

2022

Exploring the Impact of Student Conduct Models on Student Development at HBCUs

Deona Cureton
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Law Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Deona Cureton

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Dianne Williams, Committee Chairperson,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. David Kilmnick, Committee Member,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Olivia Yu, University Reviewer,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2022

Abstract

Exploring the Impact of Student Conduct Models on Student Development at HBCUs

by

Deona Cureton

MAEd, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2010

BS, Winston-Salem State University, 2006

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

February 2022

Abstract

The effectiveness of the student conduct approaches of the mixed method model, a mixture of restorative justice and traditional sanctioning, and traditional sanctioning, known as the “model code,” in student learning at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) has been largely unexamined in existing literature. This quantitative study examined whether the model code process or a mixed method model process is more effective and efficient in producing learning and accountability. The present study utilized the 28-item questionnaire from the Student Accountability and Restorative Research (STARR) Project, a multicampus study conducted in 2011 in the United States. In the current study, the questionnaire was administered to 191 students at a 4-year public HBCU, referred to as Institution A, with a population of 6,000 students. The collected data from Institution A’s responses were used to compare the responses from the previously collected data from the STARR Project. The results of the statistical analyses showed drug use as the primary violation and that most cases were considered to be moderately serious violations, ultimately supporting the finding that a mixed method model process is more beneficial than a model code process in creating student learning and accountability in the student conduct process. The results of the *t* tests, ANOVA, and a multiple binary regression indicated only slight differences based on the type of hearing process at the HBCU. This study could widely support conduct practitioners in the realm of student conduct or adjudicating participants in disciplinary proceedings within the court system.

Exploring the Impact of Student Conduct Models on Student Development at HBCUs

by

Deona Cureton

MAEd, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2010

BS, Winston-Salem State University, 2006

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

February 2022

Dedication

This is dedicated to all of the student conduct practitioners who are creating life-long lessons from their learning/teaching moments and fostering environments for a holistic experience. This is also dedicated to my parents, my son, and my family/ friends for the emotional support throughout the years of this process and for continuing to push me to the finish line.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Background	2
Problem Statement	5
Purpose Statement	7
Research Questions and Hypotheses	13
Theoretical Framework	14
Nature of the Study	15
Definitions	16
Assumptions	19
Scope and Limitations	19
Limitations	20
Significance	20
Summary	21
Chapter 2: Literature Review	23
Literature Search Strategy	24
Theoretical Foundation	24
Student Affairs	27
Student Development	29
Student Conduct Models	30
Actions and Consequences of Actions	33

Restorative Justice Model	34
Literature Review Related to Key Variables and Concepts.....	38
Summary	46
Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology	48
Institution’s Current Conduct Process	48
Research Design and Rationale	48
Dependent Variables.....	50
Independent Variable	51
Research Design.....	51
Methodology.....	54
Research Questions and Hypotheses	55
Population	56
Sampling and Sampling Procedures	57
Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection.....	59
Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs	60
Threats to Validity	61
Ethical Procedures	62
Summary	63
Chapter 4: Results.....	64
Data Collection	64
Treatment and/or Intervention Fidelity.....	65
Independent Variables	66

ANOVA and Independent <i>t</i> -test Analysis.....	68
Multiple Binary Regression Analysis	69
Summary	70
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	72
Interpretation of the Findings.....	72
Limitations of the Study.....	74
Recommendations.....	74
Implications.....	75
Conclusion	75
References.....	77
Appendix A: Consent to Reuse Content	85
Appendix B: Respondent Questionnaire.....	86

List of Tables

Table 1. Characteristics of Participating Institutions in the STARR Project	57
Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha's for the Six Measures of Student Development	61
Table 3. Independent Variables for Conduct Cases.....	67
Table 4. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Student Development by Hearing Process...	68
Table 5. Independent Sample t-test for Hearing Process and Student Development	69
Table 6. Coefficients of Interpersonal Competence	69
Table 7. Coefficients of Procedural Fairness.....	70

Chapter 1: Introduction

In higher education, when a student violates the established policies or procedures of an institution, educational sanctions (e.g., reflective essays, community service, educational classes) and punitive sanctions (verbal warning, disciplinary probation, suspension, expulsion) are utilized to bring the student back into compliance with the college or university policies. In the arena of student conduct, practitioners apply student developmental theories as the foundation for successful programs to help students reintegrate into university life and remain compliant with policies and procedures (Dannells & Lowery, 2004, p. 154).

The evolution of the student population has created gaps due to the changing emotional and cognitive processes of students from different generations (e.g., Generation X, Generation Y, millennials). Theories that were once very effective no longer have the same impact and are proving ineffective with the newer generation, specifically students born in the mid-1990s and early 2000s, who are also known as Generation Z (Levit, 2015). There is a profound generational gap that has resulted in major challenges in the application of older models to the current context. Student conduct practitioners often utilize theories such as Chickering's Seven Vectors, which explains the process of identity/psychological development of college students, and Astin's Involvement Theory, which details the importance of student involvement in college. Both theories reflect the mental and emotional processing of adolescents in the 1960s.

The students that Astin's Involvement Theory considers range from recipients of the G.I. Bill and baby boomers; to children born in the mid-1990s, when parents exhibited overprotective and overbearing nurturing tactics ("helicopter parents"); to students born in the millennial era, when the use of technology began to gain popularity (Levit, 2015). Older student development theories have continuously been used to justify the administration of sanctions in the realm of student conduct. According to Bach (2003) and Levitt (2015), there is currently a dire need for student developmental theories to evolve as student demographics change. Such an evolution should account for the role of technology in promoting or mitigating misconduct, reflect the changing worldviews of students and society at large, and place a greater emphasis on ethical thinking and practice as opposed to control- and discipline-based approaches. According to Walker (2008), one method to transform student conduct practice is to incorporate new ways to rectify student infractions using a more modern sanctioning process, such as restorative justice model (Davis, 2015).

Background

The challenge in higher education is that the sanctioning methods that are utilized in adjudicating students' cases are primarily rooted in the model code format and not in an equal blend of the model code and restorative justice model (Smith, 2012). Restorative-oriented processes reflect an attempt to implement a holistic approach; however, the harmed parties in the case are not allowed to have their hurt restored by the in-violation/respondent student due to their lack of involvement in the hearing process (Smith, 2012). Restorative justice models allow for all parties involved to be restored in a

holistic sense, rectifying the wrongs, creating an atmosphere of sincere remorse for the harm done to be expressed, and allowing the victimized parties to express their desire for restoration (Fusch, 2012; Wilson, 2006; Swinton, 2008). In contrast, the model code process focuses on punitive retribution, such as suspension, expulsion, and disciplinary probation, whereas a hybrid model creates a sanctioning process that incorporates a combination of restorative justice and model code sanctioning,

The history of RJ dates back to the 19th century (Gade, 2013). The term *restorative justice* has historically represented one of three distinct paths of justice: retributive, which is based on punishment; distributive, which refers to a therapeutic implementation for the offenders; and restorative, which is the collaborative implementation of restitution based on the victims' and offenders' input (Van Ness & Strong, 2010). Institutions such as Clemson University and Michigan State University, both of which are large 4-year public research-based, predominantly White institutions (PWIs), have become the universities at the forefront of restorative justice in higher education. Both universities have transitioned completely to the restorative justice model and have seen an increase in their retention rates and a decrease in recidivism rates (Brown, 2013; Restorative Justice: Students' Voice, 2010).

The alternative to the restorative justice model is the model code approach, which was founded based on the student development theories of the 1960s (Smith, 2012). The model code approach focuses solely on punitive sanctioning and relies heavily on regulating the relationship between the student and the university. The regulatory process is normally created by way of punitive sanctions (e.g., expulsion, suspension, deferred

suspension) that are encouraged within the tradition of the MC (Brown, 2013). Although the majority of institutions still utilize model code sanctioning founded in student development theories, some institutions have adopted the philosophy of restorative justice and have seen a dramatic positive change within their student bodies (Bazemore & Elis, 2007).

Both sanctioning models are formulated based on student development theories and philosophy, and both emphasize the importance of higher education. Student development theories create a directional movement for the maturation period of students while they are engaging with faculty, staff, and the administration. These theories were initially created to explain, support, and stimulate students during their matriculation, focusing on the common growth that occurs with an emphasis on the unique emotional and mental development process.

