Fall 2018

Understanding the Dynamics of the Student Code of Conduct: Recommendations to Reduce Student Conduct Violations at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

Savannah Krieg
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, kriegsavannah@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs_rp

UNDERSTANDING THE DYNAMICS OF THE STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT:
RECOMMENDATIONS TO REDUCE STUDENT CONDUCT VIOLATIONS AT
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY CARBONDALE

by

Savannah Krieg

B.A., Southern Illinois University, 2016

RESEARCH PAPER APPROVAL

UNDERSTANDING THE DYNAMICS OF THE STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT:

RECOMMENDATIONS TO REDUCE STUDENT CONDUCT VIOLATIONS AT

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY CARBONDALE

by

Savannah Krieg

A Research Paper Submitted in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the field of Criminology and Criminal Justice

Approved by:

Raymund Narag, Chair

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
November 8, 2018

AN ABSTRACT OF THE RESEARCH PAPER OF

Savannah R. Krieg, for the Master of Arts degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice, presented on November 8, 2018, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: UNDERSTANDING THE DYNAMICS OF THE STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT: RECOMMENDATIONS TO REDUCE STUDENT CONDUCT VIOLATIONS AT SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY CARBONDALE

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Raymund Narag

This paper aims to understand the dynamics of the Student Code of Conduct as it is being implemented at Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC). Utilizing reflections and observations, this research paper will outline some things that have and have not worked in terms of Student Conduct at SIUC. Guided by the criminological theories, such as Restorative Justice, Social Bond, and Social Learning, and Self Authorship this paper recommends four solutions. First, students who violate the Student Code of Conduct should be mandated to complete a service learning project in the Carbondale community through a service-learning course on campus. Second, Student Rights and Responsibilities should increase the use and ultimately the length of reflection papers for violators of the Student Code of Conduct. Third, those who are sanctioned to community service through Student Rights and Responsibilities should have more options for volunteer placement sites. Fourth, there should be a peer mentoring program established in Student Rights and Responsibilities for students who have committed conduct violations to encourage the completion of student's sanctions and engagement within SIUC and the community. This paper also reflects on what other universities can learn from the SIUC experience.

Keywords: Mentoring, Reflection, Service Learning, Student Code of Conduct, Student Rights and Responsibilities, Volunteerism

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This paper outlines how the Southern Illinois University of Carbondale's (SIUC) Student Code of Conduct can be improved. The Student Code of Conduct is the document that outlines the rights afforded to students, and the responsibilities of each student while attending the university. The Student Code of Conduct at SIUC is overseen by the office of Student Rights and Responsibilities. The office of Student Rights and Responsibilities administers and monitors the completion of sanctions for students who violate the Student Code of Conduct. The office of Student Rights and Responsibilities has goals, values, and missions that must be met in order to achieve SIUC's goals. According to the Student Rights and Responsibilities website, the staff must "focus on compassion, engagement, collaboration, inclusivity, integrity, learning, service and accountability" (Green, 2017). The office of Student Rights and Responsibilities aim is to have students acquire knowledge, self-reflect, and become more engaged students, within SIUC and their communities. Reviewing the Student Code of Conduct, and the improvements that could be made upon it is essential because it can help find ways to reduce violations of the code. This paper aims to understand the dynamics of the Student Code of Conduct, as it is being implemented at SIUC, and inform SIUC's administration of possible improvements that could be made to reduce violations of the Student Code of Conduct. This paper further intends to provide information to other universities about what SIUC has been doing in regard to student conduct, giving other universities the opportunity to determine if they should also make the proposed changes.

CHAPTER 2

CURRENT KNOWLEDGE

Student Conduct has only been recently discussed in criminal justice literature. Most of what is being discussed in the literature is theoretical because student conduct codes vary from university to university and it is difficult to generalize the results of studies in a criminal justice framework. Although there is a considerable amount of literature focused on student success (Bean & Eaton, 2001; Braxton, Hirschy & McClendon, 2011; Wolniak & Pascarella, 2005; Hawkins & Weis, 2017). Universities, unlike society, are seen as unique communities, and thus the universities are encouraged to develop special kinds of systems to deal with conduct violations that promote learning and development. Typically codes of conduct are developed around two models of discipline, the student engagement model and the student conduct model (Schuck, 2017). Both of the two models share the goals of student development and prevention. Unfortunately, there is limited research on whether either system achieves the goals of development and prevention. That being said there are a few studies suggesting success, such as Karp and Sacks (2014) that found when student conduct processes are founded in Restorative Justice and Self Authorship, students' are more successful than that of traditional sanctions found in the Student Conduct Model.

It is important for criminal justice scholars to study the dynamics of student codes of conduct on college campuses for three reasons. First, colleges are isolated pockets of the population that follow their own set of rules along with local, state, and federal laws. Colleges create the rules for students to follow, they enforce the rules, often with unique campus police departments, and they create sanctions for those who violate the rules often, without involving

the police or court outside of the university. Second, it is beneficial for the colleges to be able to read from criminal justice scholars. This way, colleges can make changes and improve their systems of doing things from those who research and are skilled in criminal justice policies and procedures which are very similar to student conduct procedure at universities. Third, it helps criminal justice scholars think of other ways to address violations in educational ways similar to the way universities handle minor offenses, using educational tools and sanctions.

A. KNOWLEDGE OF SIUC

Southern Illinois University Carbondale was founded in 1869, with the first graduating class having a total of 143 students. Since the first graduation, SIUC hit the peak of enrollment in 1991 with a total of 24,869 students. Ever since the successful enrollment of 1991, however, enrollment at SIUC has been steadily decreasing, and in 2017 enrollment reached 14,554 students (Institutional Research and Studies, 2018). There have been many speculations as to why enrollment is dropping, such as, the lack of state funding, rising tuition rates, and rebranding SIUC from the notorious party school to a research institution (Esch, 2018; Illinois Board of Higher Education, 2017; Esch, 2018; Rhodes, 2017). Improving Student Code of Conduct would not only decrease the number of student conduct violations but may also improve enrollment numbers by improving SIUC's reputation and making SIUC a safer community.

The current Student Code of Conduct was approved by the Board of Trustees in May of 1991. Since May of 1991, ten amendments have been made from October 3, 1997, to August 22, 2016 (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:1). Stoner (1990) suggested that all Student Codes of Conduct be reviewed, at the least, every three years. On page 37, section 7.2.1 of the Student Code of Conduct, it can be observed that SIUC has done just that. "The Student Conduct

Code shall be reviewed in its entirety not less than once every two years, and more frequently upon the written recommendation of the Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:37). Although, SIUC's last approved Code of Conduct amendment was made over two years ago, and since then SIUC has had a new University Chancellor, a new Interim University Chancellor, a new Interim University President and a new Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs that oversees Student Rights and Responsibilities. It is only fitting that with such impactful changes happening across the university, there needs to be changes made to the Student Code of Conduct at SIUC that mirror the administrative changes happening across campus.

