

Basic Program Information

Department Name:

Judicial Affairs

Division Name:

Student Affairs & Activities

Program Mission(s):

The mission of the Office of Judicial Affairs is to reinforce the core values of the college while protecting the college from disruption and harm by enforcing the College's standards of conduct and academic integrity.

Please list all Program Review team members who participated in this Program Review:

Name	Department	Position
Pat Hyland	Student Affairs & Activities	Dean
Bill Frankeberger	Student Affairs & Activities	Executive Assistant

Please include the following information about your program:

Total number of Full Time Faculty:	0
Total number of Part Time Faculty:	0
Total number of Classified Professionals:	1

Please list all existing Classified positions:

Example: Administrative Assistant I

Executive Assistant

List all Programs* covered by this review & check the appropriate column for program type:

Program Name	Certificate of Achievement Program	Associate Degree Program	Pathway Program

*If you have a supporting program or pathway in your area for which you will be making resource requests, please analyze it within this program review (i.e. Integrated Reading and Writing, Math My Way, etc.) You will only need to address those data elements that apply.

Section 1: Data and Trend Analysis

Please complete the appropriate data elements.

A) Instructional Program Data:

Data will be posted on <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/programreviewdata.php>

You must manually copy data in the boxes below for every degree or certificate of achievement covered by this program review.

Certificate and Degree Programs	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	% Change

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	% Change
Enrollment				
Productivity (College Goal 2014-15: 535)				

B) Student Services Programs Data

Please enter the number of students served over the last 3 years.

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	% Change
Students Served	210*/- ***	216*/1300	212*/1513**	-1%/+16%

This data was obtained via the following sources (circle): CCC Apply, Ask Foothill, Credentials, SARS, Other (List) Appointment Logs via Outlook, Direct count at events

*For the purposes of this report, we track the number of reports of disruptive behavior and academic dishonesty. Of the 212 direct reports, the breakdown of type is as follows (some duplication occurs when there is conduct combined with dishonesty):

178 – Academic dishonesty

(143 cases **Did Not** distribute Academic Integrity Z-Cards to students; 35 **Did** distribute the Academic Integrity Z-Cards to students)

40 – Misconduct

5 – Suspensions

8 – Formal Complaints

1 – Formal Grievance

**These numbers represent the number of students served at presentations, drop-ins and other non-discipline related appointments.

***We did not track

C) Administrative Unit Data

Please enter the information below.

Dimension	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students Served (Unduplicated)			
Faculty Served			
Staff Served			
Full-time FTEF			
Part-time FTEF			
Full-time Staff			
Part-time Staff			

Using the data entered for your program above, briefly comment (1-3 paragraphs) on changes in students or staff served, enrollment and/or productivity for your program in the last year.

What changes have been made or are planned as a result of your analysis of the data? (for example, new curriculum, new pre-requisites, a focus on student retention, changes in teaching approaches informed by SLO Assessments, changes in when classes are scheduled, better use of technology, etc.)

An analysis of the discipline data shows that, despite intense efforts to make a cultural shift toward academic integrity, the number of incidents remains fairly consistent. We also discovered that in only 24% of the integrity violations had the instructor distributed out newly revised Academic Integrity policy. This tells us that we need to do better “marketing” of our academic integrity policy and campus commitment there-to.

In conjunction with faculty and staff, an Academic Integrity Committee has been formed. This committee has met regularly to discuss how best to expand the campus conversation about academic integrity. The committee has developed a “conversation series” to help faculty and staff better understand student perspectives on academic integrity. The first such conversation will take place during Winter Quarter 2015.

Discipline counts from 12-13 to 13-14 went from 37 to 40. There is no discernable trend in types of discipline reports.

Section 2: Student Equity

The college is committed to student equity, defined by the Student Equity Workgroup as fostering similar outcomes for all students. One targeted area for improvement in this year's Student Equity plan is to increase the course completion rates for African American, Latino, and Pacific Islander students over the next three years by 3 percentage points.