With the implementation of student development theories as a specific conduct foundation for processes in conjunction with the variety of institution types, styles, and demographics, both sanction concepts are utilized in higher education, but not consistently used as a joint sanctioning technique (i.e., a hybrid model) to promote student learning (Wilson, 2006). The majority of colleges and universities utilize one method over the other. According to Smith (2012), many colleges and universities feel that the two styles of sanctioning (model code and restorative justice) would not blend seamlessly or be as effective when applied together because they were not developed to address the same demographic. Very few studies explain why both types of sanctioning are not consistently used together in a hybrid method format or examine whether a

blended application of these theories would result in successful methods to ensure effective and efficient student compliance with university rules and procedures (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

Problem Statement

The effectiveness of the mixed method model and model code approaches on different student populations and demographics in pertaining to retention rates, recidivism of infractions, student learning, and the reintegration back into the community of students who have gone through the conduct process is unknown, and the two approaches have not been adequately compared in the literature. Due to the lack of supporting literature on model code processes and restorative justice practices as more effective in fostering accountability and learning when used together, as in restorative-oriented processes or mixed method model, previous studies have not fully grasped the potential effectiveness of such blended processes within different student demographics.

Based on previous literature, it is still unknown whether a hybrid model approach would increase retention rates in higher education, reduce recidivism, prove effective for all student demographics, and encourage students who have had previous infractions to embrace their college community. The goal is to produce a more holistic, community-based college student who is more attentive to how their personal behavior affects the community in which they eat, sleep, learn, and live in. Creating the ability to compare and contrast sanctioning models would assist universities in determining which of the two models is more effective or identify the contexts in which either model is superior to the other. Creating the additional literature comparing and contrasting models would then

make the case for the integration of a mixed method model approach that uses a fluid combination of restorative justice and model code approaches in institutions of higher learning. What remains unknown in the existing literature is whether both models will be effective and efficient at an institution regardless of its composition (e.g., student demographics, student body size).

There is a notable absence of studies, especially case studies, in which schools have successfully applied the hybrid model (Karp & Sacks, 2014). According to the existing literature, restorative justice is a suitable combination of mediation and restitution that strives to achieve resolution to a conflict through identifying the injuries that were caused and constructing an amicable agreement for retribution with input from all parties (Lipka, 2009). Restorative justice offers an alternative approach to the judicial affairs/student conduct system that universities still utilize today (Lipka, 2009). Restorative justice is a sanctioning process that is in line with university mission statements centered around the personal growth of students and the advancement of communities in a holistic sense (Lipka, 2009).

The existing literature depicts the model code as a form of *in loco parentis*, the Latin expression for “in place of the parent” (Walker, 2008). From the creation of Harvard in 1636 through the early 20th century, collegiate administrations have been viewed as the caregivers and disciplinarians of students (Walker, 2008). *In loco parentis* was reiterated from the 1900s through the early 1960s, when lawmakers established that even off-campus behaviors would be sanctioned, allowing for the model code to be implemented regardless of due process for students (Evans et al., 1998).

A model code has been present in the higher education system since the dawn of colleges and universities but has failed to evolve and reflect the current needs of students and institutions (Evans et al., 1998). This approach is mainly founded on the traditional practice of an institution on an institution-by-institution basis, while still following guidelines based on state statutes (Reindl, 2004). To date, it remains unclear why there has not been a massive overhaul of certain sanctions and how the implementation of the model code can become more consistent across institution types (Reindl, 2004).

What remains to be studied is the tangible concept of implementing restorative justice and model code sanctioning in a joint effort to increase effectiveness at any type of institution. With the changes in student demographics and the multitude of variables that create a need for evolved student development theories, it is imperative that solutions to behavioral infractions evolve while reflecting best practices in the field. Through creating a sanctioning method that not only is punitive (i.e., model code) but also accounts for students' emotional and mental growth (i.e., restorative justice), schools can develop a higher education atmosphere that fosters students' learning and development in a holistic manner. The goal is therefore to produce a more robust pool of literature that supports the facilitation of a hybrid model as best practices in the field of student conduct in higher education.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to explore methods of sanctioning, namely the model code and mixed method model, and to examine their impact on the student learning experience for minority students who attend an HBCU. In this study, I was

interested in understanding how different student conduct approaches influence students' identities and motivation to engage in desired behavior after matriculating through the student conduct sanctioning process. Furthermore, I sought to understand how different approaches, applied to an HBCU, shape students' outlooks on accountability. To achieve this objective, I examined the overall effectiveness of restorative-oriented administrative hearings known as a mixed methods hearing, model code hearings, and restorative justice practices in higher education via data I collected from a quantitative assessment that was previously used in the Student Accountability and Restorative Research (STARR) Project. The STARR Project was a quantitative assessment of 659 student conduct cases that occurred at 18 colleges and universities in the United States; the cases varied in student demographics, mainly predominantly White institutions, Hispanic-serving institutions, community colleges, and junior colleges (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

In the original study, the 659 conduct case files from these institutions included surveys completed by the students who were sanctioned and surveys completed by parties who were affected by the students' infractions (Karp & Sacks, 2014). In the current study, the STARR quantitative assessment was applied to students who attend a historically Black college and/or university (HBCU) and have matriculated through the conduct process. As previously stated, the goal of the present study is to determine whether model code or mixed method is a more effective sanctioning tool to promote student development by quantitatively assessing each method based on the six measures of student development. Within the two sanctioning methods, there are two categories:

model code hearings and mixed method hearings. The STARR Project identified the two categories' contents as follows:

- Model code hearings are consistent with best practices in the field. Model code hearings focus on determining responsibility and administering sanctions ranging from warnings to expulsion of the accused student/respondent and are adjudicated administratively (one-on-one between the accused student/respondent and conduct officer) or before a conduct board (accused student/respondent and a panel of conduct members, such as faculty, staff, or students).
- Mixed method hearings reflect a more holistic approach in which the conduct officer fosters a dialogue between the respondent, who has already admitted responsibility, and the members of the community who are affected by the student's infraction. The communication between all parties focuses on identifying the harm done, repairing the damage through communication, and rebuilding trust among all members by way of tasks that must be completed by the respondent to make amends with the campus community (Karp & Sacks, 2014). The student also receives a punitive sanction that supports the process of restoring the harmed parties.

The STARR Project utilized Chickering's seven vectors and Astin's involvement theory to identify six student development goals in order to quantitatively assess students' learning from the infraction during the student conduct process. The six student development goals are as follows:

- Just community/self-authorship (i.e., “I had a voice”): This goal pertains to the active participation of the respondent in the decision-making process. The student development goal of internalizing the university or external community standards is aligned with the student’s behavior due to the student’s conscience being guided by the ethical responsibilities associated with being a member of the community. To determine if there is a level of success, the Likert scale score would have to receive a rating of 4 or 5 for the following questions: (a) “To what extent were you given options in how the case would be handled?” (b) “To what extent were you able to communicate your thoughts and feelings about the incident?” (c) “How much were you able to meaningfully contribute your ideas towards the outcome?” (d) “To what extent was the outcome tailored for you and your situation?”
- Active accountability (i.e., “I took responsibility”): This goal pertains to how much respondents understand not only how their behavior was a violation of the university rules and regulations, but also how the behavior affected others involved and the respondents’ willingness to take ownership to rectify the situation. To determine if there is a level of success, the Likert scale score would have to receive a rating of 4 or 5 for the following questions: (a) “How much did the process help you take responsibility for the consequence of the incident?” (b) “To what extent did the outcome focus on repairing the harm that was caused by this incident?” (c) “To what extent did the outcomes create opportunities to respond to larger social issues that are relevant to the incident

(research on alcohol issues, research on marijuana usage in college environments, etc.)?”

