

2012-2013 Judicial Report

June 14, 2013

To: Richard Culliton, Dean of Students

From Jonathan Connary, Interim Assistant Director of Student Life

Re: 2012-2013 Judicial Report

The following summarizes information pertaining to cases adjudicated by the Student Judicial Board (SJB) and The Residential Life Area Coordinator Staff during the 2012-2013 academic year.

Judicial Volume

During this reporting period, there were 522 cases or incidents referred to the Student Judicial Board. These cases involved 1233 students and 2036 alleged violations of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct (CNAC). When compared with the same period last year, the data indicates a 3% decrease in the number of cases the SJB processed. With this slight decrease, there was still a 4% increase in the number of alleged violations and an 8% increase in the number of students charged.

While there was a decrease in overall cases as compared to the last reporting period, there was an increase in the adjudication method. Judicial conferences increased by 8%, simplified hearings increased by 16%, and full hearings increased by 41%. It is important to note that the Tour de Franzia did not occur during this academic year. This event led to the adjudication of close to 100 students last year through expedited hearings.

When examining judicial volume by semester, the fall semester showed the greatest variation in comparison to the previous fall. There was a 32% increase in the number of cases needing to be adjudicated. There was a 56% increase in the number of reported violations when compared to the same period last year and an 84% increase over the same period in 2010. The number of students involved in judicial cases increased 26% over the previous reporting period and a 79% increase when compared to the 2010 reporting period. This data indicates the highest level of judicial activity in the past three years.

Reporting

There continues to be significant collaboration between the Residential Life student staff and the Office of Public Safety; that collaboration also extends to Physical Plant staff members who work with Residential Life to maintain compliance with Fire Safety regulations in residential areas. There were 255 Communication Reports submitted that resulted in some form of judicial follow-up; 96 of the 255 Communication Reports submitted by a Residential Life student staff member supplemented a Public Safety incident report or a report from Fire Safety. The total number of Communication Reports submitted which resulted in judicial action increased 116% when compared to the same period last year. While the SJB has appreciated supplemental reports from Residential Life student staff, some reports have not provided enough information

2012-2013 Judicial Report

to help determine a student's responsibility of violating a policy. The Office of Residential Life continues to work with the student staff to ensure detailed reports. The increase in the total number of Communication Reports may stem from the increase in RA's and also an increased presence of staff during the weekends. Communication Reports continue to be forwarded from Residential Life to the Dean's Office to be reviewed with all other documentation by the co-chairs of the SJB in consultation with Dean's Office staff to determine appropriate charges and adjudication methods.

Table 1: Student Judicial Board Cases
2012-2013 Academic Year

	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Cases	438	435	330	539	522
Alleged Violations	1446	1515	1223	1952	2036
Students Charged	972	973	695	1141	1231

Recidivism

During the current reporting period, 867 individuals, or 31% of the student population, were processed through the judicial system as a result of alleged policy violations. Of those students processed during the current reporting period, 246 appeared before the SJB at least twice. The number of students who were processed through the judicial system is a representation of those people who were charged with various offences in multiple cases; 163 of those students were processed twice, 58 were processed three times, 16 were processed four times, 5 were processed five times, 2 student was processed six times, and 2 student was processed 7 times. It is important to note that there are a few students who come before the Board on numerous occasions representing their student organization and are not charged as an individual. Overall 867 students were processed through the judicial system.

Table 2: Recidivism
2012-2013 Academic Year

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Individuals charged	722	551	798	867
Repeat Documentation	25%	21%	29.6%	29.7%

Typical Violations

Alcohol and drug violations continued to be the most prevalent violations addressed through the judicial process. Underage possession or use of alcohol charges accounted for nearly 30% (611) of the charges filed with the SJB. Combined, alcohol and drug violations accounted for 51%

2012-2013 Judicial Report

of all charges. Charges related to excessive noise or other forms of disorderly conduct (privacy and tranquility) accounted for 13% (254) of the total number of charges. Similar to the last reporting period, there was a 22% (295) increase in the number of departmental regulation charges, as well as a 52% (246) increase in failure to comply charges. While there is no clear explanation for the significant increase in failure to comply charges, it may be a result of more student staff documenting situations and residents not being respectful of the staff during the documentation. Many students are also uncooperative while being documented because they are under the impression that being documented is accepting responsibility for violating a policy.

