reviewer's visit. A sample of the documents provided were job descriptions, written and web based policies and procedures, forms, letters, and various statistical and narrative reports (See inclusive list Appendix A). The reviewers also were able to access WSU's Website and other links related to the campus conduct procedures and policies.

OBSERVATIONS

The Office of Student Conduct staff is a sincere group of committed professionals. The overwhelming majority of the feedback from the staff, faculty and students who were interviewed was positive. As to be expected, there was also some feedback from some stakeholders regarding changes they would like to see take place. The various stakeholders who participated in the interviews should be commended for their willingness to be open, honest and forthright with their thoughts, concerns and opinions.

During the day and half visit on campus, there was an opportunity to meet with several students and staff representatives, as well as a faculty member. The staff who facilitate the conduct process as well as other community members who are stakeholders in the process seemed genuinely committed to serving students and making decisions that balance the best interest of the individual student with the greater WSU community. The conduct system that staff is required to function within is very challenging. Despite those challenges, they all are student centered and believe in the educational process of the conduct system.

The information obtained from the broad representation of the WSU community provided the opportunity to obtain a robust amount information that assisted in formulating many of the findings and recommendations contained within this report. A complete schedule of the reviewer's visit is included at the conclusion of this report (Appendix B)

IDENTIFIED THEMES

Based upon our frank, thorough, and enjoyable interviews with WSU staff, faculty, and students, we have synthesized the information gathered during our day and a half on campus as well as the information garnered from the reading materials provided into the following thematic areas:

1. Staffing Model
2. Code of Conduct/Process
3. Organizational Accountability
4. Professional Development
5. Public Relations/Communication

Our identified themes are expanded upon below with brief commentary and recommendations to help WSU structure ongoing dialogue around opportunities to maximize strengths and consider new opportunities to incorporate into the conduct process.

COMMENTARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Theme One: Staffing Model

Commentary

The staff is viewed in a positive manner by those we interviewed. They seem to have a good rapport with departments throughout the division of Student Affairs as well as the Police Department. The Director is seen as a responsive and accommodating, however it is clear that due to the need for him to manage the Full Adjudication process, he has very little time to perform his other duties. The overall number of the staff is robust for a student population the size of WSU, however the total operating budget of \$28,000 is not adequate. The staff is committed to serving students in an educational setting and enjoy their jobs. Upon reviewing the holistic experiences of all of the staff, it become apparent the University needs to allocate resources for each of the staff to become well versed in the fundamental building blocks of the student conduct profession. This issue will be addressed in the Professional Development section of the report.

There is no doubt that the staff is negatively impacted as a result of having to administer a conduct process that is overly legalistic and requires the use of a court of law to adjudicate certain violations of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). A review of the WAC informs the reader that staff must resolve discipline violations utilizing two distinctly different processes. One process, Full Adjudication requires that major violations of the WAC where separation from the university will be for more than 10 days requires the case to be presented in a court of law in front of an Administrative Law Judge. Unfortunately, this process cannot be changed until such time as a different legal rendering occurs. As a result of this mandate, the removal of the educational emphasis that should be the primary focus of a student disciplinary process is absent. The other process, (Brief Adjudication) does appear to have some flexibility in its implementation if the university so desires.

The Full Adjudication Process is used to resolve a minority of cases managed by Office of Student Conduct (OSC). However, since the Director of Conduct must serve in the role of a prosecutor (representing the University) in court, he is required to spend an inordinate amount of his work week preparing and presenting these cases. This is an atypical responsibility of someone serving in the Director of Student Conduct role. Moreover, since the individual representing the University in this process must be a practicing attorney, there is currently no other individual available in the OSC to share these responsibilities. Due to the exclusive requirement of the WAC to manage Full Adjudication cases in this manner, the current staffing model is not sustainable.

Another deficit to the current system is the limited involvement of Residence Life staff in managing minor conduct violations of the WAC. After careful consideration, we believe the level of involvement that the Residence Life staff has in the conduct system should be re-evaluated. While we recognize that the Residence Life staff does manage violations of the housing contract, not having any role in managing other minor conduct violations is unusual. If the decision is made to have the Residence Education Directors help manage minor violations of the WAC, they certainly seem to have the capacity to do so. Despite the unique challenges the Conduct staff currently face, they do look for ways to be student centered, educational, and responsive to the needs of the community.