Many of the problems one sees within SIUC's Student Rights and Responsibilities office and the Student Code of Conduct appear to stem from turnover. With all of the recent changes happening across campus in the aftermath of the state's lack of a budget, there has been a feeling of uncertainty and a lack of job security within the faculty and staff at SIUC. During the aftermath, many people have left for other universities, leaving offices like Student Rights and Responsibilities understaffed. With the semi-frequent staff turnover, it has been observed that Student Rights and Responsibilities is struggling to balance the goals of the office with the implementation of the Student Code of Conduct. During the budget crisis, the frequent turnover made it difficult to determine what policies have been successful and what policies have not. This is because one cannot be sure if, the inefficiencies are based on a superficial lack of experience by the new staff or a fundamental problem with the Student Code of Conduct itself. Now, however, the Student Rights and Responsibilities office has gained its footing and can be examined on implemented policies and changes that should be made, to reduce student conduct

violations. After observing the changes across campus and within Student Rights and Responsibilities, this research paper outlines changes that should, in theory, reduce student conduct violations at SIUC.

B. KNOWLEDGE OF THE STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT

Footer (1996) suggests that the ideal Student Code of Conduct embraces and outlines the goals and missions of the institution while outlining acceptable and unacceptable behavior for students, faculty, and staff in a clear, concise manner, which can be observed that SIUC has done extremely well. The Student Code of Conduct for SIUC begins with an opening letter to all students addressed from SIUC's Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Lori Stettler. The letter states that SIUC is "built upon the foundational principles of integrity, excellence, accountability and engagement" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:1). Those principles form the foundation for the SIUC community to "build a shared sense of purpose, committed to the principle of inclusivity, in the pursuit of knowledge and dedicated to the belief that the SIUC community is stronger when standing together" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:1). Vice Chancellor Stettler goes on to say that the Student Code of Conduct outlines policies designed to reflect the culture of the SIUC community, and provide the framework for all those associated with the university (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:1). The framework upholds the "commitment to procedural fairness, equitable treatment and a sense of shared accountability" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:1).

Upon admission to the university, SIUC expects students to adhere to the university's high standards of conduct. Before attending SIUC, students must agree to comply not only with local, state, and federal laws but also with university policies outlined by the Student Code of

Conduct during their time at SIUC, both on and off campus. The policies created by SIUC "are designed to foster an environment supportive of personal, social, and ethical development and serve to promote the protection of the rights, responsibilities, safety and welfare of the university community while ensuring that all community members are free to pursue their educational goals" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:2). Section 1.5.3 of the Student Code of Conduct states that disciplinary action from the university is independent from any criminal or civil proceedings (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:3). Further, the university will not take into account "any decision, settlement, judgment, or another outcome of a criminal or civil proceeding in the adjudication of alleged violations" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:3). The statement from section 1.5.3 is used so that students and those affiliated with SIUC know that the campus rules and regulations are separate from local, state and federal laws. The statement is also used so that SIUC can demonstrate the separation by conducting separate investigations and reaching separate conclusions that may not mirror criminal or civil proceedings that the student could also be facing.

Section 1.6 of the Student Code of Conduct outlines the rights and responsibilities of each student at SIUC. Some rights students are afforded are the rights to "engage in a free exchange of ideas" and the right to "to be free from discrimination or harassment" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:3). Some of the students' responsibilities are "to recognize the ways in which their actions reflect upon and affect the university and every member of the university community" and students are responsible "for their actions, choices, and decisions" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:3).

Section 2 of the Student Code of Conduct outlines offenses that violate the Code of Conduct. Types of offenses that violate the Code of Conduct are: academic misconduct; sexual misconduct; offenses related to other people, such as, violence and stalking; offenses related to harassment; offenses related to fighting; offenses related to property, such as damage to property and trespassing; offenses related to theft; offenses related to safety, such as fireworks and bomb threats; offenses related to controlled substances and alcohol; offenses related to the operation of SIUC; offenses related to information technology; acts against the administration, like making false statements; acts against student organizations; miscellaneous offenses, such as aiding and abetting; and any other offense SIUC deems to be a violation of the Student Code of Conduct. It should be noted that Student Rights and Responsibilities sees a variety of students, with very different violations every day. The recommendations for improvements that could be made to reduce student conduct violations at SIUC in this research paper focus on students who commit less severe conduct violations. If students who violate the Student Code of Conduct were broken up into different tiers at the top one would see students, who commit egregious acts that cannot be addressed in these simple recommendations. The other tier would cover students who commit violations that are less severe in nature.

Overall in 2017 Student Rights and Responsibilities sanctioned 552 students according to staff members in Students Rights and Responsibilities. The five most frequent violations committed by students in 2017 were use or possession, underage possession or consumption, disorderly conduct, possession of paraphernalia, and knowingly present. Use or possession is defined as "The use or possession of any controlled substance without legal authorization" which 130 students were sanctioned for (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:12). 70 students in

2017 were sanctioned for underage possession or consumption which is defined as "possessing, carrying, consuming, or being under the influence of alcohol while under the legal age permitted by the State of Illinois" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:12). 49 students were sanctioned for disorderly conduct in 2017, which is defined as "acting in an unreasonable manner which has the potential to disturb or alarm another person or to provoke a breach of the peace" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:12). 44 students in 2017 were sanctioned for possession of paraphernalia, which is defined as "the possession of any item primarily intended for, designed for, or which can be demonstrably linked to, the manufacture, sale, distribution, use, or possession of a controlled substance. Such items include, but are not limited to, bongs, bowls, grinders, pipes, scales, and vaporizers" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:12). In 2017, 44 students were sanctioned for "knowingly present" which is defined as "any person who is knowingly present for the commission of a violation and does not take steps or to remove him or herself from the location of the violation may be subject to adjudication" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:14). The above violations make up 60.9% of offenses that students were sanctioned for in 2017 at SIUC.

C. KNOWLEDGE OF THE HEARING PROCESSES AT SIUC

Generally speaking, when a student is accused of violating the Student Code of Conduct each student will go through a similar process. This process begins with the student being accused of a violation within 120 days of the alleged incident (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:19). Anyone can make a claim against a student, whether it be a faculty, a staff member, a fellow student, a community member, or a law enforcement official (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:19). According to the 2017 Annual Security and Fire Safety

Report, the SIUC Police Department referred 196 cases to Student Rights and Responsibilities in

2017 (SIUC Department of Public Safety, 2018). Those referrals equate to roughly 6 cases per

week while classes are in session. The accuser must have sufficient evidence for a case to move

forward. After an individual makes a claim, a hearing officer will determine if the accusation

seems credible and what, if any, codes were violated (Student Rights and Responsibilities,

2016:16). After this step, if a hearing officer determines that the alleged incident violates the

Student Code of Conduct, the student will be notified in writing that explains the allegation, and

any details of that allegation, including, but not limited to, date and time, if the information is

available (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:20). At this point in the process, the student

is instructed to respond to the notification. During the process, the student has the right to "accept

in full, or contest, in part or in full, the allegation" (Student Rights and Responsibilities,

2016:27). If the student chooses not to respond within five days of the notification, "a hearing

officer will be assigned to investigate the allegations, determine responsibility for any alleged

violations, and determine any appropriate sanctions" (Student Rights and Responsibilities,

2016:27). What this means is the process continues without the student. If a student accepts

responsibility for the alleged incident, a hearing officer reviews all the evidence and determines

appropriate sanctions (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:21). If a student accepts

responsibility, the case is ineligible for appeal (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:21). If

a student contests responsibility, a hearing officer will investigate the incident and set a hearing

date where the student may call in witnesses and have an advisor present (Student Rights and

Responsibilities, 2016:21). All hearings are recorded by the hearing officer and may be requested

by the accused student. Hearings are closed to the public unless a student requests that the

hearing be open to the public. The hearing officer may still, however, deny the request (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:21). During the hearing the accused, and the victim(s) if any were identified, has the opportunity to present any relevant information that they might have concerning the incident (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:22). After the hearing, the hearing officer will communicate the outcome of the hearing to the accused student, and the victim(s) if any had been identified. The notification will outline the decision made by the hearing officer and the accused student's sanction(s) and the corresponding due date(s) of completion (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:26). As previously stated, the policies created and enforced by SIUC "are designed to foster an environment supportive of personal, social and ethical development" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:2).