- Interpersonal competence (i.e., “I talked it out”): This goal pertains to the respondent’s openness to listen to others’ perspectives, articulate remorse, and put forth effort to repair relationships that were damaged due to the infraction so that all parties can co-exist civilly in the university community. To determine if there is a level of success, the Likert scale score would have to receive a rating of 4 or 5 for the following questions: (a) “How much did the process help you to understand the point of view of those most affected?” (b) “To what extent did the process offer an opportunity to give a sincere apology to those most affected? (c) “To what extent was a sincere apology offered during this process?” (d) “To what extent would you now feel comfortable seeing the others involved in the incident around campus or in the community?”
- Social ties to the institution (i.e., “I belong here”): This goal pertains to the respondent’s relationship to the university community, including positive communication and interactions with campus administrators and police. To determine if there is a level of success, the Likert scale score would have to receive a rating of 4 or 5 for the following questions: (a) “How much did the process help you to understand your responsibilities as a member of the community?” (b) “As a result of this process, I have a greater appreciation for the campus administrators involved in my case (such as deans, housing and

residence life staff, conduct officers, etc.).” (c) “As a result of this process, I have a greater appreciation for campus safety officers.”

- Procedural fairness (i.e., “That was fair”): This goal pertains to the respondent’s understanding that the conduct process was impartial and fair, reaffirming that the conduct process and the university’s rules and regulations are legitimate. To determine if there is a level of success, the Likert scale score would have to receive a rating of 4 or 5 for the following questions: (a) “To what extent did you receive the information needed for you to confidently participate in this process?” (b) “How much did the process include people who could offer you counsel and support?” (c) “To what extent did you feel respected throughout the process?” (d) “To what extent was the process fair to all parties?”
- Closure (i.e., “I’m ready to move on”): This goal pertains to the respondent’s satisfaction with the process, from facing the infraction to gaining closure and discussing positive future interactions. To determine if there is a level of success, the Likert scale score would have to receive a rating of 4 or 5 for the following questions: a) “Overall, how satisfied are you with the way this process was handled?” b) “Overall, how satisfied are you with the outcomes of this process?” c) “How much did the process help you bring closure to this situation?”

Research Questions and Hypotheses

There is a clear research gap on the comparative efficacy of the model code and restorative justice. There is also no known data on the use of mixed model regardless of the demographics of the institution (i.e., the use of model code and/or restorative justice at HBCUs nor the use of mixed method at HBCUs). The research questions for this study therefore reflect the key objective of the study, which was to determine which model creates better student learning and accountability in the realm of student conduct in higher education. The research questions and hypotheses are derived from the review of existing literature on the topics of student conduct, mixed method, restorative justice, and the model code.

RQ1: Will the coefficients for the six measures of student development reveal more significant regression results when the student underwent a traditional administrative hearing (model code) or an administrative hearing with restorative justice components (mixed method)?

H_{11} : The regression results will affirm that the model applied to a student's conduct process (model code and mixed method) will significantly predict active measures of student development (just community/self-authorship, active accountability, interpersonal competence, social ties to institution, procedural fairness, and closure).

H_{01} : The regression results will not affirm that the model applied to a student's conduct process (model code and mixed method) will significantly predict active measures of student development (just community/self-authorship, active accountability, interpersonal competence, social ties to institution, procedural fairness, and closure).

RQ2: Will the Likert scale responses to the six measures of student development in the student survey reveal that traditional administrative hearing processes (model code) score higher or lower than administrative hearings with restorative justice components (mixed method)?

H₁₂: Participants who reported their opinions via Likert scale responses on the six measures of student development will report gaining more learning opportunities (success) from administrative hearings with restorative justice components (mixed method) over the traditional administrative hearing process (model code).

H₀₂: Participants who reported their opinions via Likert scale responses on the six measures of student development will not indicate a higher score for administrative hearings with restorative justice components (mixed method) over the traditional administrative hearing process (model code).

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study is Chickering's theory of the seven vectors, which was originally established in the 1960s and then revitalized for the early 1990s student population (Chickering, 1969; Wise, 2017), and Astin's involvement theory (1984). These theories are applied as the framework for the present study because it is the foundation of almost all student development theories in higher education as well as of portions of RJ philosophy (Ortiz, 1999). This is evident in the theory's emphasis that institutions of higher learning are primarily focused on encouraging the development of human potential.

The seven-vectors theory explains college students' mental and emotional development due to external and internal variables during college matriculation (Wise, 2017). This theory offers researchers and practitioners an understanding of how to create educational sanctioning systems that can work alongside college students' mental and emotional development to assist with their personal growth. Chickering's seven vectors are the following: (a) developing competence, (b) managing emotions, (c) moving through autonomy towards interdependence, (d) developing mature interpersonal relationships, (e) establishing identity, (f) developing purpose, and (g) developing integrity (Wise, 2017).

It is imperative to examine a potential combination of sanctioning methods created from various student development theories to encourage and assist students in gaining self-understanding and self-awareness, critical thinking, and understanding of community via specific interventions based on sound educational practices (Walker, 2008). It is also imperative to examine combinations of sanctioning methods created from student development theories that support the diversity of student demographics and their emotional competencies based upon historical trauma.

Nature of the Study

A quantitative study design was selected due to the nature of the original STARR Project, which collected explorative data that could be quantified. I was not privy to the rationalization as to why the previous study was not implemented via a mixed-methods approach. To remain consistent with the original study's approach, the questionnaire was administered, and the data were quantified. Furthermore, a quantitative method is more

approachable for the study due to the large amount of data and the desire to compare statistical information from a large pool of participants. The quantitative study design was also selected to ensure congruency with the original study. By utilizing the same study design, but applying it to a different demographic, it allows for the assessment of the results to be completed in an easier manner.

Definitions

As the realm of student conduct is like the judicial court system for higher education but includes more educational components, it is crucial to define key terms to highlight similarities and differences in terminology. This breakdown of terms gives validity to work in student conduct through revealing similarities to the legal system, and it also acknowledges the differences through the educational components. Chickering's (1969) theory directly applies as it explains how a college setting impacts students' development in various aspects including socially, emotionally, intellectually, and physically, especially regarding the formation of identity.

Accused student: MC language used to describe the accused party or the individual(s) facing accusations; the accused are the persons who reply to something or are defending themselves against accusations regarding their actions (Karp, 2013).

Complainant(s): RJ language used to describe the accusing party or the individual(s) accusing the other party of an infraction (Karp, 2013).

Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs): a college or university that was established prior to 1964 and founded on the mission to educate students of African

American descent and accredited by a nationally recognized higher education accrediting agency (What's an HBCU, 2020).

Higher education: describes the many 2-year (associate degree) and four-year (bachelor, master, doctorate, and professional degrees) institutions of higher learning that provide post-secondary education to individuals seeking education after high school, all located within the United States (Walker, 2008).

Model code (MC): traditional conduct practices that differ significantly in both the procedural practice and sanctioning process; focuses on the punitive sanctioning process, such as disciplinary warning, disciplinary probation, suspension, and expulsion, among others (Stoner & Lowery, 2004; Pavela, 1979).

Predominantly White college and university (PWI): is a term used to describe institutions in higher education where 50% or more of the student population is Caucasian or identify as Caucasian. Statistically, United States higher education is systemically rooted in predominantly Caucasian dominant institutions (What's an HBCU, 2020).

Respondent(s): RJ language used to describe the accused party or the individual(s) facing accusations (Karp, 2013).

Restorative justice (RJ): collaborative decision-making process that incorporates the respondents (alleged/offenders), complainants (accuser/victim), and others seeking to hold the alleged individual(s) accountable by (a) having the individuals hold themselves accountable for offenses by accepting and acknowledging their wrongdoing; (b) encouraging accused students to mend the harm that they have caused via their actions;

and (c) reducing the recidivism risk by forging positive social alliances with the educational community that the infraction impacted (Karp, 2013).

Mixed method: is a restorative-oriented administrative hearing; a hybrid method of sanctioning that combines the restorative goals of restoring harm and acknowledging the infraction in a one-on-one atmosphere with a conduct officer; the parties who were on the receiving end of the harm are not involved in the process but are able to provide input for the sanctioning process (Karp & Sacks, 2011).

School-to-prison pipeline: describes a trend within the school system for at least the past 10 years in which primarily minority students are funneled out of public schools and into the juvenile and criminal justice systems when infractions occur and punitive sanctions are the only sanctioning method administered (Smith, 2012).

Student development: defined as the way a student develops, evolves, or enhances their developmental abilities (psychosocial and cognitive-structural) as a result of entering into an environment of higher education (Chickering, 2014).