Recommendations

1. Hire a part-time attorney in the AG's office to relieve the Director of his responsibilities of managing Full Adjudication cases. He is currently required to spend too much of his time focused on these cases and as a result, the time necessary to provide supervision for, be proactive or strategic, and manage the day to day operations of the office is compromised. Additionally, since most Title IX cases are referred to Full Adjudication, if the current Director is no longer managing these cases, the concern that there may be collusion between the Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and the Director of Student Conduct (they are husband and wife) in these types of cases is removed. Also, while we believe there is absolutely no substance to the concern, even the perception that such a possibility exists is eliminated by this staffing change.
2. Strongly consider having the Residential Life staff manage low level violations of the Code that occur in the residence communities. While we recognize there is a concern of the Director that the staff will have to stop performing their collateral assignment, we believe they have the capacity to manage this task without doing so.
3. A staff member in OSC should assume primary responsibility for serving as the main liaison to the Residence Life staff when they need guidance managing cases to help with consistency concerns and to help ensure the distribution of cases amongst the staff are appropriate.
4. Assign one staff in OSC to be main point of contact to manage group accountability cases and to liaise with Greek Life and the Office of Student Involvement.
5. Complete a benchmarking study related to the total office operating budget.

Theme Two: Code of Conduct/Process

Commentary - WAC

The Washington Administrative Code (WAC) is the central document that provides guidance to student behavior on campus. Similarly, to what other institutions refer to as the Code of Conduct, the WAC contains many of the traditional policies and procedures provided for in a traditional code of conduct. However, the WAC is written utilizing very legalistic language, is duplicative in parts, and is organized in such a manner that students reported it is not "student friendly". We concur with their concern. As an example, it was challenging for both of us, as seasoned conduct Bond/Dickstein External Student Conduct System Review

officers, to identify all of a student's rights they are entitled to when entering into the disciplinary process. We believe a student is not able to easily interpret the process and "what to expect" if they are documented. Indeed, this was reflected in conversations with students during our visit.

Commentary – WAC Processes

As mentioned earlier, there are two distinct processes that a student may participate in, depending on the seriousness of the alleged violation. For a major violation of the Code that might result in separation from the institution, a legal process known as Full Adjudication is utilized. This process, as required by law is executed when there is a possibility that a finding of responsibility may lead to a sanction warranting separation (suspension/expulsion/loss of recognition) of a student or student organization from the university for more than 10 days. In such instances, each case must be presented to an Administrative Law Judge.

While this process is used to resolve the minority of cases managed by Office of Student Conduct, the requirement that the Director of Conduct serve in the role of a prosecutor (representing the University) in a court of law requires him to spend a majority of his work week preparing and presenting these cases. Moreover, since the individual representing the University in this process must be a practicing attorney, there is currently no other individual available in the Office of Student Conduct to fulfill this responsibility.

The second process that is used to resolve violations of the WAC is known as the Brief Adjudication process. This process, which is utilized to resolve alleged violations that most likely will not result in separation of the student/organization from the institution is similar to what most conduct professionals would consider a "traditional" process involving a notice of alleged violation, possible meeting with a conduct officer, determination of responsibility or not and the sanctioning of the student and/or organization if found responsible. Currently, due to the number of minor violations coupled with the fact that the Residential Life staff do not perform any conduct functions, several minor violations are attempted to be resolved through an administrative process without the benefit of a face to face meeting with the student. This process in its current form, deprives both the student and the staff member of the opportunity to have conversation about not only the alleged violation, but other relevant issues such as how they are performing in school or how they are feeling about their experience so far at WSU. The opportunity to have these face to face conversations also help ease the perception that the conduct process is negative and can produce "educational moments" where a student can obtain a greater insight into their behavior and its impact on the community.

Upon reviewing the WAC as well as receiving feedback during interviews, especially from students, it is apparent that this is a document that is extremely hard to digest, contains legalistic terminology not appropriate for a student discipline process, and does not communicate clearly the information contained within it to the student. It is vital that students fully understand their rights and responsibilities and every effort must be made to communicate those to the students.