Please describe how you see members of your program contributing to this goal.

The Academic Integrity Committee has interwoven the perspectives of students from under-represented populations into the upcoming conversation series. It is the thinking of the committee that as a campus we have more suppositions than first-hand data from these populations regarding pressures they face.

Please review the equity data available to you on the students served in your program and their outcomes by ethnicity (including, for instructional programs, course success rates by ethnicity). If differences exist, what efforts have members of your program undertaken or discussed to address them? If your program has undertaken any initiatives or interventions as a result of these efforts or discussions, please share what you have learned as a result of these initiatives.

We disaggregated our data using the Banner Citizen Status (we do not access race identity information). The categories are: 1=US Citizen; 2=Permanent Resident; 3=Temporary Resident; 4=Refugee/Asylee; 5= Student Visa; 6= Other States; X=Unknown

Our Counts are as follows:

1 = 113
2 = 19
3 = 1
4 = 1
5 = 67
6 = 8
X = 3

It appears that F1 Student Visa students continue to be over-represented in terms of reports. They represent 32% of our reports yet represent only 12% of the campus population.

Section 3: Outcomes Assessment Summary

- A) Attach 2013-2014 Course-Level (for Instructional Programs Only) – Four Column Report for CL-SLO Assessment from TracDat, please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.**

- B) Attach 2013-2014 Program Level – (for all programs) Four Column Report for PL-SLO Assessment from TracDat, please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.**

Section 4: Assessment and Reflection

Based on your assessment data and reflections, please respond to the following prompts.

- A) For instructional programs only, what curricular, pedagogical or other changes have you made as a result of your course level student learning outcomes (CL-SLO) assessments?**

- B) For instructional programs only, how has assessment of program-level student learning outcomes led to certificate/degree program improvements? Have you made any changes to your program based on the findings?**

For all programs: Instructional, Students Services, Administrative

C) How do the objectives and outcomes in your area relate to the program-level student learning outcomes and to the college mission?

Mission Statement: Foothill College offers educational excellence to diverse students seeking transfer, career preparation and enhancement, and basic skills mastery. We are committed to innovation, ongoing improvement, accessibility and serving our community.

Our objective of increasing awareness and communication about this being a campus of integrity helps communicate to all that our students are held to high standards and as a result the receiving institution, employer or community member should expect no less.

Our presentations to departments and programs on campus include discussions about how one is perceived by potential employers or transfer institutions and the dangers of inappropriate posting on social networking sites.

D) What do members of your program do to ensure that meaningful dialogue takes place in both shaping and evaluating/assessing your program's student learning outcomes?

The addition of a campus Academic Integrity Committee and a full-functioning Behavioral Threat Assessment Team have allowed us to have more eyes on our procedures and processes. It has been input from these new voices that has led to innovations such as the addition of Advocate, a behavioral threat assessment software; the development and distribution of our Z-Card academic integrity policy; the distribution of a campus-wide academic integrity survey and the distribution of a Sexual Assault informative brochure.

Section 5: Program Goals

Please comment on progress you have made on program goals from prior program reviews.
Check the appropriate status box & provide explanation in the comment box.

Goal/Outcome (This is NOT a resource request)	Related to prior resource request (Y/N)	Status: Completed, In progress or Revised	Comment on Status
1. Behav. Intervent.	N	In Progress	Committee forms (15 members), software in process of rollout, webpage developed/published
2. Acad. Integ.	N	On-going	Committee formed (7 members), data tracking in place
3. Sexual Harass.	Y	On-going	Obtained resources that have been distributed to students, in process of contracting for online training program
4. Services Survey	N	Complete	Students felt heard and respected. Only 1 student felt that the discipline was not appropriate for the incident.

Please list any new goals for your program you would like to undertake this year. The goals should be linked to the college mission and be driven by data (including student and program learning outcomes reflections).