Alcohol use was identified as a factor in 56% (291) of all cases processed by the SJB and drug use was a factor in 21% (110).

Table 3: Most Common Violations
2012-2013 Academic Year

Violation Type	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	% Change
Privacy & Tranquility	308	251	334	254	(24)
Alcohol/Drug/Distribution	657	576	891	1028	15
Departmental Regulations	173	145	243	295	21
Property	167	83	156	101	(35)
Failure to Comply	95	89	162	246	52
Harassment and Abuse	29	32	24	26	8
Reckless Endangerment	30	12	34	24	(29)
Total	1515	1223	1952	2036	4

Hearing Adjudication

During the fall semester, the SJB saw a significant increase in the number of cases needing to be adjudicated when compared to previous years. The Board did an excellent job at scheduling cases in a timely manner and they were actually able to improve their adjudication time from the previous fall semester. The Area Coordinators were also able to keep their adjudication times low through a few slight changes in how they were notified of pending cases. These changes allowed the Area Coordinators to generate notification to students without having to wait for the case file to become available. The chart below compares typical resolution methods year to year:

Table 4: Adjudication Methods
2012-2013 Academic Year

Adjudication Method	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	% Change
Judicial Conference	204	160	254	273	8
Simplified Hearing	111	97	121	140	16
Full Hearing	24	13	17	24	41
Total	435	330	539	522	(3)
Individual "Responsible" findings	928	639	1092	1004	
Cases with "Responsible" decision	364	283	456	427	
Median Adjudication Time (days)	12	12	15	14	

Judicial Sanction Data

In response to the violations outlined above, the SJB has continued to employ a range of sanctions. The new point system was implemented in the fall and there has been an adjustment period in ensuring fair and consistent sanctioning. The implementation of the point system has been challenging for the board due to the progressive nature of the system. The SJB sometimes feels that there is no leniency in sanctioning as in previous years, but there are continued conversations about the reasoning for a progressive sanctioning model and how there needs to be more accountability and ownership on the part of the students coming before the board.

The University's participation in NCHIP has continued into this year and several intervention strategies have been implemented in the hopes of decreasing students' high-risk drinking behavior. In the fall, all hearing officers were trained in brief motivational interviewing techniques and a "readiness to change" sanction model was revised and introduced. Through asking a series of questions during a student's hearing, the board gains a better understanding of a student's readiness to change and implements an appropriate sanction. This new model provides more intentional sanctioning for students who were found responsible for violating the alcohol policies. The Director of WesWell met with the Board periodically throughout the year to ensure the sanction model was working and to help answer any questions or concerns regarding implementation.

In lieu of formal judicial follow-up, 68 students who were transported to the hospital for the first time for alcohol/drug use were asked to complete an educational program and meet with a health professional. Three students were transported for a second time and were processed through the judicial system and received a formal sanction focused on education and health. In

addition to the underage students transported to the hospital, two students who were 21 years or older needed hospitalization due to severe intoxication.

Table 5: Judicial Sanction Data
2012-2013 Academic Year

Sanction Type	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	12-13
Disciplinary Warning	409	519	385	586	582
Disciplinary Probation	64	90	40	135	76
Community Service/University Service	76	115	53	77	41*
Referral To HC	96	99	97	232	285
Restitution/Fines	6	27	9	17	16
Suspension/Expulsion	4	7	8	8	9
Total	655	672	698	1458	1202

**Student Organizations have been assigned service hours and are represented solely as an organization. These organizations sometimes have been sanctioned for each member to complete a designated number of hours each and these individual students' hours are not reflective in this number.*

During the current reporting period the SJB found the students or groups charged had some level of culpability in 427 (82%) of the cases adjudicated compared with 456 cases (85%) during the previous reporting period. While the SJB has done well at finding some level of culpability in their cases heard as noted above, they have struggled overall in holding individuals accountable for their behavior. During this reporting period, 51% of students were found responsible for their alleged violation, with 49% being found not responsible. This is a slight change from the previous reporting period when 58% of students were being found responsible and 42% found not responsible.