Recommendations

1. During our visit it was brought to our attention that there was a Student Conduct Task Force that was charged with reviewing the WAC. It was concerning to learn that no representation on this task force was present from the Office of Student Conduct. We

would recommend that content experts such as the Director of Student Conduct always be included in such a review. Furthermore, it may be also be helpful to have a consultant participate as a member of the task force and/or review all the recommendations to insure industry standard practices/policies are recommended.

2. The WAC and other student conduct polices should be incorporated into one document that is widely disseminated to students. We understand such a document is will be ready for dissemination beginning Fall, 2018.
3. Review and recommend changes to the WAC that are specifically designed to articulate all of the rights of the complainant and respondent and create a section specifically for Student Organization accountability.
4. Take out policy language in definitions section and place in Prescribed Conduct Section (i.e. Cheating)
5. Section 504-26-304: Change language to not single out Sororities and Fraternities.
6. Section 504-26-103: Reduce the amount of time the decision is final in Brief Adjudication cases from twenty-one days to 7 days if legally possible.
7. Look for sections that are duplicative and combined (i.e. sections 504-26-203 and 504-26-204).
8. 504-26-100: The composition of the conduct and appeal panels should be appointed by Director of Student Conduct, not the VPSA.
9. 504-26-213: Does not mention knives or stun guns.
10. 504-26-301: Change name to **Bias Related** Intent
11. 504-26-407: Change name to **Appeal** of decision in brief adjudications.
12. Incorporate into the process for all students who are referred for misconduct to have at least one in-person meeting with a WSU staff member (OSC or Residential Life). This will help the student with acquiring a greater understanding of the process as well as allow for “educational conversations” to take place between the student and a professional staff member.
13. RAs should be specifically listed in the definition section (#17) as a University official so that when appropriate, information on a need to know basis concerning disciplinary matters may be shared with them. They should also be well trained in every aspect of the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).
14. Incorporate a regularly scheduled review of the Code annually as compared to current language that states every three years.

Theme Three: Organization Accountability

Commentary

One of the greatest challenges the Office of Student Conduct faces is their treatment of matters involving organizational misconduct. This is not dissimilar from campuses across the country as these types of cases have many competing interests and challenges. Not only are these types of matters more difficult to investigate given the number of parties that may be involved, but the treatment and outcome of such cases are influenced by parties affiliated with the campus that may have conflicts of interest preventing them from having an unbiased perspective.

WSU appears to have Alumni who are attempting to significantly influence the conduct process. This has been a polarizing issue for the campus. It is our understanding that there is a desire to modify the WAC in an effort to reduce student organization accountability and only permit the removal of recognition of a student organization as a result of being found responsible for hazing. This course of action is of serious concern. While we were told that a perception exists that the only punishment considered for Greek organizations by campus administrators is the loss of recognition, this does not seem to be the reality.

There is an innumerable amount of behaviors that could or should result in any organization losing their recognition for a period of time or even permanently. However, such a loss of recognition by the University, similar to an individual's dismissal from an institution, should be the last option used after other attempts at corrective and educational opportunities have been exhausted. The practice of considering the egregiousness of the violation(s), the number of violations resulting from the incident, and/or the cumulative history of the organization as mitigating circumstances when completing the sanctioning phase of a conduct process should always be incorporated into the decision-making calculus. Furthermore, the level of cooperation and the amount of responsibility taken by the organization and/or its members for the inappropriate behavior should also be considered.

We strongly recommend against the institution restricting the conduct process by creating a system where organizations are held to different sanctioning thresholds based upon their membership. We do not believe such a practice would be in its best interests and such a system is not in line with any industry standard of which we are aware. There is also a concern that such a change would expose the University to possible legal action by other non-Greek organizations when they are sanctioned differently solely based upon the members who comprise their organization. All student organizations must be eligible to receive the same sanctions in a disciplinary process. Moreover, the negative national attention Greek Life systems on college campuses have experienced of late should serve as notice to colleges and universities that organizational accountability is paramount to deterring poor behavior and reducing liability.