Student development theories: defined by Chickering (1990) as the educational psychology theories that outline how students obtain knowledge in higher education environments (Chickering, 2014).

Student conduct administrators: individuals tasked with the duties of administering the disciplinary code of conduct, adjudicating infractions of the code of conduct, and educating the institution's community within their higher education environment (Evans et al., 1998).

Student affairs administrators: university or college administrative employees responsible for the holistic cultivation and supervision of the student population while attending the institution (Sandeem, 1991).

Assumptions

One assumption that was present before the study was conducted was that more students would state that their learning increased due to the mixed method model of sanctioning. Another assumption is that due to the study being applied to an HBCU, minority students would feel that a mixed method model is more beneficial for them and avoids the school-to-prison-pipeline effect, and that the regression results for coefficients of race would demonstrate even higher significance than in the original study. There is also the assumption that participants disclosed in an honest and accurate manner due to the voluntary nature of the study.

Scope and Limitations

The data in this study was collected from students at an HBCU with a student population of 6,000 located in North Carolina in the United States. Roughly 300 students have gone through the student conduct process at the university from the 2019–2020 academic year and those students were invited to participate in the study. A minimum of 100 students participated in this study. The university was solicited with the intention of gathering data from some different geographical and economic contexts to provide a robust data pool.

The reported responses in the study were based on the participants' personal perceptions of their process and reported via a Likert scale. However, these perceptions

may not accurately depict the intention of the process, and due to some students physically accepting accountability but emotionally not accepting accountability, their responses may not be accurate. Due to the presence of self-disclosure, reporting biases may have occurred.

Limitations

In the original study, a large number of participants were included in the study; however, the ethnic and economic diversity of the participants was minimal. The types of institutions included in the original study were largely predominantly White institutions (PWIs), which potentially skewed the regression results for race and process. In the current study, the use of an HBCU created statistical data that was missing from the original study. A limitation of the study is the lack of a mixed-methods approach, the study did not capture the data that could have been extracted via a qualitative approach.

Significance

This research could affirm the importance of a collaborative sanctioning process and the effects on diverse student populations. The significance of the study could enable the original study to be reapplied to different types and sizes of institutions to further the support of student conduct reform. The findings can increase student learning and engagement during the student conduct process, advance inclusion in the institution by promoting ethical behavior and reducing recidivism rates through a more holistic process and enhance individuals' sense of community and social ties to the institution through encouraging a better understanding of how their infractions have harmed the community.

According to Wilson (2006), RJ not only increases retention numbers within institutions but also decreases recidivism rates and increases school pride among the student body.

This study also has the ability to transform how colleges and universities, specifically HBCUs, administer their sanctioning process, which according to Smith (2012) can decrease school-to-prison pipeline statistics for minority students and lower-income students in urban institutions. In essence, this study can fill the knowledge gap pertaining to the need for a mixed method sanctioning model and the effectiveness of this form of sanctioning compared to the traditional silo approaches of using solely the model code or restorative justice model.

Summary

With student development theories as the foundation of conduct processes, both sanction methods are utilized in higher education, but are not consistently implemented as a sanctioning technique for all institutions (Wilson, 2006). Colleges and universities have historically utilized one method over the other based on many variables. According to the literature, the two styles of sanctioning would not work well together, as they were not developed to fit the same demographic. There have been few, if any, studies that have disproved this historic hypothesis. Furthermore, there has been little to no research on the three styles of sanctioning and their effectiveness at HBCUs. Much of the literature on the model code, restorative justice, or mixed method either supports the singular use of the MC or paints it as an archaic use of sanctions. Other literature praises the rehabilitative efforts of restorative justice and model code suggests that it is solely responsible for developing student learning in the realm of student conduct.

Due to the lack of literature on model code, restorative justice, and mixed method practices as effective in creating accountability and student learning, the analysis of the data in the original STARR study did not acknowledge the potential effectiveness of the RJ process on different student demographics. The original STARR Project focused on various colleges and universities within the United States and the student learning that occurred within their designated conduct processes. This study focuses on the same contents, student learning that occurred during the student conduct process, and is applied to a 4-year public HBCU with a population of 6,000 students located within the United States. An HBCU is the focus of this study because no HBCUs were included in the original study's data pool.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Howe and Strauss (2000) emphasized the urgent need to understand the unique needs of today's students in institutions of higher learning. The authors highlighted the need to understand the culture and worldview of the current generation of students, which affect how they socialize, learn, and resolve conflicts. Individuals from different generations view and interpret the world differently. Generation Y comprises individuals born between 1982 and 1993, whereas the most recent generation, or the internet generation, comprises individuals born between mid-1993 and the late 1990s.

Howe and Strauss (2000) identified seven key attributes of current college students, who are largely 18 to 22 years old or slightly older at 23 to 25 years old. According to the authors, these students are more sheltered compared to previous generations, are regarded as special by their parents because they have fewer siblings to compete with, are more resourceful, are environmentally conscious, are more confident due to higher levels of parental involvement, are team oriented, experience greater pressures, and are high achieving. Parents of millennials are perceived as overly involved in the lives of their children on campus. According to Woodard et al. (2001), millennials are increasingly living in an inconsistent world that is without structure. The mass media and technology have created a world where virtually no boundaries exist, and the search for individual identity and the elimination of loneliness is a constant challenge facing this generation.

The need for the evolution of sanctioning practices in student conduct is a priority in institutions that value institutional collaboration as a means of fostering student

success. Research on the effectiveness of the model code and other student conduct approaches is scarce and inconclusive. Institutions of higher education are increasingly emphasizing student success using institution-wide departments and policies.

Literature Search Strategy

In order to identify literature that is pertinent to the study and supports both sanctioning methods, my process of searching for literature was to review the references in the original study, which led to additional articles that are similar in nature. Furthermore, researching the authors also led to additional supporting articles.

Theoretical Foundation

There are essentially two schools of thought with regards to student development: cognitive approaches and psychosocial approaches. Cognitive approaches emphasize reconstruction of thoughts and feelings that subsequently generates assumptions, values, and beliefs. Cognitive theories include Kohlberg's (1969) theory of moral development. Most psychosocial approaches are premised on the notion that development occurs sequentially and in stages that include thinking, perception, behavior, valuing, and establishing social relations. Examples of psychosocial theories are the seven vectors of development proposed by Chickering (1969) and the eight development crises identified by Erikson (1959).

Chickering's seven-vector theory, which is the theoretical foundation of the present study, views the seven vectors as a demonstration of how a student's development in a higher education institution can have a profound and lasting impact on their social, emotional, physical, and intellectual development, especially in formation of

individual identity. According to Evans (1995), Chickering's (1969) theory can be viewed as an expansion of Erikson's (1956) theory, especially in connection to issues of intimacy and identity. However, emphasis is placed on the development of a student's identity throughout their years in college. Chickering also highlighted the individual aspect of student development; thus, individual differences must be acknowledged and accounted for when delivering student services, including sanctioning.

Baldizian (1998) insisted that professionals working in student affairs departments, especially key administrators, have a mandate to act as role models of ethical behavior for students. They are well positioned to engage students in the discussion of ethical issues and effective resolution of conflicts. However, the limited research, according to Baldizian, in this area may act as an impediment to professionals' ability to have the right kind of impact on students. More research, especially studies that compare different models to student conduct procedures, would inform professionals on how to steer through political challenges, exercise moral judgment, and encourage professional evaluation, especially when they are faced with contradicting interests.

In this context, Beauchamp and Childress (2001) discussed four concepts that enable professionals in this line of work to make ethical decisions, especially when faced with conflicting interests: beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice. The first two principles are primarily based on the ethical principle of "do no harm." When teachers adopt a systematic strategy for problem solving, they also act as role models for students, who subsequently benefit.

This principle is also at the core of Chickering's (1969, 2014) perspective, which suggests that institutions of higher learning prioritize their role in ensuring the academic and social success of their students. In this perspective, matters affecting student affairs are the most important and have the most far-reaching impacts on higher education. Therefore, collaborative involvement of all departments in an institution is necessary to minimize and address misconduct and to enhance the academic experience and student life throughout students' academic careers (Lancaster & Waryold, 2008).