Goal/Outcome (This is NOT a resource request)	How will this goal improve student success or respond to other key college initiatives?	How will progress toward this goal be measured?
1. Title IX/OCR Training; Survey	Retention rates are significantly higher when students are made to feel safe/respected on campus (Schreiner, 2009)	Number of trainings, conferences, satisfaction survey results

Section 6: Program Resources and Support

To be completed only if making a new resource request.

Using the tables below, summarize your program's unfunded resource requests. Refer to the Operations Planning Committee website: <http://foothill.edu/president/operations.php> for current guiding principles, rubrics and resource allocation information.

Full Time Faculty and/or Staff Positions

Position	Related Goal from Table in section 5 and how this resource request supports this goal.	Was position previously approved in last 3 years? (y/n)

Unbudgeted Reassigned Time (calculate by % reassign time x salary/benefits of FT)

Indicate duties covered by requested reassign time:

Responsibility	Related Goal from Table in section 5 and how this resource request supports this goal.		% Time

One Time B Budget Augmentation

Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 5 and how this resource request supports this goal.
Conference/training funds. Survey expenses	\$15,000	There have been significant changes and updates in compliance requirements for Section 504, Title IX as well as Title II (see US Dept. of Ed Dear Colleague letter 2014). By receiving up-to-date training, we will be better able to appropriately address concerns. Additionally, by participating in a campus-climate survey we will be more informed regarding areas of deficiency which in-turn will help us focus our retention efforts.

Ongoing B Budget Augmentation

Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 5 and how this resource request supports this goal.

Facilities and Equipment

Facilities/Equipment Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 5 and how this resource request supports this goal.

Section 7: Program Review Summary

Address the concerns or recommendations that were made in prior program review cycles, including any feedback from Dean/VP, Program Review Committee, etc.

Recommendation	Comments
1.	

a. After reviewing the data, what would you like to highlight about your program?

The scope of demands/expectations for services from our office continues to grow. More and more of our actions and conversations involve “legal” rhetoric. Keeping up with changes in regulations and requirements is becoming challenging with existing personnel.

Section 8: Deans Feedback and Follow Up

This section is for the Dean to provide feedback.

A) Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis:

B) Areas of concern, if any:

C) Recommendations for improvement:

D) Recommended next steps:

- Proceed as planned on program review schedule
- Comprehensive Program Review (Out of cycle) Recommended
- Remediation Plan Recommended

Upon completion of section 8, the Program Review should be returned to department faculty and staff for review, and then submitted to the Office of Instruction and Institutional Research for public posting. See timeline on Program Review Cover Sheet.

Unit Assessment Report - Four Column

Foothill College SA - Judicial Affairs

Mission Statement: The mission of the Office of Judicial Affairs is to reinforce the core values of the college while protecting the college from disruption and harm by enforcing the College's standards of conduct and academic integrity.

Primary Core Mission: Transfer

Secondary Core Mission: Basic Skills

Tertiary Core Mission: Workforce

Service Area SLOs (SA-SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action & Follow-Up
<p>SA - Judicial Affairs - Behavioral Intervention - Faculty, staff and students will utilize an online "behaviors of concern" program to report concerning behavior to the campus Behavior Evaluation and Strategies Team (BEST).</p> <p>Year(s) to be Assessed: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 12/15/2014</p> <p>End Date: 06/19/2015</p> <p>SA-SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Compilation of report data - disaggregated by reporter status</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Data</p> <p>Target: Emails containing information regarding concerning behavior are reduced to fewer than 10.</p>	<p>12/03/2014 - Rolling out this software has been exceptionally slow. I have continued to gather data via our old reporting form and Bill has been developing a count as in years past.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	
<p>SA - Judicial Affairs - Academic Integrity Initiative - Increase communication and tracking of data about Academic Integrity.</p> <p>Year(s) to be Assessed: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 07/01/2013</p> <p>End Date: 06/30/2014</p> <p>SA-SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Our office will collect data regarding the number of instructors who have distributed the new Academic Integrity Policy; how many cases of academic dishonesty are referred in the 2013-14 year vs 2012-13, by whom and related student demographics.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Data</p> <p>Target: 100% of instructors are familiar with the new Academic Integrity Policy Academic dishonesty referrals are reduced by 20% or greater</p>	<p>11/14/2014 - Of the 184 cases of academic dishonesty submitted for the 13-14 year only 35 indicated that they had distributed the AI Z-Card. What do we need to do to get the word & the cards out??</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>11/14/2014 - Data collected during 2013-14 showed 184 AI cases as opposed to 179 in 12-13. There were 4 AI suspensions in 13-14 as opposed to 5 in 12-13. There were 0 expulsions in 13-14 as compared to 8 in 12-13.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred:</p>	