Another issue of note pertaining to organizational discipline was/is a perception that the conduct system does not treat Greek organizations and student athletes fairly. We expected to receive a considerable amount of negative feedback from the student leaders who were affiliated with Greek Life about this issue, but that was not the case. The students did express a need for increased communication and wanting to enhance their relationship with the Student Conduct Office which we interpreted as positive.

We are aware that the original concern was significant enough to warrant the University hiring an external investigator to determine if bias did impact the decisions being made within the conduct system. Conducted by an external law firm, the report produced by Lyons O'Dowd, PLLC, dated February 16, 2017 clearly indicates that this is not the case. Upon reading the report and synthesizing the information from our interviews, we concur with the findings. Moreover, a cursory review of the discipline statistics provided also supports the finding that no bias seems to exist.

It should be noted that strong organizations have strong advisors. It seems that many organizations, including Greek organizations have a university employee who is serving in the role of an advisor in name only. The lack of a committed advisor deprives the organization (and the campus) of the opportunity to engage positive alumni, faculty, or staff as resources for the campus.

Finally, the Greek Life staff share the responsibility of holding Greek organizations accountable to campus policies, and our conversations with them were fruitful. They are a committed staff and seem dedicated to supporting and enhancing a vibrant and healthy Greek community on the campus. Now that there is stability within the staff, they are poised to play a key role in engaging advisors and chapter leaders to assist in the establishment and maintenance of safe practices within the campus community. That being said, it is ultimately the responsibility of the Office of Student Conduct staff to hold the organizations accountable for misconduct that may threaten individuals within the campus community. For this reason, the Greek Life staff and the Office of Student Conduct staff should act in concert with the support of senior administration to that end.

Recommendations

1. Do not change the sanctioning options by limiting the type of violation that must be committed before an organization may lose their recognition.
2. Conduct educational programming sessions for the Greek life community on the topic of organizational misconduct paying special attention to how incidents will be investigated and adjudicated, what roles each department may play, and how and why sanctions are assessed.
3. Consider revising the Group Accountability Statement to read as follows: The behavior in question was committed by, condoned by or involved organization officers, or the actions/behaviors of individuals present during the incident would lead a reasonable person to believe the organization was associated with the event.
4. If not currently offered, require all student organization leadership to acknowledge in writing their awareness of the policies and procedures associated with being a recognized student organization. This document should minimally, yet specifically reference hazing, gender based violence and harassment and alcohol and drug use and abuse. Also acknowledging their understanding and agreement with the Group Accountability Statement would be beneficial as well.

5. Create a series of education-based sanctions that are connected to resources offered by the campus. This includes risk management, gender based violence and harassment, alcohol education, bystander intervention, leadership and multicultural competency training. Include in sanctioning options when appropriate, the requirement that if not 100% of the membership, a significantly high percentage of the members must participate in interactive programming intended to increase each member's knowledge of the above mentioned areas.
6. Encourage sanctions, when appropriate that require a long-time period to show improvement. An example would be an organization having to develop an improvement plan that would then need to demonstrate improved behavior over the course of a year or more.
7. Create an online "tool kit" for advisors: series of documents and information clarifying the conduct process, University policies and expectations, and services available to advisors and student leadership.
8. Provide regular training and professional development opportunities for faculty and staff who serve as advisors of campus organizations. The Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA) may be having a track on group accountability at the next Gehring academy. This training would be a great opportunity to attend. Require alumni to be "certified" advisors, making certification dependent on knowledge of campus resources and routine communication with the organization.
9. Incentivize the role advisors play by creating a recognition system for advisors. Incentivize having an advisor with all student organizations by making it a criterion for awards given to student organizations.

Theme Four: Professional Development

Commentary

The professional staff come to their roles in the Student Conduct office from various educational backgrounds. They have advanced degrees in law, counseling, and/or higher education. Such a composition of staff makes for a strong foundation when creating a student-centered approach to student discipline. However, while the staff are student-centered and committed to their profession, as shared previously, the University needs to allocate resources to insure that each staff member becomes well versed in the fundamental building blocks of the student conduct profession.

There is a need to identify and invest in professional development opportunities. While the training they have participated in is well documented, some of the basic building blocks of student conduct theory and practice need attention. As we know you are aware, but nonetheless want to reiterate, the funds spent on proactive approaches to training and professional development will be much less than the cost of a single lawsuit due to poorly trained or ignorant staff. An assessment of each individual staff member should be conducted to identify where skill enhancement can take place.