After a decision has been reached by the hearing officer both the victim(s) and the accused student may file an appeal if they believe that: there was a procedural error; there was no evidence to support the finding; new evidence has become available; or the sanctions imposed by the hearing officer are disproportionate to the violation (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:35). The student(s), both the accused and the possible victim(s), have three days to file an appeal. To file an appeal, the student(s) would submit a letter to the Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities outlining the basis for the appeal and all of the corresponding supportive information when the student desires to have the appeal considered (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:35). After a decision is reached that decision is final, meaning that no more appeals can be made (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:35). Some potential outcomes for the appeal are: there is no basis for an appeal; the decision is upheld; the decision is

modified; the decision is overturned; a new hearing is set; and a new investigation is ordered (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:36).

Sanctions decided upon by Student Rights and Responsibilities are not limited to those outlined in the Student Code of Conduct. Further, students may be assigned to more than one sanction (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:29). All sanctions must be "developmental, educational, preventative, or restorative in nature or intent" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:29). The hearing officer assigned to a case may consider any relevant information, such as: academic performance; evidence provided at the hearing; or information indicating that the violation occurred out of an individual's bias; or prior conduct history (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:29). There are various academic sanctions a student may be given, such as a written warning, or an adjustment to a student's individual or overall grade (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:30). The student may even be suspended, expelled, or their degree may be revoked (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:30). There are also many types of educational sanctions that students face, such as: altering the students housing status; a written warning; required attendance at a class or workshop; mandated community service; fines; mandated assignments; restitution; restrictions on extracurricular activity; and written assignments (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:31-34). Sanctions are considered in effect from the point they were communicated to the student in writing until the sanctions are completed (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:14). If a student does not complete their sanctions, additional sanctions may be applied and holds may be placed on their accounts. The holds could prevent the student from obtaining transcripts, registering for classes, or receiving their diplomas. The student may also be suspended (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:14).

It is apparent from reviewing the opening letter in Student Code of Conduct that the components or goals of Student Rights and Responsibilities are to educate students, prevent them and others from committing future violations of the Student Code of Conduct, and restore relationships with students who have already committed violations. These components can all reinforce each other, which leads to better success for Student Rights and Responsibilities. For example, if a student was educated on the effects that their violation has on themselves, the victim(s), and the community, according to Restorative Justice Theory (Van Ness & Strong, 2014) the student would be less likely to reoffend. The student would be less likely to reoffend because they would become a stakeholder in SIUC's community. The student would become a stakeholder because the process that the student would go through in being educated on the effects their actions have would begin to strengthen and repair the aforementioned affected relationships through awareness. Subsequently, if that education coupled with restoring the student's relationships that were affected through sanctions like community service, the effects would be more significant. Thus, Student Rights and Responsibilities could reach their goals of preventing future violations from occurring.

Community service can prevent future violations through creating or restoring social bonds or relationships within the community. When a student volunteers, they are interacting within the community and forming ties to the community, which reinforces the stakes the student has to the community. Keeping in mind that the clientele of Student Rights and Responsibilities are students, it is appropriate that the goals are to educate, prevent, and restore relationships affected by the violations. Since students are at the university to learn, it should always be a goal

to prevent future violations. Further, the students will be in SIUC's community for years to come.

It only makes sense to try to restore the relationships affected by the student's actions.

CHAPTER 3

THEORIES

This paper views three different criminological theories which can be applied to the

Student Code of Conduct and the policies of Student Rights and Responsibilities at SIUC. These

three theories are: the Restorative Justice theory, the Social Bond theory and, the Social Learning

theory. There is also one theory outside of criminology that can also be applied to the Student

Code of Conduct and Student Rights and Responsibilities, the Self-Authorship theory.

As initially alluded to above, Restorative Justice exists throughout the policies in SIUC's Student

Code of Conduct and Student Rights and Responsibilities. Within traditional justice, it is the goal

to sanction individuals for creating/causing harm, whether that harm was physical, emotional, or

social in nature. Within Restorative Justice, the goal is not to sanction an individual for causing

harm; the goal is to fix the harm that was created by the individual's actions (Bazemore, &

Schiff, 2015). Although the Restorative Justice Theory does not identify why violations occur, it

does address how society should be responding to the violations.

There are four guiding principles in the Restorative Justice Theory: peace, respect,

responsibility, and solidarity (Bazemore, & Schiff, 2015). A key feature of Restorative Justice is

that it addresses how a person can be deterred from offending in the future. An individual would

be deterred from future conduct violations after the harm has been remedied, because the

individual would become a stakeholder in the community. This concept is considered as a type of

general deterrence (Barton, 2000). Restorative Justice also deters others from violating the

Student Code of Conduct because students see the harm the violation causes, and the individual

would not want to inflict such widespread harm on the community. This, in turn, would increase

an individual as stakeholder in the community, (Barton, 2000). This theory is the overarching criminal justice concept found in Student Rights and Responsibilities and the Student Code of Conduct. SIUC holds students accountable for recognizing the ways in which the student's actions reflect on and affect the university and the members of SIUC's community (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016). SIUC is compliant to the Restorative Justice Model in many ways, for instance, Student Rights and Responsibilities focus not on sanctioning the students but rather, in the office is focused on ways which the students can reflect on their actions and repair the harm that the student has caused the community and the victim(s).

Braithwaite's (1989) Reintegrative Shaming theory has been referred to as the fathering theory that started the movement towards Restorative Justice. Braithwaite (1989:10) explained Reintegrative Shaming as, "efforts to reintegrate the offender back into the community as law-abiding or respectable citizens through words or gestures of forgiveness or ceremonies to decertify the offender as deviant." In this theory, there is mention of two types of shaming, what was currently being done when the theory was formulated disintegrative shaming, and what Braithwaite was calling for, reintegrative shaming. Disintegrative shaming is when society attaches labels and stigmatizes individuals, ostracizing them from the community because of the individuals' violation(s). Reintegrative shaming is when the community focuses on rehabilitating the individual in a supportive environment while the community helps the individual in their effort to change. There are two mechanisms through which Reintegrative Shaming is achievable: interdependency and communitarianism (Braithwaite, 1989). Interdependency occurs when individuals show attachments to others and make commitments to their community. Alternatively, communitarianism is the concept that close-knit communities rely on each other;

therefore those communities succeed and fail together. SIUC is continuously striving to develop interdependency and communitarianism; it is the hope that when both are fully developed students will show attachments to each other and develop a sense of communitarianism. SIUC is striving to create interdependency and communitarianism through the sanctions that students have to complete after they have committed a conduct violation. For example one of the frequently used sanctions is mandated volunteerism, Student Rights and Responsibilities facilitate students into becoming attached to the community by making them volunteers. SIUC is trying to create communitarianism with the Carbondale community, so the university is continuously trying to encourage students to volunteer outside of the campus and create bonds and ties with the community as well as within campus.