Judicial Process Feedback

Over the past two years, the Dean of Students Office has reached out to students that have been through the judicial process to help gain better understanding of each student's experience. The hope in soliciting feedback from students is so the SJB and other hearing members will have pertinent information from which to assess the current process and potentially implement meaningful change to improve aspects of the process which have resulted in challenges for students charged with judicial violations. Requests were sent to 1004 students to which 19% (190) responded by completing the survey. The survey asked students to quantify their agreement or disagreement with three questions and to answer yes or no to two others. Respondents were also provided the opportunity to provide qualitative feedback to each question and at the end of the survey.

Table 7: Judicial Experience Feedback Data
2012-2013 Academic Year

Adjudication Method	Understood Point System				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Simplified SJB Hearing	24	25	9	8	11
Full SJB Hearing	2	5	5	2	3
Dean's Conference	7	14	12	6	1
Judicial Conference with Area Coordinator	15	25	4	7	5
Total	48	69	30	23	20
2012 - 2013 Percentage	25%	36%	16%	12%	11%
2011 - 2012 Percentage	-	-	-	-	-

Adjudication Method	Timeliness of Resolution				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Simplified SJB Hearing	28	24	18	5	2
Full SJB Hearing	1	9	4	2	1
Dean's Conference	21	9	3	3	4
Judicial Conference with Area Coordinator	23	21	5	3	4
Total	73	63	30	13	11
2012 - 2013 Percentage	38%	33%	16%	7%	6%
2011 - 2012 Percentage	27%	41%	7%	11%	14%

Adjudication Method	Treated Respectfully				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Simplified SJB Hearing	38	29	10	0	0
Full SJB Hearing	4	12	0	1	0
Dean's Conference	27	8	2	1	2
Judicial Conference with Area Coordinator	29	24	2	0	1
Total	98	73	14	2	3
2012 - 2013 Percentage	52%	38%	7%	1%	2%
2011 - 2012 Percentage	45%	31%	9%	9%	7%

Adjudication Method	Understood Process				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Simplified SJB Hearing	21	27	15	8	6
Full SJB Hearing	4	6	4	2	1
Dean's Conference	5	22	8	4	1
Judicial Conference with Area Coordinator	15	16	15	8	2
Total	45	71	42	22	10
2012 - 2013 Percentage	24%	37%	22%	12%	5%
2011 - 2012 Percentage	31%	28%	19%	18%	4%

Adjudication Method	Use of Advisor	
	Yes	No
Simplified SJB Hearing	17	60
Full SJB Hearing	5	12
Dean's Conference	3	37
Judicial Conference with Area Coordinator	6	49
Total	31	158
2012 - 2013 Percentage	16%	84%
2011 - 2012 Percentage	19%	82%

Adjudication Method	Proper Sanction	
	Yes	No
Simplified SJB Hearing	56	19
Full SJB Hearing	13	7
Dean's Conference	31	6
Judicial Conference with Area Coordinator	50	6
Total	150	38
2012 - 2013 Percentage	80%	20%
2011 - 2012 Percentage	73%	27%

Cc: Mike Whaley, Vice President for Student Affairs
 Tony Bostick, Interim Director of Public Safety
 Student Judicial Board
 Fran Koerting, Director of Residential Life
 Maureen Isleib, Associate Director of Residential Life
 File