Examples of professional development opportunities that are appropriate are attendance at ASCA national, regional or state conferences. Participation in Gehrig Academy modules, attending work-place investigation, trauma-informed training and multi-cultural competency workshops. While some staff did complete some of the above-mentioned trainings, everyone should complete them all in a timely fashion. Also, membership in ASCA will assist the staff in becoming more aware of the many low-and no-cost opportunities that may be available and should be utilized whenever possible. We also suggest possibly partnering with other schools to facilitate trainings as well as utilize your local and state law enforcement agencies, Rape Crisis counseling centers and any faculty or other staff on campus who may be able to provide helpful trainings as well.

The trainings that are being offered by the Office of Student Conduct for the campus community seem to be well received. When asked, the staff is very responsive and it is appreciated. The documentation of training provided to panel members was very good. However, the feedback also identified a need for even more outreach to multiple constituents about the purpose of the conduct system and resources the office provides. Feedback from students produced an awareness of the difficulty in their ability to have a basic understanding of the conduct process as well. A factor that unfortunately may enhance this problem is the fact that the RA staff communicated to us that they are told not to share information or try to explain the disciplinary process and instead simply refer students to the Residential Education Director. While this approach has some limited advantages, it severely limits the ability of the RA to be a resource for their students in conduct matters.

Recommendations

1. Each staff member should become an institutional member of Association of Student Conduct Administration (ASCA) in order to take advantage of educational opportunities including webinars, discounted state and national conference rates and access to the student conduct listserv. Membership also provides access to various communities of practice where professionals discuss student conduct issues based on topic areas (e.g. Greek Life, Residence Life, academic integrity, etc.). Institutional membership is cheaper than individual membership and will allow for multiple staff members in both OSC and potentially Residence Life and/Greek Life to participate as well.
2. Standardize the training records to include the day, month and year of the trainings the staff complete.
3. Standardize the training so that all staff have participated in the same basic trainings on an annual basis to include implicit bias, Title IX/Gender Based Violence and Harassment, FERPA, Student Development theory and Conduct Boot Camp 101 Basics.
4. Add the topics of implicit bias and Title IX/Gender Based Violence and Harassment to the training the Conduct Board members receive.
5. Develop mentoring relationships with senior student conduct officers outside of WSU. Such arrangements can be provided through ASCA and other collegial means.

6. Have staff attend regional training opportunities (e.g. state conduct meetings, training academies, or webinars).
7. Encourage ongoing learning that includes discussions on student conduct-related matters. This could take place in the form of brown bag discussions over articles, current events, hot topics, etc. Include interested faculty and staff in these discussions.
8. Provide all of the campus members who have a direct role with the conduct process with cultural competency training to become more knowledgeable and sensitive to cultural differences.
9. Resident Assistants should be well trained and encouraged to discuss policy violations and what a student can expect in the discipline process as a part of the incident documentation process.
10. Increase and intentionally recruit and train diverse students, faculty, and staff to be involved in conduct boards.
11. Establish a protocol for publishing student conduct statistics within the community on an ongoing and consistent manner. Such transparency may help with perceived bias.
12. Collaborate with Residential Life staff to provide at least annual training to Resident Assistants and Resident Education Directors on student conduct related topics.

Theme Five: Public Relations and Communication

Commentary

The Office of Student Conduct, not unlike similar offices on other campuses, in that it appears to struggle with having a well-developed marketing and communication plan for the programs and services it provides. While feedback indicates there is always a willingness to provide trainings and outreach when requested, the office could benefit from the creation of a marketing and outreach plan that results in a proactive approach to increasing the level of knowledge that students, faculty and staff possess regarding the student conduct process. Included in this plan could be the presentation of statistics each semester and annually to the campus community informational programming for student organizations, international, residential and commuter students and campus wide programming like an Ethics or Academic Integrity Week.