Braithwaite (1989) found that communities which demonstrate high levels of communitarianism are more likely to use Reintegrative Shaming strategies than communities that do not have high levels of communitarianism. Meta-analyses of Restorative Community Programs have shown that offenders are more satisfied when participating in Restorative Community Justice Programs (Hayes, 2005; Latimer, Dowden, & Muise, 2001; Umbreit, Coates, & Vos, 2002). Offenders are also more likely to be compliant and complete the sanctions that are assigned (Hayes, 2005; Latimer, Dowden, & Muise, 2001; Umbreit, Coates, & Vos, 2002). Criminal Justice research has also shown that individuals who participate in Restorative Community Justice programs are less likely to reoffend or recidivate back into criminal behavior (Hayes, 2005; Latimer, Dowden, & Muise, 2001; Umbreit, Coates, & Vos, 2002; Bergseth, & Bouffard, 2013). Most of the clients in these criminal justice settings were juveniles and youths, which have populations similar to college campuses.

Social Bond theory is another theory that can be seen in SIUC's Student Rights and Responsibilities department and the Student Code of Conduct. Travis Hirschi formulated Social Bond Theory in 1969. The theory asserts that the strength of an individual's bonds will affect their likelihood of committing a violation (Akers, Sellers, & Jennings, 2017). Essentially, when an individual has stronger bonds developed with others, that individual will be less likely to commit a violation (Hirschi, 1969). There are four key elements outlined by Hirschi (1969). Those elements are: attachment, belief, commitment, and involvement. Hirschi also asserts that the elements are highly correlated, meaning the strength or weakness of one of the elements will affect the other elements.

In the study, Hirschi (1969) found that the more insensitive an individual is towards others, the less likely that individual is to feel constrained by norms, and the more likely that individual is to violate those norms. Hirschi (1969) also found that the less an individual accepts and endorses norms, the more likely an individual will violate those norms. This means the less someone feels they should obey the rules or laws, the more likely they are to violate them. Hirschi asserted that when an individual is invested in shared norms and values, the less likely he or she will violate the norms and values (Akers, Sellers, & Jennings, 2017). The last assertion Hirschi (1969) made was that the more an individual is involved in activities that are conforming to shared norms and values of a community, the less likely they are to violate those norms and values. SIUC's Student Code of Conduct adheres to the tenets of this theory in many ways such as using mandated volunteerism as a way to facilitate the creation of bonds between students and the community. Additionally, the policies created by SIUC "are designed to foster an environment supportive of personal, social and ethical development and serve to promote the

protection of the rights, responsibilities, safety and welfare of the university community while ensuring that all community members are free to pursue their educational goals" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:2). This statement demonstrates that SIUC, in the creation of the Student Code of Conduct, aims to make students more sensitive towards others, so that they feel more constrained by the norms and values of SIUC. SIUC also strives to make students accept and endorse the norms and values of SIUC. SIUC also works towards making all students invest in SIUC's community by providing more opportunities to foster personal growth and experience, so the student has more of an investment in the shared norms and values of SIUC. By SIUC continuously creating more activities and student organizations across campus, it gets more students involved in the university so that they are less likely to violate the norms and values of the SIUC community.

Ronald Akers developed Social Learning theory; the theory asserts that violations and deviance is a learned process (Akers, 1990). Social Learning theory is comprised of four main concepts: differential association, definitions, differential reinforcement, and imitation (Akers, Sellers, & Jennings, 2017). Differential association is the notion that the groups an individual belongs to or associates themselves with can shape their behavior. There are two different dimensions for the concept of differential association: interactional and normative. The interactional dimension is a direct association with individuals who engage in similar behaviors and groups. Conversely, the normative dimension is the different values and norms that every individual is exposed to throughout their lives through the associations of the interactional dimension (Akers, Sellers, & Jennings, 2017).

Akers explains definitions as an individual's attitudes that are associated with a given

behavior (Akers, 1990). These definitions can be positive, neutral, or negative in nature. Positive

definitions are attitudes that would make deviant activities desirable. Neutral definitions are

attitudes that would justify the deviant behavior. Negative definitions are attitudes that would

make deviant activities undesirable. These definitions can be broken down even further into two

different categories: general and specific definitions. General definitions are religious beliefs and

morals that would encourage or prevent someone from deviant activities. Specific definitions are

unique to each person.

Differential reinforcements are the learned rewards and sanctions that follow behavior.

Social Learning theory states a person's decision to commit a violation rest on the learned

rewards and/or sanctions that will result from committing that violation. Differential

reinforcements are broken down into two categories, positive and negative reinforcements.

Positive reinforcements are the rewards an individual would get for committing a violation.

Negative reinforcement is the removal of negative outcomes that encourage criminal behavior

(Wood, Cochran, Pfefferbaum, & Arneklev, 1995). Imitation is engaging in behaviors after

observing the same behavior by others. Akers (1990) argued that individuals learn criminal

behavior by watching and imitating others.

There are concepts of Social Learning theory in Student Rights and Responsibilities and

the Student Code of Conduct. SIUC uses the notion of Differential Association by providing

students with the opportunity to join organizations on campus. The organizations are monitored

by faculty, and staff members ensure what goes on in the organizations is a positive environment

so that students can develop their personal, social and ethical beliefs while pursuing their

educational goals.

SIUC uses the notion of definitions to help mold each student's thoughts of the Student

Code of Conduct by attempting to get each student involved in the SIUC community. The office

of Student Rights and Responsibilities administers sanctions by attempting to get each student

"to recognize the ways in which their actions reflect upon and affect the university and every

member of the university community" (Student Rights and Responsibilities, 2016:3). SIUC

offers students many rewards for good behavior and attendance at SIUC events, like scholarships.

However, SIUC also sanctions those that do not meet the standards SIUC has for the students due

to student conduct violations. SIUC uses these differential reinforcements in an attempt to deter

students from committing conduct violations by using rewards and/or sanctions to steer students

in the right direction. SIUC also uses Akers' notion of imitation to deter students from

committing conduct violations, by showcasing students who are achieving and doing things that

SIUC determines is good behavior. SIUC does so by displaying the achievements in the Daily

Egyptian Newspaper, SIUC's radio station, television broadcasts, alumni magazines and even

through social media. Displaying the achievements shows current and prospective students what

can be achieved at SIUC through good behavior and hard work.

Student Rights and Responsibilities and the Student Code of Conduct also employ

notions from Self-Authorship theory to guide the hearings that take place. Self-Authorship is a

theory created by Marcia Baxter Magolda (2008), a student development, and learning scholar.