As Hoffman (2006) observed, the last two decades have experienced an increased use of and reference to MC conduct consequences such as expulsion and suspension. However, the increased usage of these tools has been associated with a rise in student deviance, aggression, vandalism, and disengagement. It has also been reported that such approaches are disproportionately used for minority communities, including those from racial and ethnic minorities, those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, and those with disabilities. The result has been the overrepresentation of at-risk children in legalistic student conduct proceedings, which has further jeopardized their academic achievements and placed them at even higher risk of dropping out of school.

Individuals who do not feel like they are a part of a community are likely to withdraw or engage in socially deviant behavior as a way of carving out a place for themselves in society. When the offending behavior is not resolved, the tendency of the MC approach is to increase the penalties, such as lengthening the suspension period. This approach fails to address the core of the problem, as the same students will return to the learning environment without the underlying cause of their misbehavior having been

addressed (Hoffman, 2006). This failure worsens the situation for all stakeholders involved, including the victims, perpetrators, teachers, school administration, and entire school and community. The problem is further exacerbated when the victims and perpetrators remain at the fringes of society, while the absence of perpetrators from school leads to their academic deterioration and even further marginalization.

Student Affairs

According to Thomas (2002), student conduct is regulated under guidelines provided by student affairs departments and usually determines the type of approach that an institution prefers to sanction misconduct. The department of student affairs became formalized during the 1970s. Prior to this point, student affairs primarily focused on athletic programs and administrative roles that reflected a surrogate parent approach, with an emphasis on enforcing regulations. In the wake of the racial and equal rights movements during the 1960s, institutions of higher learning were increasingly compelled to address critical matters such as sexual violence, race relationships, and substance abuse. In response, student affairs departments were expanded to include administrative staff that were skilled in such matters. The departments expanded their focus to enhancing campus safety, managing residential units, and promoting cultural awareness among other areas of discipline and adherence to rules and regulations.

Lancaster and Waryold (2008) stated that administrators of student conduct are well positioned to help students understand the decisions that they have made and how these decisions will impact them and others. These administrators have access to tools that can shape the perspectives of students, especially regarding their view of the world.

However, Lancaster and Waryold also noted that this access may increase the potential for student conduct adjudicators to exclusively rely on policy as opposed to focusing on evaluating each case on a needs basis.

The importance of pausing and reflecting on each individual situation cannot be overemphasized. This practice has the potential to create a deeper sense of meaning that results in value-based decisions (Lancaster & Waryold, 2008). It enables all stakeholders involved to view the situation from the perspective of an ethical dilemma and thus increases the potential that a well-considered solution will be reached. This deep reflection of values increases the chances that stakeholders will experience growth from simple moral awareness to expanded moral reasoning.

The RJ model is more likely to achieve this level of conflict resolution than the often-rigid rule-based MC approach. In contrast to the MC, RJ encourages stakeholders to use moral courage to find a suitable solution. Restorative justice can be used in combination with the Truth Courage Compassion (TCC) model developed by Baldizan (2006). The TCC model was created to aid in ethical decision making and is fundamentally committed to the principle of doing no harm. Similar to RJ, the TCC approach connects the actions of individuals with the desire to serve the common good.

Truth is an important element of the TCC model and entails the recognition of the facts surrounding the context and of the difference between feelings and facts (Baldizan, 2006). The model calls upon moral courage, which is the ability to evaluate all available options and opportunities in a manner that minimizes harm. The third element of the model is compassion, through which courage is tempered with a measure of empathy and

non-judgment. Applied in the RJ model, the TCC approach enables all stakeholders to recognize their mutual vulnerabilities and allows students to suitably face their own truths.

Student Development

As Duderstadt (2000) noted, students in institutions of higher learning have attributes that evolve throughout their educational careers. These transformations are underscored by students' discovery of feelings, emotions, independence, and a sense of achievement as they progress through college or university. The examination of theories of student development facilitates a deeper understanding of the character attributes of students at different stages of education and development. The concept of student development has various fundamental premises. Among them is the notion that a student's needs must be addressed holistically, and that the student should be viewed as a complete whole (Lancaster & Waryold, 2008). The holistic approach addresses various needs of the individual, including health, safety, mental and emotional needs, and social needs (Evans et al., 1998). The individual student is also viewed as a unique being, and their needs must be addressed from this perspective, including accounting for cultural, social, and biological requirements.

Another important premise of student development is that behavior occurs through a complex relationship between the individual and the environment and that the overall environment within a learning institution is educationally focused and must be directly involved in ensuring that learners achieve their highest potential (Baldizian, 2006). However, students bear responsibility for their social and personal development,

with encouragement and facilitation by the school environment. Student development also requires a setting that provides a suitable balance between support resources and a challenging learning environment.

Developmental tasks are competencies and skills that are acquired by students as they gain mastery of their environment (Baldizian, 2006). Another major concept that is at the core of the present study's purpose is that crises usually arise from an ineffective balance, especially when students lack ample skills and competencies to adequately deal with a situation. As the current student population often lacks skills for coping with their environment, students often rely heavily on their primary caregivers, such as parents and guardians.

Student Conduct Models

Evans et al. (1998) noted that professionals involved in student development tend to address student behavior from a perspective that emphasizes the holistic development of students' studies as well as the general development of the larger student community. Traditional models of student conduct focus on addressing the specific behavior of the student who has caused the harm by applying punitive sanctions against that student. Since the advent of higher education institutions, students have lived in communities with each other. Regardless of the basic differences between institutions, all institutions must address the needs of the community or individual who has experienced some form of harm (Chickering & Kytle, 1999). In a community where individuals from different backgrounds come together, it is likely that some will commit infractions against each

other or break the school's code of conduct. In such an event, a suitable framework for addressing conduct violations must be called upon.

A key role of student development practitioners is to deal with the internal issues that caused the student's initial conduct and the specific events of the misconduct. Lancaster and Waryold (2008) insisted that it is more effective when such issues are addressed from a student development perspective. When the actions of a student have adverse effects on the community, especially in a manner that goes against the mission of the institution, student development professionals become involved immediately. From this perspective, the focus is on not only the safety of other students on campus, but also efforts to ensure that the institution remains aligned with its overall vision and mission.

Abelman et al. (2007) noted that the traditional approach to dealing with student conduct usually emphasizes that actions should have specific consequences and that bad behavior should be addressed using punitive measures. However, the more unconventional approach, especially through RJ, views consequences as not necessarily punitive, but also focused on the developmental and educational needs of the perpetrator and the individual harmed.

An institution's code of conduct represents the standards that the university expects its students to uphold. Institutions have very different structures and approaches to their codes of conduct. Despite these fundamental differences, research such as that conducted by Bach (2003) suggests that the application of action and consequences is fairly consistent across institutions. In most cases, the traditional approach to student conduct procedures leaves no room for subjective interpretation of the established

standards. There are essentially two approaches to student conduct that are generally applied across most institutions of higher education in the US: the RJ approach and traditional conduct strategies. However, despite the revolutionary stance toward student conduct embodied by RJ, very few institutions of higher education, specifically HBCUs, employ the RJ approach with many preferring the MC or other traditional models.

Regardless of the size of the institution, Bach (2003) noted that every university or college has an MC, a term that is often used interchangeably with the code of conduct. Some schools use different expressions such as “moral code” or a specific term that reflects the mission and vision of the institution. The MC usually reflects the institution’s vision and mission. The focus of traditional student conduct procedures is on the school’s ability to effectively regulate the behavior of its student population using punitive sanctions (Calhoun & Pelech, 2013). Professionals and administrators of student conduct must both advocate for student development and encourage compliance with the code of conduct. The student conduct process is a part of the personal accountability of learners, as it seeks to address behavior with the aim of advancing character development and developing citizens.

Bazemore and Elis (2007) observed that schools are gradually shifting their focus from punitive sanctions to softer and more inclusive measures that address the needs of all stakeholders. As a result, researchers have acknowledged that the use of restorative measures and language in student conduct procedures calls for a similar shift from the code-of-conduct model to an RJ-based perspective. The urgency of such a shift is especially notable considering that the MC model has served to create a highly

adversarial environment based on judicial and legal procedures, furthering the school-to-prison pipeline effect especially for underrepresented and minority students (Swinton, 2008). The traditional approach also focuses on offenders and thus makes the victims feel excluded in the justice process. When the victim is not suitably involved, that individual is likely to develop unresolved relational issues within the larger student community (Calhoun & Pelech, 2013).