2012-2013 Judicial Report

2012-2013 Case Summaries

Regulation 1 – Privacy and Tranquility

The intentional infringement upon the right to privacy of any member of the community is prohibited. Disorderly and disruptive conduct and/or the persistent interruption of a reasonable level of peace and quiet is also a violation.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A, B, C, D and E were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 1 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students A, B, C, D and E not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A, B, C, and D were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 1, 14 and 4 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Students A, B, C and D responsible for regulations 1 and 4 and not responsible for regulation 14 and recommended that students A, B, C and D receive a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 1, 2, 4, 13e and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A responsible for regulations 1 and 14 and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 1 and 2 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A responsible for regulation 1 and recommended that student A be put on disciplinary probation. Additionally, the board recommended that student A meet with Jon Connary, house manager and complainant.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 1 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A responsible and recommended that Student A receive a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 1, 4 and 5 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible for 1, 4 and 5 and recommended that Student A participate in Alcohol Innerview.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that students A and B were alleged to have violated section II, regulations 1 and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students A and B not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A and B were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations, 1, 13b and 13e of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A responsible for 13e and recommended the student receive a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that students A, B, C, D and E were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 1 and 14 of the Code of non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A not responsible and Students B, C, D and E responsible for 14 and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 1, 13b and 14 and student B was alleged to have violated regulations 13b and 14 of the code of non-academic conduct. The board found student A responsible for 1 and 14 and student B responsible for 13b and 14 and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A and B were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 1, 15 and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students responsible for all violations and recommended disciplinary warnings.

2012-2013 Judicial Report

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 1, 13b and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A not responsible for regulation 1, but responsible for regulations 13b and 14. The board recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A and B were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 1, 13b and 15 and Students C and D were alleged to have violated regulations 1 and 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students C and D not responsible and Student A responsible for regulation 15 and Student B responsible for regulations 1, 13b and 15 and the board recommended a disciplinary warning for Student A and disciplinary probation for Student B.

In a Simplified Hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A, B and C have violated Section II, Regulation 1 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found the students responsible and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a full hearing, the board considered the allegation that Student A has violated Section II, Regulations 1, 10, 13B, 13G, 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found the student responsible for 1, 10, and 14, but not responsible for 13B and 13G and recommended disciplinary probation and a ride along with a Public Safety officer.

In a Simplified Hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A violated Section II, Regulation 1 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a Simplified Hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A violated Section II, Regulation 1 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A not responsible.

In a Simplified Hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A violated Section II, Regulation 1, 13B, 13C, 14, 4 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible for 4 and 13C. The board recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a Simplified Hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A violated Section II, Regulation 1 and 13a of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A not responsible.

Regulation 2 – Harassment and Abuse

Harassment and abuse, intentionally directed toward individuals or groups, may include at least the following forms: the intentional use or threat of physical violence, coercion, intimidation, and verbal harassment and abuse. Wesleyan University's commitment to nondiscrimination means that intentional discriminatory harassment may be punished more severely than nondiscriminatory or unintentional forms of harassment.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 2 and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 2 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A not responsible.

Regulation 4 - Property

The unauthorized use, or the abuse, destruction, or theft of university property or the property of any of its members, guests, or neighbors is prohibited. This includes but is not limited to all tunnels, roofs, and areas under construction. This regulation prohibits the unauthorized appropriation or "borrowing" of common property for personal use.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 4 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible for violating the policy. Student A did not attend the hearing. The board recommended that Student A receive a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A, B, C, D, E and F were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 4 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students responsible and recommended that they receive a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A and B were alleged to have violated section II, regulation 4 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A and B not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated section II, regulation 4 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A, B, C and D were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 4 and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students A, B and C responsible for 4 and Students A, B, C and D not responsible for 14 and recommended students A, B and C receive a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A and B were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 4 and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A not responsible.

In a full hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 4 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible and recommended disciplinary probation.

In a full hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A, B and C were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 4 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Students A, B and C responsible and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a Simplified Hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A has violated Section II, Regulation 4 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found the student responsible and assessed a disciplinary warning.

Regulation 5 – False Information

Knowingly furnishing false information to a university officer or member of any constituted hearing board acting in performance of his/her duties is prohibited.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A, B and C were alleged to have violated Section II, Regulations 5 and 13b of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible for 13b and recommended that Student A receive a disciplinary warning and one point each.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 5 and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible for regulation 5, but not regulation 14. The board recommended a disciplinary warning.