Magolda defined Self-Authorship as the capacity of someone to define their own beliefs, identity,

and social relationships (Magolda, 2008). In Magolda's research, she found three questions that

individuals in their twenties ask to help define their sense of self (Baxter Magolda, & King, 2007). The first question is Epistemological- How do I know? During this time, the individual is learning to trust their internal voice (Baxter Magolda, & King, 2007). The second question is Intrapersonal-Who am I? During this stage, the individual is building their internal foundations (Baxter Magolda, & King, 2007). The third and final question is Interpersonal- How do I want to construct relationships with others? At this point, the individual is securing internal commitments (Baxter Magolda, & King, 2007). The intersection between these questions is what leads a person to Self-Authorship.

Within the theory, there are also four phases in which the three questions are explored. The first phase is the following formulas phase. In this phase, the young adults are following the path that was laid out for them by parents and other guidance figures (Magolda, 2008). The second phase is the crossroads phase. During the crossroads phase, the young adult realizes that the path that they are on may not be the path that they want to take because the path does not address their wants and needs. At this point, they also realize that they have been defined by others and decide they want to find themselves (Magolda, 2008). The third phase is the author of one's life phase. In this phase, the individual is conformable expressing and living out the path that they chose by themselves (Magolda, 2008). The final phase is the internal foundation phase. In this phase, the individual is grounded in their own beliefs but is open to change. The individual is also aware of external forces and does not let those forces guide their own life (Magolda, 2008).

Magolda also developed learning partnership models, in order to help young adults, develop Self-Authorship (Magolda, & King, 2004). Magolda's assumption when developing this

model was that young adults must challenge authority in order to develop Self-Authorship (Magolda, & King, 2004). Magolda's model consists of three assumptions. First, knowledge is complex and socially constructed. Second, self is central to knowledge construction. Third, authority and expertise are shared in the mutual construction of knowledge among peers (Magolda, & King, 2004). Keeping those three assumptions in mind, Magolda asserts that there are three educational principles in which educational systems can encourage Self-Authorship. First, validate the learner's capacity to know. Second, situating learning in the learner's experience. Third, mutually constructing meaning (Magolda, & King, 2004).

In Student Rights and Responsibilities, during the conduct hearing meeting, the hearing officers are instructed to touch on the three stages of Self-Authorship. First, the student needs to examine their behavior, which would be found in stage one: the epistemology. The student is asked: what role they played in the incident; if they thought it was wrong; how they would describe their behavior; and why they think it is prohibited on campus. Next, the hearing officer and the student discuss stage two: intrapersonal. During this portion of the conversation, the student connects their behavior with their personal goals. The student is asked: how the incident connected to their personal values; how it will affect their academic and life goals; and how the incident could affect their goals of graduation. Following stage two the student and hearing officer move to stage three: interpersonal. During this part of the discussion, the student should connect their behavior with their social goals in the community and society as a whole. The student is asked: how did the situation affect their roommates or friends; how it affected the community; and how it affected the students support network. From here, the hearing officer and student move back into the epistemological stage, where the student develops a plan of action for

moving forward. At this time, the student is asked: how the situation could be prevented in the future; what strategies the student could use to avoid being in the same situation; what the student could do to make things right with those they harmed; and what actions the university could take to help them learn from the mistake the student made.

To truly appreciate the overlapping concepts of criminal justice and student development it must first firmly be stated that student conduct is a product of student development and not criminal justice. SIUC's student conduct model emphasizes the educational and developmental sanctions which are intended to educate and develop the students, not to punish them for violating the student code of conduct. There are many criminal justice theories such as the ones outlined in this research that suggest violations of the law should be handled in educational and developmental ways the same as there is student development literature that suggests student conduct violations should be handled. Additionally, in criminal justice, the penalties for violating the laws swing like a pendulum between sanctions that are punitive in nature (traditional justice) and developmental (restorative justice) similar to that of the two different models of student conduct, the conduct model and the engagement model. The restorative justice model in criminal justice emphasizes restoration which is similar to the engagement model that emphasizes the role of sanctions as educative.

Although there are overlapping concepts between the two disciplines, there are distinctions as well. For one thing in student discipline, there are no trials; there are hearings which is less formal than a trial. Also due to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), student conduct cases are confidential. Not to mention, in criminal proceedings, the

accused would be represented by an attorney, but in student conduct cases the student would represent themselves.

In Pavela's 1979 work, Pavela proposed a new Student Code of Conduct for the University of Maryland, whose legalistic approach was affecting the students' successes on campus. Due to rising fears of institutions being brought to court, many universities started taking a more legalistic approach to student conduct to protect the university. Unfortunately, that approach had not been helping students grow and develop like colleges are intended to do they were instead creating miniature criminal justice systems. (Pavela, 1979). "[In] efforts to manage the college environment, many higher-education institutions have deployed complex systems of student discipline -- often in the form of legalistic codes of conduct" (Lake, 2009:1). In the article Lake (2009) demonstrated that over time to manage student conduct violations institutions have increasingly made student codes of conduct more complex and has taken a more legalistic approach. The issue with this is that he found that students are seeking, mentors, and relationships. Court decision trends have also emerged showing that when colleges are treating student disciplinary hearings and outcomes like court systems, the colleges are being held to the legal standards of the courts, so we are seeing a transition out of these legalistic approaches. For example, in Schaer v. Brandeis (2000), the Massachusetts Supreme Court questioned the judgment of the university in attempting to use legalistic approaches and court like procedures in a higher-education institutional setting.

CHAPTER 4

PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

This paper is not aimed at diminishing the great things that SIUC is doing, nor the improvements the administration has accomplished and is striving to accomplish. This paper is a call to action to not only staff members in Student Rights and Responsibilities but to the administration. The research in this paper provides a basis to examine what parts of the current Student Code of Conduct and the Student Rights and Responsibilities office are working, and what parts are not. SIUC should search for improvements that will not only reduce student conduct violations but improve the lives of current and future students. This chapter will outline things that have been observed in Student Affairs within five years; it is the hope that by outlining areas that are not working, and with the recommendations, student conduct violations at SIUC will be reduced.

There are four things that do not seem to be working currently in Student Rights and Responsibilities and the Student Code of Conduct. First, there is a lack of consistent follow up with students after the sanctions are given to them due to understaffing in the office. Second, the students that are currently being sanctioned to volunteerism do not grasp the value of what they are doing; it is less about helping the community and more about completing their sanction(s). Third, there are currently too few volunteer sites approved by the Center for Service Learning and Volunteerism for sanctioned students to choose from. Fourth, the reflection papers that sanctioned students currently have to turn in are sometimes lacking in substance.

One of the most important things that do not currently seem to be working in Student Rights and Responsibilities is the lack of consistent follow up with students after the sanctions

are given to them. This ineptitude is likely due to understaffing in the office. It has been witnessed first-hand, looking through the list of students who have not completed their mandated volunteerism. This list did not just cover recent students, but even students that have graduated or left the school already, dating back to 2011. According to Student Rights and Responsibilities staff, more than half of all sanctions assigned to students go uncompleted by students. Students are given sanctions, and from that point, there is no follow up, unless they are being sanctioned again. Until March of 2018, the staff of the Center for Service Learning and Volunteerism did not even know what students were sanctioned to mandated volunteerism until the students notified the staff. From the observations, these issues all stem from the office of Student Rights and Responsibilities being understaffed.