Actions and Consequences of Actions

Lancaster and Waryold (2008) noted that the action-versus-consequences method entails understanding the consequences of a particular action and then choosing to take the action that has the least adverse consequences. When a student violates a specific standard, for example, by bringing alcohol into a residential hall, the consequence can be seen publicly by fellow students and other administrators, especially in relation to other future violations.

Harper et al. (2005) noted that consequences can be far-reaching, especially when considering the implications of the actions for all those involved in the situation. Students who are involved (e.g., the hearing panel, the administrators who process the case, other students who witnessed the incident), as well as other sub-groups of stakeholders, may be impacted by various consequences of the actions. There is a fundamental link between the ethics of student development and student conduct professionals in how they view the impact of consequences of student misconduct (Lancaster & Waryold, 2008).

Another approach, highlighted by Lancaster and Waryold (2008), is the deontology approach. This method is primarily focused on setting rules and insisting that

stakeholders follow them. Such standards address issues such as academic dishonesty, sexual harassment, and violent behavior, among other infractions. Demonstrating that rules and regulations are the most important factors in guiding behaviors and communicating the standards of an institution to the student body are major factors in increasing adherence. However, overreliance on established rules and standards has the potential to detract focus from the individual, undermining any corrective measures that are undertaken. To remedy the situation, assessment of standards or rules should be differentiated from assessment of the offending action. A focus on rules and standards usually has the inadvertent result of making the rules more important than the consequences; therefore, care should be taken by institutions to avoid an overabundance of rules and regulations.

Restorative Justice Model

According to Braithwaite (2005), the mechanisms for correcting misconduct in many institutions often assume that the actions undertaken by individuals are exclusively driven by their individual self-interest. As a result, punishment and rewards have largely dominated regulation methods in such institutions. On the contrary, when a different view is taken, such as the premise that the behavior of individuals is largely driven by their need to affirm social relationships or to derive meaning as members of a group, institutions must recognize and account for their responsibility to nurture positive relationships among students. This responsibility includes encouraging positive relationships that foster social bonds and enable group members to view themselves in the context of social identities.

The number of institutions of higher learning adopting the RJ process as a replacement for traditional models, such as the MC, is growing. Contemporary universities and colleges are gradually shifting from a sanctions-focused approach to student conduct procedures and are adopting a philosophical shift that prioritizes RJ (Bazemore & Elis, 2007). This shift has been characterized by the application of different sets of questions in student conduct proceedings and the promotion of the restoration of harm through collaboration with the perpetrator. This approach is different from implementing penalizing and punitive measures that jeopardize the development and future outcomes of parties involved.

Bodenhorn (2006) reported that when an institution's administration perceives an opportunity for RJ procedures, the pre-conference meetings include the perpetrator of harm as well as those who have experienced harm. When all parties involved are willing to participate, the issue is addressed through group conferences with facilitators trained to undertake such proceedings (Bazemore & Elis, 2007). The aim of such conferences is to arrive at a mutually agreed upon understanding with regards to the harm that has occurred and how such harm will be redressed.

At the core of the RJ model is the notion that when student misbehavior occurs, it harms the victim as well as the larger community within the institution and other stakeholders that may be involved (Calhoun & Pelech, 2013). In contrast, traditional approaches are more interested in institutional sanctions against the offending party. When the phenomenon is viewed from the student development perspective, it is evident that education transcends the confines of a classroom. All stakeholders have an interest in

the conduct of students as well as their holistic development. Restorative justice thus succeeds because it is centered on the needs of the victim, the larger community, and other stakeholders as opposed to an exclusive focus on the perpetrator's offending behavior (Calhoun & Pelech, 2013). Perpetrators are also provided redemptive opportunities, especially by being viewed as victims of their own poor choices.

The character-based method of the RJ strategy focuses on the growth and development of all individuals involved (Lancaster & Waryold, 2008). It ensures that any sanctions that are undertaken account for the type of individual that the institution seeks to develop. The fundamental missions and visions espoused by most institutions of higher learning, which inform student conduct procedures, emphasize growth, transformation, and learning. These principles contradict with rule-based methods such as the MC due to the emphasis of RJ on rule flexibility in novel situations, which contrasts with an MC's focus on the rigid interpretation and application of rules. This comparison is at the core of this study, which ultimately seeks to understand which method, RJ or an MC, when applied to the student conduct process is more viable in contemporary higher education institutions. In many contexts, student conduct in higher education is viewed through the lens of legal and often adversarial procedures that contradict the student growth and development approach suggested by Chickering's (1969) seven-factor theory.

Lancaster and Waryold (2008) recommended that a suitable approach to student conduct procedures should focus on addressing behavioral expectations in addition to providing a framework for the discussion of behavior and providing situations for students to experience personal growth. A suitable approach should also offer the

opportunity to the school administration to strike a balance between different perspectives of student conduct procedures.

According to Karp (2004), RJ measures can be implemented through four basic practices. The first practice is the victim–offender mediation method, also referred to as victim–offender dialogue or victim–offender mediation. The design of this approach is intended to initiate and maintain dialogue between the victim and the offender for the purposes of clarification and reconciliation. The victim is provided with the opportunity to confront the perpetrator and describe the event or experience as well as pose questions to the offender. The intended outcome is to establish a restorative contract whereby the perpetrator of the negative behavior commits to make amends. The second type of RJ practice is family group decision making (Karp, 2004). This type of session includes supporters of both the victim and the offender, such as family members and friends. The supporters of both parties are invited to actively participate in the session with the goals of providing support and ensuring accountability.

The circle, also referred to as the peacemaking circle, is the third practice under RJ processes. The participants in this mediation include all parties who have been affected. Each person has a chance to address the group. Finally, the fourth type of practice is the integrity board or community panel, which consists of a panel of community members who act as mediators between the offender and the aggrieved party. According to Karp (2004), this format is similar to the judicial boards used on campuses in traditional student conduct proceedings. However, the restorative panel emphasizes

dialogue to restore relationships and ensure that the perpetrator commits to making amends.

The first intended outcome of the restorative process is a contract whereby the perpetrator is required to make a pledge that they will repair the harm committed and henceforth abide by the expected code of conduct in the institution. Restorative justice is also intended to ensure that the aggrieved party receives a meaningful apology from the offender and in turn communicates a degree of forgiveness. The apology and statement of forgiveness act as a profound foundation for repairing broken relationships and ensure that both the offender and aggrieved party are not alienated from the learning community.

The third outcome under RJ is restitution, which is usually paid by the offender as a way of making amends. However, Karp (2004) cautioned that restitution should not be perceived as a fine, as this would undermine the intended process and outcomes of RJ. The last intended outcome of RJ is enlightened community service, which should also not be mistaken for a punitive form of service. The community service is designed to be a form of reintegration for the offending student as it provides an opportunity for the student to make a pro-social statement that is evident to others in the community. This action will, in turn, facilitate stronger ties with the community when members perceive the reparative efforts being made by the offender.

Literature Review Related to Key Variables and Concepts

As Lewis (2009) observed, there is no simple solution for dealing with misconduct or violence in schools, and there have been many distinct approaches to dealing with these problems. Some of the main approaches have been the conservative

approach, which prioritizes punitive measures, and the more liberal method, which favors rehabilitation of perpetrators in combination with justice for the victims. According to Inkpen (2006), liberal approaches are compassionate means of addressing misconduct, while conservative approaches ensure accountability for the perpetrators' actions. Both approaches seek to transform behavior and ensure the safety of learning institutions. However, there is insufficient research conclusively determining the most effective approach and whether it is more effective to implement a hybrid approach that combines the two strategies.