Regulation 8 – Fire Protection Systems

Tampering with fire extinguishers, fire alarm boxes, or smoke or heat detectors anywhere on university property is prohibited. Additional information about fire safety procedures may be found at Wesleyan.edu/firesafety .

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A representing house B was alleged to have violated section II, regulations 8, 13a, 13e, and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found house B not responsible.

Regulation 9 – Restricted Items/Fire Hazards

9e-Lethal Weapons-Personal possession or use of operable firearms, air guns, or other lethal weapons is prohibited on the Wesleyan campus or while participating in university activities.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 9(e) of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible and recommended a disciplinary warning.

Regulation 10 – Reckless Endangerment

Creating condition(s) or an environment that endangers, or has the potential to endanger, other members of the community or property is prohibited. Failure to take reasonable constructive action to remedy such conditions may also constitute a violation.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 10 and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible and recommended a disciplinary probation till graduation a complete a written paper.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 10 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible and recommended a disciplinary warning.

Regulation 13 – Drugs and Alcohol

a. The possession, use, manufacture, distribution, or dispensing of illegal drugs or controlled substances by any member of the Wesleyan community. This includes the misuse or abuse of any medications prescribed by a physician to another individual. Students should be advised that university personnel may confiscate drug paraphernalia (including bongs, water pipes, etc.). Such items will be tested for drug residue and the owner held responsible for a drug policy violation if appropriate.

In a full hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 13a and 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A responsible and recommended that student A receive a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that students A, B, C and D were alleged to have violated section II, regulation 13a of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students A, B, C and D not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A and B were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13a and 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found both students not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A-E were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13a of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. Additionally, students D and E were

2012-2013 Judicial Report

alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Students A-E not responsible for either violation.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that students A, B, C, D, E, F and G were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 13a of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found all students not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A, B, C, D, and E were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 13a and 13b, in addition to 14 for student A, of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found only student A responsible for 13a and 13b and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A, B and C were alleged to have violated section II, regulation 13a of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students A, B and C not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A, B, C and D were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 13a of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A responsible and recommended the student receive a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated section II, regulations 13a and 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to violated Section II, regulations 13a and 14 of the code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found the student responsible for 13a and 14 and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13a, 15 and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A not responsible.

In a full hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13a and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible for both violations and recommended disciplinary probation.

In a full hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A and B were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13a, 14 and 15 of the Code of Non-academic Conduct. The board found Student a not responsible for all of the charges and decided that the board will table a decision for Student B until other roommates who were abroad could corroborate.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13a and 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A not responsible for both regulations.

In a full hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13a, 14 and 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a Simplified Hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A violated Section II, Regulation 13a, 13b, and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A not responsible for all charges.

Regulation 13 – Drugs and Alcohol

b. Underage possession or consumption of alcohol anywhere on university property or at university-sponsored events.

2012-2013 Judicial Report

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M and N were alleged to have violated Section II, Regulation 13b, 13c (students L and M), and 13e (Student N) of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I and J not responsible and students K, L, M and N responsible for 13b. Students L and M were found not responsible for 13c and Student N was found not responsible for 13e. The board recommended that Students K, L, M and N receive a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13b, 13c, 13d and 5 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A responsible for 13b, 13c, 13d and 5 and recommended that student A receive a disciplinary warning and Alcohol Edu. Student B was found responsible for 13b and the board recommended a disciplinary warning, and student C was found responsible for 13b and received a recommended disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that students A, B, C, D, E, and F were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13b and 13c of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students A-E not responsible. The board found Student F responsible for 13b and 13c and recommended that Student F receive a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that students A, B, C, D, E and F, G, H, and I were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13b, 13c, and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students A-I not responsible for all violations.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A and B were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 13b and 13c of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct in addition to the regulation 14 for student B. The board found student A responsible for 13b and student B not responsible for any violation.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 13b, 13c and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A-F were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 13b of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students A-F not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13b, 13e and 14 of the Code of non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A responsible for 13b and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated section II, regulation 13b of the code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated section II, regulation 13b of the Code of non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student a responsible for 13b and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13b of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A not responsible.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I and J were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13b of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found all students not responsible.