Further, the staff are overworked and do not have the time to follow-up with students. The lack of staffing and mentorship for these at-risk students is ultimately affecting the ability of the office Student Rights and Responsibilities to meet the goal of reducing student conduct violations. Beyond that, if SIUC truly strives to be an institution of highly skilled, engaged students, the administration should provide the at-risk students sanctioned by Student Rights and Responsibilities with a mentor. This mentor would help guide them in the right direction and to make sure the students are on track to completing their sanctions promptly. According to Dannells (1997) currently, Student Codes of Conduct rely on processes and sanctions rather than providing guidance to the students. Dannells (1997) suggests that universities should rethink the purpose of their Student Codes Conduct and use it as a tool to provide guidance.

According to Social Bond theory, when individuals establish positive social bonds with others, they are less likely to commit violations (Hirschi, 1969). Social Learning theory, on the

other hand, states that people learn behaviors from associating themselves with others (Akers, Sellers, & Jennings, 2017). By not providing the at risk-students with a peer mentoring program within Student Rights and Responsibilities to establish positive social bonds SIUC allows a gap for at-risk students to create bonds with negative influences. Prior research by Stoner (2004) suggests that judicial student affair systems are losing site of education and moving towards an adversarial environment for students to get lost in because the peer mentoring aspect is less emphasized.

Another issue with student conduct at SIUC is that the students that are currently being sanctioned to volunteerism do not grasp the value of what they are doing. The observation suggests that, to students, it is less about helping the community and more about completing their sanction(s). SIUC can address this issue by mandating the students to complete a service learning project by requiring students to take a service-learning course on campus. According to Restorative Justice, Social Bond and, Social Learning theories, when individuals are engaged in their communities, they are more likely to create positive bonds and behaviors while being active members of their community, which reduces the likelihood of committing violations (Akers, 1990; Bazemore, & Schiff, 2015; Braithwaite, 1989; Hirschi, 1969). Unfortunately, these things are not currently being achieved. Students may be volunteering, but they are certainly not engaged in what they are doing. Since the students are not engaged, they are not creating positive bonds and behaviors, nor are they going to continue to be active in the community after their sanction is complete. If Student Rights and Responsibilities sanctions students to volunteer and does not mandate the students to service learning projects within a service learning course, students will not be able to grasp the value of what they are doing. Holdsworth and Quinn

(2012:401-402) asserted that administrators in higher education have a duty to turn the practice of volunteering into a "worthwhile learning experience".

The next problem with SIUC's Student Conduct processes is that there are currently too few volunteer sites that have been approved by the Center for Service Learning and Volunteerism for sanctioned students to choose from. Right now, students who are sanctioned to complete mandated community service or volunteerism can only choose from six organizations. Due to the limited number of approved organizations for sanctioned students, these students are less likely to find an organization that they are interested in and ultimately will not continue to volunteer with the organizations after completing the sanction. Thus, the student will not be involved in the community so they will not become a stakeholder in the community. Further, the student will not be able to develop themselves, or positive bonds and behaviors if the student is not engaged with the organization. King (2012) found that students have been responding to community service sanctions more than other types of sanctions, if this is the case, there should be no reason to limit the places sanctioned students can volunteer to a mere six organizations.

When a student is not interested in what they are doing within the organization, it is unlikely that the student will continue to be involved with the organization when they no longer have to be. These are consistent with the claims of the different theories. According to the Restorative Justice theory (Barton, 2000), the student would not become a stakeholder in the community after being sanctioned to volunteer with an organization they do not have interest in. If a student is not interested in the volunteerism they are mandated to complete; they would not be utilizing the experience to develop their beliefs and identity. According to Self-Authorship theory (Magolda, 2008), students would be less likely to make connections between what they

are doing and whom they want to be. According to Social Bond theory when someone is not interested in something, they are less likely to form bonds with those individuals, and the community as a whole. Finally, according to Social Learning theory, when students are not engaged in what they are doing, they are less likely to be receptive to learning positive behavior from what they are doing. Thus, by simply allowing students who are sanctioned to community service to choose where to volunteer from a larger pool of organizations, the issues previously mentioned could be averted.

The final issue that can be observed within Student Rights and Responsibilities is the fact that the reflection papers that sanctioned students have to turn in lack in substance, granted not all of the reflection papers are, but with modification, reflection papers can serve as a more useful tool in deterring students from future conduct violations. One of the most effective ways for students to reflect on their sanction and decision-making is to make students write multiple reflection papers at different stages of their sanctioning process. Restorative Justice theory would call for the student to be simultaneously solemnized and reintegrated back into the community. When a student is not honest, reflections upon their actions do not solemnize them. The student is simply wasting their time by not being honest and truly reflecting on their actions, and they are wasting the readers' time as well. When sanctioned students are writing reflection papers, they should be thinking about their individual beliefs. Sanctioned students should also be thinking about their identity along with their social relationships that have to lead them to violate the student code of conduct. Further, they should be thinking about what they could change to no longer make the decisions that lead them to violate the code of conduct in the first place, according to Self Authorship theory. King (2012) found that students do not value a majority of

the sanctions they receive which reiterates the need for the students to have to write reflection

papers at multiple points of their sanctioning process.

CHAPTER 5

PROPOSED CHANGES

This chapter will outline suggested changes that SIUC should make to reduce student conduct violations and improve the lives of present and future students. These are based on the shortcomings that were described earlier. First, students who violate the Student Code of Conduct should be mandated to complete a service learning project in the Carbondale community within a service-learning course on campus. Second, Student Rights and Responsibilities should increase the use and length of reflection papers for violators of the Student Code of Conduct. Third, those who are sanctioned to community service through Student Rights and Responsibilities should have more options for volunteer placement sites. Fourth, there should be a peer mentoring program established in Student Rights and Responsibilities for students who have committed conduct violations to encourage the completion of the student's sanctions and engagement within SIUC and the community. If one or more of these suggestions are taken, the number of student conduct violations should decrease.

One of the most important changes that SIUC should make is mandating students who violate the Student Code of Conduct to complete a service learning project; this can be done easily by requiring students to take a service-learning course on campus. Service learning courses are classes that students can take in which the students get to partake in active learning, meaning the students learn concepts in class, and then the students go out into the community to experience the concepts that were covered in class. The service learning courses teach students, classroom concepts, social awareness, and responsibility. If students were required to complete a service learning project, SIUC would be engaging students in the classroom and in the

community. When students are engaged in the community, according to Restorative Justice, Social Bond and, Social Learning theories, the students are more likely to create bonds, learn positive behavior, and be active members in the community (Akers, 1990; Bazemore, & Schiff, 2015; Braithwaite, 1989; Hirschi, 1969). In a 2017 study, Chan, Ngai, and Kwan found that when students were mandated to service learning, the students' learning and development was positively impacted, and the students were more interested in the subject.

By having students take a service-learning course and do a service learning project, SIUC would be encouraging and facilitating students to become stakeholders in the community simply by getting them involved, which is consistent with Restorative Justice. While taking the course and doing the project, students are learning in the classroom and in the community. While they are doing so, the students are creating bonds within the community, which, according to Social Bond theory, prevents offending. When students are out in the community for their service-learning courses, they will develop their beliefs and identity while creating social relationships, which is consistent with the Self Authorship theory of Student Development. When students are taking these courses, they are learning positive behaviors from the instructors of the courses and also from the community members they work with which, according to Social Learning theory, prevents offending. This suggestion is geared towards students who are not serious or non-serious violators of the code of conduct; it is geared to the students who are in between those two categories could benefit most from community engagement as a deterrent from student conduct violations. Examples of the types of violations that would benefit from this suggestion would student code 2.4.6- theft, 2.3.6- fighting, or 2.4.7-vandalism (Student Rights and Responsibilities (2016).