Morrison (2005) recognized that the issue of violence and misconduct in schools has become a significant social problem over time and is a reason for concern for all stakeholders. Misconduct and violence in institutions of higher learning create extensive harm that affects not only victims of violence but also perpetrators, the school community, and society more broadly. For perpetrators, studies such as that facilitated by Slee (1995) have established that misconduct and violence are usually a progression of domineering and aggressive behavior that have developed over time. The perpetrators' victims, moreover, are subjected to long-term emotional scarring, depression, victimization, low self-confidence, and self-criticism, among other debilitating effects of violence. As a result, perpetrators and victims often experience some form of alienation from the societies in which they live. Thus, the choice of an intervention should consider the long-term impacts on both the perpetrator and the victim, and the preferred approach should seek to reduce alienation for both and ensure that they have adequate opportunities to re-establish their connection with the community.

Learning institutions are well positioned to choose the best form of intervention for school misconduct and violence. According to Bodenhorn (2006), learning institutions capture a significant part of the population base, including students; their parents; and other members of the students' support community such as extended family, teachers, instructors, friends, coaches, and the larger community. Therefore, schools are microcosms of society, and addressing student-related misconduct should include all interested parties.

Sumner, Silverman, and Frampton (2010) argued that schools have the ability to exclude and stigmatize as well as to integrate and nurture individuals within the school and larger society. In this vein, the progression through which an individual becomes a chronic offender or chronic victim in society can be determined through the cycles of serial violence or serial victimization that usually develop within the school system. School misconduct as well as victimization in learning institutions can therefore signal a failure in the creation of social relationships. In such cases, re-establishing positive relationships is necessary for the wellbeing of the victim, the perpetrator, and society as a whole.

For this reason, some K–12 institutions have begun implementing meditation rooms in lieu of in-school suspension, better known as “ISS.” Robert W. Coleman Elementary School in Baltimore, Maryland, is one example. In a crime-filled community where aggressive students are merely a product of their environment, this K–12 school decided to break the chains of the school-to-prison pipeline and systemic labeling of children and instead implemented a restorative approach to its conduct process (Bloom,

2016). The school created the “mindful moment room” in the hopes of avoiding suspensions and other disciplinary sanctions against students who are rowdy and/or disruptive to the learning environment. Students who are sent to visit the room are met with a facilitator who discusses with the student about why they were dismissed from the classroom or activity. At the conclusion of the conversation, the student is then instructed to close their eyes and participate in different breathing exercises and techniques.

At the conclusion of the session, the student is then allowed to return to the classroom or activity in a calmer state of mind (Bloom, 2016). Principal Carlillian Thompson stated that in the three years since the room’s creation, she has seen few to no students in her office for disciplinary matters and has had no suspensions in the past year: a far cry from the figures of the previous year (Bloom, 2016). Students who once were deemed “frequent fliers” of conduct issues are now model students or at least on the path to becoming such. This alternate method of discipline that not only creates accountability but also realigns the internal community within the school also creates an opportunity to restore external social dynamics in which students are a part.

This notion is affirmed by Lewis’ (2009) study which affirms the positive impact of viewing deviant behavior not in the context of individual pathology, but rather in the context of mending social relationships to sustain the wellbeing of all individuals involved. The challenge thus becomes rebuilding the lives of individuals at the first indication of a breakdown of relationships or disenfranchisement of the perpetrator or victim.

Collaborating with the perpetrator and the victim at the earliest indication of a problem is at the core of liberal interventions in general, and RJ specifically. Restorative justice recognizes the adverse effects of school misconduct and violence, which alienate both the victim and the perpetrator from society. Restorative justice targets mutual respect and accountability, as well as the promotion of human dignity. Its chief aim is building relationships and promoting social and individual wellbeing.

According to Braithwaite (1989), two characteristics are at the center of RJ processes: successful reintegration and confrontation between the victim and the perpetrator. The first element reflects that successful reintegration with society must be preceded by the participation and presence of a community of support for the victim and the perpetrator. The community should comprise individuals who care for and respect the victim and offender. Confrontation involves an opportunity for the victim to address the offender about the offense with the support of the community involved in the mediation process.

Restorative justice therefore allows the victim and community to make it clear to the perpetrator that the offence cannot be tolerated within society while at the same time providing support and respect without condoning the misbehavior (Lewis, 2009). In this regard, RJ succeeds by providing an option outside of the traditional moralistic and often punitive approaches that prioritize rules and regulations over the wellbeing of the individuals involved. While the traditional approach only looks at accountability, RJ advocates for support and care for the individuals. There is a clear effort to distinguish the offending act from the individual who perpetrated it.

Restorative justice aims at reintegrating all parties who have been affected by the misconduct back into the community, enabling them to identify with the community, and ensuring that they become cooperative members of that society who uphold its values. Indeed, researchers such as Sumner, Silverman, and Frampton (2010) have found that individuals who feel excluded from society are more likely to engage in deviant behavior compared to those who have a sense of belonging and ownership in the community. A sense of ownership enhances an individual's sense of responsibility for ensuring the wellbeing of society, while alienation increases the chance that the excluded member will not value the ideals and laws of the community toward which they do not feel a sense of ownership. In this way, RJ prevents the recurrence of violence and misconduct by acting as a facilitator of individual identities that are law-abiding.

Bradshaw et al. (2009) added that the process of RJ is further enhanced when there is a wider institutional framework and culture that reflects the essence of RJ values. Restorative justice thus functions as a proactive measure for reintegrating affected parties into society, whereas traditional interventions are more reactive in nature and aim at increasing accountability and punishing the perpetrator. Restorative justice has broad and enduring advantages as it creates a caring community that is based on participation, respect, and consideration, in addition to developing the students' skills in effective conflict resolution. Conflict resolution skills are promoted by ensuring that both the offender and victim develop emotional intelligence skills that enhance their ability to cope with emotions, especially those that typically characterize conflicts and act as a significant impediment to resolving conflicts effectively. Restorative justice is a source of

hope for all those who are impacted by aggressive behavior and other forms of misconduct.

As Morrison (2005) stated, “through focusing on relationships, the practice of restorative justice has the potential capacity to harness the development of social capital, hence maximizing quality outcomes for all members of the school community, in particular students” (p. 335–336). The author defined social capital as the social glue that binds together the social fabric, which is comprised of the many interactions that form individuals’ private and public lives. As such, personal responsibility and accountability are fostered by opportunities to participate in regulatory frameworks that develop strong social bonds. Accountability is enhanced when an individual has ample opportunities to participate in communal life. However, the ability to provide such meaningful opportunities largely depends on the investments in building institutional capabilities for implementing RJ.

A community or institution’s investments in creating participatory opportunities is in turn determined by the extent to which it perceives a responsibility to enhance the common good (Morrison, 2005). A school becomes a suitable institution to initiate participatory frameworks when it is also a key institution where the education and development of citizens takes place. Thus, social capital is cultivated and maintained by effectively developing institutions that recognize and determine the development of individual accountability and responsibility, as well as ensure mutual exchanges for upholding the responsibilities of these institutions.

When institutions foster an environment that makes students feel as though they do not belong, they inadvertently generate anti-social behavior. By fostering shared identities among students and focusing on shared goals, institutions can eliminate disenfranchisement among students and reduce incidences of misconduct and violence (Sumner, Silverman and Frampton, 2010). Restorative justice is one approach to accomplish this task due to its ability to simultaneously foster dialogue, justice, care, and respect. When students are not provided the opportunity to find a place of respect within their society, the likelihood that they will engage in deviant behavior increases.

According to Latimer et al. (2005) and Sumner, Silverman, and Frampton (2010), victims who participate in the RJ process report satisfaction with the program, especially when compared to other methods of addressing student misconduct. However, Braithwaite (2002) found conflicting reports suggesting that victim satisfaction was not high in all instances and sometimes was considerably lower compared to other groups. This disparity in satisfaction levels may be attributed to whether the victim had the opportunity to engage in a face-to-face confrontation with the offender. In some instances, the victim may opt out of a direct conference and use a mediator to communicate information.

Another dimension of examining satisfaction outcomes for victims was identified by Umbreit (1999). In this study, while victims reported being satisfied with the RJ process, they also reported that they were still upset about the crime, and a small number held concerns about re-victimization by the same offender or others. Strang et al. (2006) and Cyr (2005) reported in their respective studies that the number of victims who were

still afraid of their perpetrators was still relatively low compared to measures taken before the initiation of dialogue. There were also higher levels of empathy by the victim for the perpetrator and reduced levels of anger and distress. From the offenders' viewpoint, Latimer et al. (2005) found higher levels of satisfaction with the RJ process compared to a different program. Indeed, the satisfaction rates are higher for offenders (91%) than for victims (89%; Umbreit, 1999). Similar findings with regards to high levels of offender satisfaction have been reported in other studies (Braithwaite, 2002).