As mentioned in the Lyons-Odowd report, and in several conversations throughout our visit, the Office of Student Conduct is negatively impacted by an image problem it does not necessarily deserve. While engaging in student discipline does not evoke an initially positive impression from the student body (indeed, it is reasonable for students to want to avoid the office), the office should not be saddled with the negative connotation based on the unfounded rumors by some or a lack of awareness by others. It is vital that the Office of Student Conduct have strong, consistent communication with a myriad of partners on and around campus. The greatest tool the office can wield is its sharing of accurate, relevant information so that campus partners may make informed decision on how to address trends in negative behavior and educate the campus on how strong a resource the Office of Student Conduct can be. Intentional time must be

allocated to create opportunities where constructive and informative dialogue takes place with others.

Recommendations

1. Increasing the method and techniques in regards to how the process is communicated to the campus community, especially students would be beneficial. It may be possible to utilize an advanced marketing class to help the office design a plan and at the same time, students who work on this project could receive class credit.
2. Create MOUs between the police department, Student Affairs and University Communications to ensure proper protocols regarding the sharing of information and who should be involved in dialogue during crises and/or major issues that occur.
3. Feedback from students illuminated a difficulty in their being able to find and clearly understand the information in the WAC. Once a universal WSU code of conduct (handbook) is created, disseminate it widely in multiple ways (written, electronic, etc.) to both internal and external stakeholders.
4. Establish a protocol for communicating student conduct statistics within the community on an ongoing and consistent manner. Dispel myths about students of color in process by presenting annual report with Student Affairs staff and advisors. Number of respondents of color proportional to student population.
5. Present OSC data at ASWSU, Greek life, and student athlete gatherings.

Conclusion

The Office of Student Conduct at Washington State University is at a sensitive time in its history. Currently, the significant influence exerted by external stakeholders is presenting challenges that detract from the office's purpose. Working within a conduct system that is legalistic and needs numerous revisions to its governing documents also contributes to an environment that is difficult to focus on the true purpose of student conduct, helping students learn, grow, and develop a deeper sense of citizenry. As previously shared, there is also the need to provide professional development opportunities for the entire staff. The chief conduct officer is spread too thin with legal responsibilities that draw him away from providing leadership, vision and supervision of his staff.

That being said, the consultants are optimistic that positive change is attainable. Appropriate revisions to the WAC, consideration of altering the staffing structure in the Office of Student Conduct and Attorney General's office and allowing the Residence Life team to participate in the conduct office would result in an immediate positive impact. The recommendations offered in this report are measured and reasonable. Indeed, some are already being initiated. The staff is committed to doing what is in the best interest of their students and so while undoubtedly a few recommendations may be met with reservation, we are confident that if implemented, positive results will be produced. The consultants remain at the service of Washington State University for any clarification or questions this report may elicit.

Reviewers

The reviewers are colleagues within the Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA). Both have a deep history providing leadership and supervision in student conduct administration spanning two decades within residence life, housing, and campus discipline programs throughout their careers. Dr. Dickstein brings additional expertise in Fraternity and Sorority Life as well as student organization accountability while Mr. Bond provides additional insight into student conduct work through his legal background and extensive knowledge of residential disciplinary processes.

Dickstein Bio

Dr. Gary Dickstein currently serves as the Interim Vice President for Student Affairs at Wright State University. Dr. Dickstein has worked in the field of higher education as an administrator for the past 29 years. Over the course of his career, Dr. Dickstein has held numerous positions within various areas of Student Affairs including Housing and Residential Life, Fraternity and Sorority Affairs, Off-Campus Housing Services, and Community Standards and Student Conduct.

Dr. Dickstein received his bachelor's degree in Social Work from Western Michigan University; a Master's of Arts in Higher Education Administration from Wright State University and his Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration from Ohio University. His dissertation research focus was in the areas of student conduct and mental health.

Dr. Dickstein has served on the Board of Directors of the Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA) as director at large, President Elect, President, and immediate past President. He also served the association as the conference chair and Secretary for the Foundation. In addition to being involved in ASCA, Dr. Dickstein is also a member of several other organizations including the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), Order of Omega, Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity, Alpha Lambda Delta and Omicron Delta Kappa (ODK) society.

Dr. Dickstein is also an adjunct professor in the College of Education and Human Services and also served as a faculty member for the ASCA Donald D. Gehring Conduct Administration Academy and has presented at numerous local, state, regional and national conferences.