A second change that SIUC should make is that Student Rights and Responsibilities should increase the use and length of reflection papers for violators of the Student Code of Conduct. This would aid in sanctioning students and reflecting upon the students' assigned sanctions and poor decision-making. Outside of the reflection paper being an obvious sanction for students, taking time out of their day, it is also beneficial. One of the most effective ways for students to reflect on their sanction and decision-making is to make students write multiple reflection papers at different stages of their sanctioning process. For instance, when a student is sanctioned to community service, the student should write two reflection papers: one before going out to volunteer, and a second after the student has completed their assigned volunteerism. According to Eyler (2002), when students have to reflect before community service, it opens the students' minds to be able to learn from the volunteerism and reflect about what put the student there in the first place. The second paper, arguably the most important, is designed to reflect upon what the student has learned while volunteering and how the student can integrate that into their life and be more engaged in the community (Elyer, 2002; Van Goethem et al., 2014).

The recommendation of increasing the use and ultimately the length of reflection papers a student must write when they are sanctioned is consistent with Restorative Justice and Self Authorship theories. The student would be reflecting on the harm they caused themselves, the community, and the victim(s), at multiple points in their sanctioning process, which is consistent with the solemnizing aspect of Restorative Justice Theory. Through the process of writing a reflection, and through other sanctions, they would be reintegrated back into the SIUC community. Just as the community service aims to solemnize the student, so to do the reflection papers, but a dual purpose is served because the student would be reintegrated through their acts

of community service. While writing the reflection papers, students would have to think about their individual beliefs and identity, along with their social relationships. This also facilitates the student to think about how the student can make better choices and be the person they want to be, which is consistent with Self Authorship theory. This suggestion is geared towards all non-serious violations of the student code of conduct that would result in the student having to write a reflection paper such a 2.4.7- vandalism or 2.9.2-knowingly present (Student Rights and Responsibilities (2016).

Currently, students who are mandated to complete community service or volunteerism can only choose from six organizations. Those organizations are two thrift stores, two food pantries, one city clean up and one equine service organization. Those who are sanctioned to community service through Student Rights and Responsibilities should have more options for where they can volunteer. Non-sanctioned students can choose from roughly 70 different organizations to volunteer in, which are approved by SIUC. Although sanctioned students should not be permitted to choose from any of the organizations, the list of approved organizations should be expanded in order to encourage future engagement in the community. Due to the limited number of approved organizations for sanctioned students, these students are less likely to find an organization that they are interested in on the list. Since the student likely will not find an organization of interest, they likely will not continue to volunteer after completing the sanction (Clary & Snyder, 1999). Since one of the goals of Student Rights and Responsibilities and SIUC is to get students invested in the community, one way to engage students who are having disciplinary issues is to sanction them, but also have them do something they are interested in. This would encourage the student to continue getting involved with that

organization and develop relationships that promote positivity in the student's life, and possibly future successes.

As previously stated, when students are engaged in the community, according to Restorative Justice, Social Bond and, Social Learning theories, the students are more likely to create bonds, learn positive behavior, and be active members in the community (Akers, 1990; Bazemore, & Schiff, 2015; Braithwaite, 1989; Hirschi,1969). In 2000, Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, and Yee, found that students who were engaged in community service were more likely to perform better academically, and the students were more likely to become civically involved after graduation.

Restorative Justice, Self-Authorship, Social Bond, and Social Learning theories are all consistent and applicable to help reduce student conduct violations at SIUC. When students can choose from more organizations, they are more likely to find an organization that they are interested in. When they are interested in an organization, the student would be more likely to continue to volunteer with the organization. Thus, they would become a more active member in the community, which is consistent with Restorative Justice theory. When the students are interested in what they are doing with the organizations, they would be utilizing the experience to develop their beliefs and identity. Whereas, if they are not interested in what they are doing at an organization, the students would be less likely to make connections between what they are doing and whom they want to be according to Self-Authorship theory. When someone is interested in something like an organization, they are more likely to form bonds with those individuals in the organization and the community as a whole according to Social Bond theory. If students were allowed to choose from more organizations when completing their community service sanction,

the student would be more likely to be interested in what they are assigned to do at the organization. This, in turn, would make them more engaged and receptive to learning positive behavior according to Social Learning theory. This suggestion would be beneficial to all students who are sanctioned to community service at SIUC.

The final suggestion to reduce student conduct violations at SIUC is to establish a peer mentoring program in Student Rights and Responsibilities to encourage the completion of sanctions by students, facilitate engagement within SIUC and the surrounding communities and to ensure the at-risk students continued success on campus. Currently, Student Rights and Responsibilities have a small staff. Staff members are currently spread too thin to be able to see actual changes in the student's deviant behavior and oversee the completion of their sanctions. SIUC strives to be an institution filled with highly skilled, engaged, socially and ethically developed students. At-risk students sanctioned by Student Rights and Responsibilities should be provided with a peer mentor program to help guide the at-risk students in the right direction and to make sure the students are on track to complete their sanctions in a timely manner. Two previously mentioned theories would support this change: Social Bond theory, and Social Learning theory. Social Bond theory asserts that when an individual establishes positive social bonds with others, they would be less likely to commit a violation. Therefore, if at-risk students were to establish a relationship with a peer mentor in Student Rights and Responsibilities they would theoretically be less likely to commit a conduct violation.

Further, the mentor would make sure that the student is doing all the things that need to be done in order to complete their sanctions and make better choices while attending SIUC. According to differential associations found in Social Learning theory, people learn behaviors

from associating, themselves with others. By at-risk students associating themselves with a peer

mentor, the students would learn behaviors to make them a better student and a better SIUC

community member. Prior research by Campbell and Campbell (2007), Komarraju, Musulkin,

and Bhattacharya (2010), and Sorrentino (2006) suggests that mentor relationships lead to more

academic success among students. This suggestion would be beneficial to the group of violations

who are in the in-between group between serious and non-serious violations. Just like community

engagement being most beneficial to those in-between students, so would a peer mentor

relationship. Some examples of violations that would benefit from this suggestion would be

2.9.2- knowingly present, 2.4.4- trespassing,, 2.4.7-vandalism, or 2.4.6- theft (Student Rights and

Responsibilities (2016).