Service Area SLOs (SA-SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action & Follow-Up
		<p>2013-2014</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection:</p> <p>Might be time to decide that the numbers will remain approximately the same despite our efforts. Perhaps targeting a reduction in referrals misses the mark as an important goal.</p>	
	<p>Assessment Method: Every member of the Academic Integrity committee will report back on their meetings with their assigned divisions, indicating what was covered, questions posed and the number of AI policy cards distributed.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Interviews/Focus Groups</p> <p>Target: 100% of the divisions will have received a visit from a member of the AI committee.</p>	<p>12/05/2014 - The only division with which the committee has not met is Athletics/Kinesiology. Despite this intensive outreach, in fewer than 25% of the cases had the student received our AI Policy cards.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>11/14/2014 - In addition to division meetings & student presentations, the Foothill campus was selected to receive the Campus of Integrity Award by the International Center for Academic Integrity. A team of Foothill faculty and one student traveled to the annual conference to make a presentation on our efforts.</p> <p>Foothill has been selected to present at the 2015 International Conference in Vancouver as well.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>11/05/2014 - All but Kinesiology have received in-person presentations at division meetings. All divisions have been provided AI policy cards. Despite these meetings, there is inconsistent distribution and commitment to campus-wide enforcement of academic integrity policies.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	

Service Area SLOs (SA-SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action & Follow-Up
<p>SA - Judicial Affairs - Sexual Harassment Awareness - Students, Faculty and Staff will receive appropriate, sensitive and timely assistance when reporting issues related to sexual misconduct.</p> <p>Year(s) to be Assessed: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 01/06/2014</p> <p>End Date: 06/30/2014</p> <p>SA-SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Review by 3rd party of compiled printed and web-based materials to determine suitability for Foothill Community College students, faculty & staff.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Presentation/Performance</p> <p>Target: All materials will meet the Office of Civil Rights Title IX guidelines</p>	<p>12/05/2014 - We have not been able to contract with an outside consultant willing to review our materials. We thought we had a connection with a former OCR Investigator but have been unable to make it happen.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	<p>12/02/2014 - There have been so many recent changes in regulations that we are struggling to stay current. Additionally, it was determined in a district administrator workshop this Fall that the Chief Judicial Officer should not also serve as the Title IX Coordinator so the responsibility should be shifting to Laureen Balducci. That said, we have handled 3 sexual harassment cases since that decision.</p> <p>Both Laureen Balducci and I should attend formal Title IX Compliance training to help the campus avoid missteps.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>Resource Request: \$2700 - Title IX training funds for 2 people.</p>
<p>SA - Judicial Affairs - Title IX/OCR Training - Students reporting concerns about inequitable treatment based on race, gender, sexual orientation or other protected categories will receive appropriate, timely guidance and services from trained individuals in the Judicial Affairs, Psychological Services, Health Services and Counseling Offices.</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Counts of trainings attended; counts of information distributed, complaints received & addressed</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Data</p> <p>Target: A minimum of 4 individuals will receive training.</p>		

Service Area SLOs (SA-SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action & Follow-Up
Year(s) to be Assessed: End of Academic Year Start Date: 01/11/2015 End Date: 06/26/2015 SA-SLO Status: Active			