Bond Bio

James Bond, J.D. serves as Assistant Director in the Office of Student Conduct at the University of Maryland. He has held this position for 6 years. His prior role was as Coordinator of Rights and Responsibilities for the Department of Resident Life at the University of Maryland. In these capacities, he has spent his entire professional career working in student discipline in both the academic and nonacademic arenas. He has also taken on many volunteer opportunities with other departments to supplement his student affairs experience. This includes being the faculty adviser to a chapter within the Department of Fraternity and Sorority Life, an instructor of classes within the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences and the College of Education, and committees with the University Senate.

Mr. Bond received his Juris Doctorate from Georgetown University Law Center in 2004 and a Bachelor of Arts in Government and Politics as well as in Journalism from the University of Maryland in 2001. Mr. Bond has actively served the Association of Student Conduct

Administration, most recently on its Board of Directors for four years as the Director of Diversity and Inclusion. He also serves on other committees within the association, is active as an advisor with Sigma Kappa Sorority, LeaderShape, and a voting a faculty member with ODK

APPENDIX A

MATERIALS REVIEWED (FORMAT)

1. 2014 Student Code of Conduct Stakeholder Survey (MSWORD)
2. 2017 Sanction Framework (MSWORD)
3. 3 Stage Mindful Decision-Making Sanction (PDF)
4. Glossary of Maxient Terms (MSWORD)
5. Alcohol and Drug Information School Information (PDF)
6. Academic Integrity Board Member Training (PDF)
7. Academic Integrity Hearing Board Membership (PDF)
8. Alcohol and drug Policy (MSWORD)
9. Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Hearing Overview (MSEXCEL)
10. Appeal Guidelines (MSWORD)
11. Appeal Board Membership (PDF)
12. Assistant Director Position Description (PDF)
13. Campbell Resume (PDF)
14. Chapter 2: The WSU Conduct Process-Revised (MSWORD)
15. Chapter 3: The WSU Conduct Officer – Revised (MSWORD)
16. Chapter 4: Processing Complaints and Conduct Officer Actions-Revised (MSWORD)
17. Chapter 5: Sanctioning Chapter – Revised (MSWORD)
18. Chapter 6: Alcohol – Drug-Revised (MSWORD)
19. Chapter 504-26 WAC: Standard of Conduct of Students (PDF)
20. Chapter 504-28 WAC: Policies and Regulations Applying to All Student Organizations (PDF)
21. Chapter 504-33WAC Facility Use Rules for First Amendment/Free Speech Activities (PDF)
22. Chapter 504-35 WAC: Facility Use Rules for Other than First Amendment/Free Speech Activities (PDF)
23. Conduct Flow Chart (PDF)
24. Conduct Officer-Position Description (PDF)
25. Conduct Officer 2 – Position Description (PDF)
26. Curriculum Vitae: Jussel (PDF)
27. Decision Letter Template-Updated 1/5/2017 (MSWORD)
28. Director Position Description (PDF)
29. Division of Student Affairs Proposed Organization Chart-Cluster Roll Up (PDF)
30. Fall 2016 SMD Training Schedule (MSWORD)
31. Fall 2016 University Conduct Board University Appeals Board Member Requirements (MSWORD)
32. Fall 2016 University Conduct Board and Training Schedule – Facilitator (MSWORD)
33. Fall 2017 Conduct Meeting Form Updated (PDF)
34. Information about the Conduct Process & Frequently Asked Questions about Contesting (PDF)
35. Information About the Conduct Process & Frequently Asked Questions (PDF)
36. Frequently Asked Questions about the Conduct Process – Revised (MSWORD)
37. Good Samaritan Conduct Resolution Agreement (MSWORD)
38. Good Samaritan Guideline (PDF)
39. Group Accountability Statement (MSWORD)
40. Housing and Dining Financial Contract 2017-2018 (PDF)
41. Housing and Dining Policies 2017-2018 (PDF)
42. IMPACT Sanction –Alcohol (PDF)
43. IMPACT Sanction – Marijuana (PDF)