This paper does not only advise SIUC staff on how to make the institution better through

Code of Conduct policy changes, but this paper is also helping other universities become better

institutions as well by reviewing what SIUC is currently doing and what the institution can

improve on. Other universities that read this paper will have learned how to model their own

Student Code of Conduct successfully, or they will have learned what improvements they can

make themselves in order to reduce their student conduct violations. This is important because it

helps create uniformity among higher learning institutions, which will in turn help to create a

good regime for future assessments ultimately bettering the lives of future students**.**

It should be noted that there are limitations to this research and the outlined

recommendations to reduce student conduct violations at SIUC. The first limitation is the lack of

generalizability. As it was made clear universities are unique communities and the institutions

are encouraged to develop special kinds of systems to address student conduct violations at their

individual institutions. Therefore, until there is uniformity amongst student codes conduct and how violations are treated at higher learning institutions there cannot be high levels of generalizability. The second limitation of this research and the outlined recommendations is student motivation. SIUC could implement all four of these recommendations, and they would not have an effect on student conduct unless the students these changes will affect are motivated and open to change**.**

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY

This paper was aimed at explaining the dynamics of the Student Code of Conduct as it is being implemented at Southern Illinois University. This research paper outlined activities and practices in Student Rights, and Responsibilities that have been working and things have not been working. Guided by criminological theories such as Restorative Justice, Social Bond, and Social Learning theory this paper recommended the following changes. First, all incoming students should be mandated to complete a service learning project in the Carbondale community. Second, Student Rights and Responsibilities should increase the use and length of reflection papers for violators of the Student Code of Conduct. Third, those who are sanctioned to community service through Student Rights and Responsibilities should have more options for volunteer placement sites. Fourth, there should be a peer mentoring program established in Student Rights and Responsibilities for peers to act as mentors for students who have committed conduct violations and to encourage the completion of student's sanctions. Additionally, this paper also reflected on what other universities can learn from the SIUC experience.

REFERENCES

Akers, R. L. (1990). Rational choice, deterrence, and Social Learning theory in criminology: The path not taken. J. Crim. L. & Criminology, 81, 653.

Akers, R. L., Sellers, C. S., & Jennings, W. G. (2017). Criminological theories: introduction, evaluation, and application. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). How service learning affects students.

Braxton, J. M., Hirschy, A. S., & McClendon, S. A. (2011). Understanding and reducing college student departure: ASHE-ERIC higher education report, volume 30, number 3 (Vol. 16). John Wiley & Sons.

Barton, C. (2000). Theories of Restorative Justice. Australian Journal of Professional and Applied Ethics, 2(1), 41-53.

Baxter Magolda, M. B., & King, P. M. (2007). Interview strategies for assessing self-authorship: Constructing conversations to assess meaning making. Journal of College Student Development, 48(5), 491-508.

Bazemore, G., & Schiff, M. (2015). Restorative Community Justice: Repairing Harm and Transforming Communities. Routledge.

Bean, J., & Eaton, S. B. (2001). The psychology underlying successful retention practices. Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 3(1), 73-89.

Campbell, T. A., & Campbell, D. E. (2007). Outcomes of mentoring at-risk college students: gender and ethnic matching effects. Mentoring & Tutoring, 15(2), 135-148.

Chan, S. C., Ngai, G., & Kwan, K. P. (2017). Mandatory service learning at university: Do less-inclined students learn from it?. Active Learning in Higher Education, 1469787417742019.

Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1999). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. Current directions in psychological science, 8(5), 156-159.

Dannells, M. (1997). From Discipline to Development: Rethinking Student Conduct in Higher Education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 25, No. 2. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, The George Washington University, One Dupont Circle, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036-1183.

Esch, J. (2018). As SIUC Carbondale lost its party school rap, did enrollment suffer?

Esch, J. (2018). SIUC's rising tuition likely among primary causes of enrollment decline, but it's complicated.

Footer, N. S. (1996). Achieving fundamental fairness: The code of conduct. New Directions for Student Services, 1996(73), 19-33.

Green, J. (2017). Mission and Vision, Student Rights and Responsibilities

Green, J. (2017). Learning Outcomes and Goals, Student Rights and Responsibilities

Hawkins, J. D., & Weis, J. G. (2017). The social development model: An integrated approach to delinquency prevention. In Developmental and Life-course Criminological Theories (pp. 3-27). Routledge.

Hirschi, T. (1969). Causes of Delinquency. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Holdsworth, C., & Quinn, J. (2012). The epistemological challenge of higher education student volunteering: "reproductive" or "deconstructive" volunteering?. Antipode, 44(2), 386-405.

Illinois Board of Higher Education. (2017). Fiscal Year 2019 Higher Education Budget Recommendations: Operations, Grants, and Capital Improvements.

Institutional Research and Studies (SIUC). (2018). Student Headcount | Institutional Research and Studies | SIUC.

Karp, D. R., & Sacks, C. (2014). Student conduct, restorative justice, and student development: Findings from the STARR project: A student accountability and restorative research project. Contemporary Justice Review, 17(2), 154-172.

King, R. H. (2012). Student conduct administration: How students perceive the educational value and procedural fairness of their disciplinary experiences. Journal of College Student Development, 53(4), 563-580.

Komarraju, M., Musulkin, S., & Bhattacharya, G. (2010). Role of student-faculty interactions in developing college students' academic self-concept, motivation, and achievement. Journal of College Student Development, 51(3), 332-342.

Lake, P. F. (2009). Student Discipline: The Case against Legalistic Approaches. Chronicle of Higher Education, 55(32).

Magolda, M. B. B. (2008). Three elements of self-authorship. Journal of College Student Development, 49(4), 269-284.

Magolda, M. B. B., & King, P. M. (2004). Learning partnerships: Theory and models of practice to educate for self-authorship. Stylus Publishing, LLC..

Pavela, G. (1979). Limiting the pursuit of perfect justice on campus: A proposed code of student conduct. JC & UL, 6, 137.

Rhodes, D. (2017). Falling public university enrollment shows effects of state budget impasse.

Schaer v. Brandeis (2000)

Schuck, A. M. (2017). Evaluating the impact of crime and discipline on student success in postsecondary education. Research in Higher Education, 58(1), 77-97.

SIUC Department of Public Safety. (2018). 2017 Annual Security and Safety Report (pp. 1-165, Rep.).

Sorrentino, D. M. (2006). The SEEK mentoring program: An application of the goal-setting theory. Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 8(2), 241-250.

Stoner, E. N. (1990). Harnessing the spirit of insubordination: A model student disciplinary code. JC & UL, 17, 89.

Stoner, E. N. (2004). Navigating past the spirit of insubordination: A twenty-first century model student conduct code with a model hearing script. JC & UL, 31, 1.

Student Rights and Responsibilities. (2016, August 22). Southern Illinois University Carbondale Student Code of Conduct.

Wolniak, G. C., & Pascarella, E. T. (2005). The effects of college major and job field congruence on job satisfaction. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67(2), 233-251.

Wood, P. B., Cochran, J. K., Pfefferbaum, B., & Arneklev, B. J. (1995). Sensation-seeking and delinquent substance use: An extension of learning theory. Journal of Drug Issues, 25(1), 173-193.

Van Goethem, A., Van Hoof, A., Orobio de Castro, B., Van Aken, M., & Hart, D. (2014). The

    role of reflection in the effects of community service on adolescent development: A

    meta-analysis. Child development, 85(6), 2114-2130.

Van Ness, D. W., & Strong, K. H. (2014). Restoring justice: An introduction to restorative

    justice. Routledge.

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Savannah R. Krieg

kriegsavannah@gmail.com

Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Bachelor of Arts, Criminology and Criminal Justice, December 2016

Research Paper Title:
Understanding the Dynamics of the Student Code of Conduct: Recommendations to Reduce Student Conduct Violations at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

Major Professor: Dr. Raymund Narag