2012-2013 Judicial Report

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that students A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O and P were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 13b and Student P was further alleged to have violated regulation 13c. The board found Students A-H responsible for 13b and Student P responsible for both 13b and 13c, while students I-O were found not responsible for regulation 13b. The board recommended disciplinary warnings and an alcohol online program.

In a full hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A, B, C, D and E were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13b and 13e of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Students A, B, C and F not responsible and Student D responsible for 13b. The board recommended Student D receive a disciplinary warning.

In a full hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 13b of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student A responsible and recommended a one-semester suspension.

In a Simplified Hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A has violated Section II, Regulation 13b and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found the student responsible for both regulations and recommended disciplinary probation for a year. The board also recommended counsel for drinking problems.

In a Simplified Hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student C violated Section II, Regulation 13b and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Student responsible and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a full hearing, the board considered an allegation that the program house A was alleged to have violated Section II, Regulations 13b, 13e, 14 and 4 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found the house responsible for 13e, 14 and 4 and designated a provisional status in addition to community service work for five hours per person for all members and residents.

Regulation 13 – Drugs and Alcohol

c. Distribution of alcohol to underage persons anywhere on university property or a university-sponsored event. Hosts of social events where alcohol is distributed may be held responsible for any such illegal distribution committed by guests.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student group A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 13c, 13e, 13f and 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student Group A responsible for 13e and 15 and recommended that student A receive a disciplinary warning.

Regulation 13 – Drugs and Alcohol

e. Possession of open containers of alcohol is prohibited at all times and at all campus locations, except in private residential settings where the residents are of legal age or during registered events. In addition, the possession or consumption of alcohol on city property, streets, and sidewalks is prohibited by city ordinance.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Farm House was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 13e of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Farm House not responsible for violating the regulation.

Regulation 14- Failure to Comply

Members of the community are expected to comply with reasonable requests made by university personnel acting within the capacity of their responsibilities, including requests for adequate identification. Public Safety officers should be allowed to enter private residential spaces to address suspected policy violations. Officers may enter private residential spaces without residents' permission only with the approval of the vice president for student affairs (or designee).

2012-2013 Judicial Report

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A and B were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 14 and 13b (for student A) and 14 and 5 (for student B) of the Code of the Non-Academic Conduct. The Board found Student A responsible for 14 and student B responsible for 5. Both students received a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Psi U has violated Section II, regulations 14 and 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found Psi U responsible for the violation and sanctioned the extension of their party ban.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 14 of the code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A not responsible for 14.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered allegations that Students A, B, C, D, E and F were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 14 and 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found student A responsible for regulation 15 and recommended that student A receive a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that students A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I and J were alleged to have violated Section II, regulations 14 and 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found all students not responsible for 15, but responsible for 14 and sanctioned students A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I and J with a disciplinary warning.

In a Simplified Hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student C violated Section II, Regulation 13b and 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found the student responsible and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a Full Hearing, the board considered allegations that Student A violated Section II, Regulations 14 and 15. The board found Student A responsible for violating Regulation 15 and recommended the student receive a Disciplinary Warning.

Regulation 15 – Department Regulations

Members of the community are expected to abide by duly established and promulgated non-academic regulations. This is intended to cover the operating regulations of all university programs and facilities. These include, but are not limited to, the policies outlined later in this booklet and available at Wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/standardsregulations/universitypolicies/

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that students A, B, C, D and E were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 15 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students not responsible for 15.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Students A, B, C and D were alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 14 of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct. The board found students responsible and recommended a disciplinary warning.

In a simplified hearing, the board considered an allegation that Student A was alleged to have violated Section II, regulation 15 (chalking). The board found Student A responsible and recommended a disciplinary warning.