44. IMPACT Sanction – Polysubstance (PDF)
45. IMPACT Sanction –Second Violation (PDF)
46. IMPACT Flow Chart Fall 2016 (PDF)
47. Lyons-Odowd Report Regarding Investigation of Discrimination/Bias in the WSU Student Conduct Process (PDF)
48. OSC Council for the Advancement of Standards Self Study Results (PDF)
49. OSC Summary Report 2016-2017 (MSEXCEL)
50. Police Department Organization Chart (PDF)
51. Program Support Supervisor 1: Position Description (PDF)
52. Registered Student Organization Manual 2017-2018 (PDF)
53. Reflection Paper Rubric (MSWORD)
54. Resume: Jean-Louis (PDF)
55. Resume: McGilvray (PDF)
56. Resume: Metzner (PDF)
57. Resume: Yadetta (PDF)
58. Retaliation Warning Letter (MSWORD)
59. Senior Conduct Officer Position Description
60. 9-27-17 Task Force Draft Report (MSWORD)
61. Training Overview (MSWORD)
62. University Conduct Board and Appeals Board Demographics 2017 (MSEXCEL)
63. University Conduct Board and University Appeals Board Expectations 2016 (MSWORD)
64. WSU Academic Integrity Task Force Report (PDF)
65. WSU Presidential Task Force on Prevention and Education for Alcohol and Other Drugs (PDF)
66. WSU Executive Policy Manual (PDF)
67. WSU Organization Chart (PDF)

APPENDIX B

EXTERNAL REVIEW SCHEDULE

Gary Dickstein, Ph.D. and James Bond, J.D.
WSU STUDENT CONDUCT REVIEW SCHEDULE

Monday, October 16, 2017

- 8:00-9:45** Student Conduct Staff, French 130
Adam Jussel, Director
Karen Metzner, Assistant Director
Christina McGilvray, Conduct Officer
Holly Campbell, Conduct Officer
Stephen Jean-Louis, Conduct Officer
- 10:00-10:50 am** Attorney General's Staff, French 332
Danielle Hess, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Division
Chief & Nathan Deen, Assistant Attorney General
- 10:50-11:00 am** Break
- 11:00 – 11:50 am** Housing and Residence Life, French 122
Edwin Hamada, Director
- 12:00-1:00 pm** Lunch - Adam Jussel, Director
- 1:30-2:00 pm** Travel Time
- 2:00 – 2:50 pm** MSS, GIESORC, and WRC Reps, CUB 406
Lucila Loera, Assistant VP, Access, Equity and
Achievement
Donna Arnold, Associate Director, MSS
Amy Sharp, Director, WRC
Matthew Jeffries, Director, GIESORC
Stephen Bischoff, Asian American Pacific Island Retention
Counselor
- 2:50-3:00 pm** Break
- 3:00-3:50 pm** Center for Fraternity and Sorority Life, French 130
Dan Welter, Director
Megan Harre, Assistant Director
Nicholas Hudson, Assistant Director
Robert Morales, Residential Education Director (Collateral)

- 4:00-4:50 pm** Resident Education Directors, French 122
 Kate Gannon-Kullinan, Assistant Director
 Brandon Brackett, Assistant Director
 Andrew Beck, Residential Education Director
 Dustin Cooper, Residential Education Director
- 5:00-5:50 pm** Resident Assistants
 Alex, Don, Raleigh, Sara & Cameron (Graduate Assistant Housing Director)

Tuesday, October 17, 2017

- 8:00 – 8:50 am** WSU Police, French 122
 Bill Gardner, Associate Vice President
 Steve Hansen, Assistant Director
- 9:00-0:50 am** Office of Equal Opportunity, French 134
 Kim Anderson, Executive Director, Compliance
 Holly Ashkannejhad, Assistant Director
- 10:00-10:50 am** Student Leaders
 Jordan Frost (ASWSU President)
 Katy McMullen (Pan Hellenic Council)
 Antonio Cardenas (MSS)
 Joe Kurle (Interfraternity Council)
 Malik Welch (Mentor, BMMAD)
- 11:00 – 11:45 am** Craig Hemmens, Ph.D. Former Task Force Chair - French 122
- 12:00 – 12:45 pm** Karen Fischer, Associate Dean of Students, French 122
- 12:45- 2:00 pm** Lunch and Wrap Up
 Kathy MacKay, Interim Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
 Adam Jussel, Director, Student Conduct