Summary

In the existing literature on the sanctioning methods used in higher education and in education more broadly, there is no consensus on which method is more effective and efficient for all institution types. Different stances are often justified by which side of the debate the party interpreting the data is on. On one end, there are individuals who feel that if a person has created some form of harm or has violated community standards, then that person has to undergo some form of MC sanctioning by receiving a "punishment," such as suspension, expulsion, fines, or even jail (Karp & Sacks, 2014). On the other end of the spectrum are practitioners whose research demonstrates that a restorative approach to mending harm created by violations of the law or community standards is the better method of adjudication.

Yet, the existing research does not truly examine the idea of combining both methods of adjudication such that they are used in a synergetic manner, repairing the harm in a holistic approach. In the present study, I focus on student learning that occurred during the student conduct process using a quantitative questionnaire from the STARR

Project. I will apply the questionnaire to the estimated 300 students who matriculated through the student conduct process from 2019–2020 while in attendance of a 4-year public, 6,000 students populated HBCU located within the United States. An HBCU is the focus of this study due to no HBCUs being included in the original STARR Project's study data pool.

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology

The purpose of this study was to quantitatively determine, through examination of six measures of student development, whether model code and mixed method was a more effective sanctioning tool to promote student learning and accountability for students matriculating through the student conduct process. The study utilized 191 students from a population of 363 who met the criteria and matriculated through the student conduct process from the 2019–2020 academic year while in attendance of a 4-year public HBCU located within the United States.

Institution's Current Conduct Process

The selected HBCU's current conduct process consists of administrative hearings, facilitated via the director of community standards & civility, area coordinators, or assistant directors, and sanction students who are responsible of conduct or academic infractions via MC hearings or HM hearings. Depending on the severity of the infractions, mitigating circumstances, all incorporating evidence, past/present conduct record, and all factors, the student will have either hearing applied to their process. When a student has very serious infractions which carry the weight of suspension or expulsion as a sanction, the student will have their hearing via a council hearing process. The council consists of students, faculty, and/or staff members that have agreed to serve as council members for the day.

Research Design and Rationale

In this study, I was interested in determining how student conduct approaches at an HBCU influence a student's identity and motivation to engage in expected behavior

after matriculating through the student conduct sanctioning process. The questionnaire I used for this study was originally created for the STARR Project, a quantitative data collection project created to obtain information from varying institutions (PWIs and community colleges) and conduct processes (i.e., MC versus RJ; Karp & Sacks, 2014). The STARR Project invited 108 institutions to participate, but only 18 colleges and universities ultimately provided data (Karp & Sacks, 2014). From the 18 colleges that participated in the STARR Project, none were HBCUs. The purpose of sampling in this study was to create an opportunity for additional data that can support appropriate conduct methods for all student demographics.

In this study, two categories of sanctioning were identified after reviewing the STARR Project's methodology:

1. Model code hearings are consistent with "best practices" in the field. Model code hearings focus on determining responsibility and administering sanctions ranging from warnings to expulsion of the accused student/respondent and are adjudicated administratively (one on one between the accused student/respondent and conduct officer) or before a conduct board (accused student/respondent and a panel of conduct members such as faculty, staff, or students).
2. Mixed model hearings which are restorative-oriented administrative hearings, which are a combination of model code hearings and restorative justice practices, combining the holistic approach of restorative justice practices with the one-on-one structure of model code hearings (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

Restorative justice practices reflect a more holistic approach in which the conduct officer creates a dialogue between the accused student/respondent, who has already admitted responsibility, and the members of the community who were affected by the student's infraction (Karp & Sacks, 2014). The communication among all parties focuses on identifying the harm done, repairing the damage through communication, and rebuilding trust among all members via tasks that must be completed by the accused student/respondent to make amends with the campus community (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

This study utilized the same theories outlined in the STARR Project to retain consistency in assessment implementation. The theories utilized were Chickering's seven vectors and Astin's involvement theory (Karp & Sacks, 2014). These theories identified, six student development goals, which will then be quantitatively assessed via the questionnaire that will be completed by students who have experienced the student conduct process during the 2019–2020 academic year at the designated HBCU.

Dependent Variables

To establish the variable for student development, a composite interval ratio measure was developed from the six subscales; based on the student development and RJ theory (Karp & Sacks, 2014). The subscales were originally created in the STARR Project and utilized for this study. The scales gauge the following: (a) community/self-authorship, (b) active accountability, (c) interpersonal competence, (d) social ties to the institution, (e) procedural fairness, and (f) closure. The scales were chosen based on real-world applicability, with particular consideration given to the educational environment of

day-to-day student conduct administration and based on historical data from literature on the matter (Karp & Sacks, 2014). Cronbach's alpha was used to test the statistical reliability of each scale (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

Independent Variable

The independent variables were measured at the categorical level and assessed were type of hearing process, specific types of violations, the egregiousness of the infraction (i.e., suspension-worthy case, created harm to the community, and if the campus or local police were associated with the case), and the respondent students' demographics (i.e., ethnicity, gender, and classification; Karp & Sacks, 2014). It was projected that due to the HBCUs student body being more heavily populated by women, but statistically having more men going through the conduct process, there would be an even number of women and men in the data pool.

Research Design

A survey instrument was used to facilitate this study. The survey was originally created for the STARR Project (Karp & Sacks, 2013). The six parameters of student development identified from the Karp and Sacks (2013) student offender survey were the following:

- Just community/self-authorship (i.e., "I had a voice"): This parameter pertains to the active participation of the respondent in the decision-making process. The student development goal of internalizing university or external community standards is aligned with the student's behavior, which is guided by the ethical responsibilities associated with being a member of the

community. The outcomes of the questionnaire that indicate success in achieving this student development goal were a rating of 4 or 5 on the Likert scale for the following questions: (a) “To what extent were you given options in how the case would be handled?” (b) “To what extent were you able to communicate your thoughts and feelings about the incident?” (c) “How much were you able to meaningfully contribute your ideas towards the outcome?” (d) “To what extent was the outcome tailored for you and your situation?”

- Active accountability (i.e., “I took responsibility”): This parameter pertains to how much respondents understood how their behavior was a violation of the university rules and regulations and how their behavior affected others involved, as well as their willingness to take ownership to rectify the situation. The outcomes of the questionnaire that measure success toward this goal were a rating of 4 or 5 on the Likert scale for the following questions: (a) “How much did the process help you take responsibility for the consequence of the incident?” (b) “To what extent did the outcome focus on repairing the harm that was caused by this incident?” (c) “To what extent did the outcomes create opportunities to respond to larger social issues that are relevant to the incident (research on alcohol issues, research on marijuana usage in college environments, etc.)?”
- Interpersonal competence (i.e., “I talked it out”): This parameter pertains to the openness of respondents to listen to others’ perspectives, articulate remorse, and put forth effort to repair relationships that were damaged due to

the infraction so that all parties can co-exist civilly in the university community. The outcomes of the questionnaire that measure success were a rating of 4 or 5 on the Likert scale for the following questions: (a) “How much did the process help you to understand the point of view of those most affected?” (b) “To what extent did the process offer an opportunity to give a sincere apology to those most affected?” (c) “To what extent was a sincere apology offered during this process?” (d) “To what extent would you now feel comfortable seeing the others involved in the incident around campus or in the community?”

- Social ties to the institution (i.e., “I belong here”): This parameter pertains to the respondents’ relationship to the university community, including positive communication and interactions with campus administrators and police. The outcomes of the questionnaire that measure success in achieving this student development goal were a rating of 4 or 5 on the Likert scale for the following questions: (a) “How much did the process help you to understand your responsibilities as a member of the community?” (b) “As a result of this process, I have a greater appreciation for the campus administrators involved in my case (such as deans, housing and residence life staff, conduct officers, etc.).” (c) “As a result of this process, I have a greater appreciation for campus safety officers.”
- Procedural fairness (i.e., “That was fair”): This parameter pertains to the respondents’ understanding that the conduct process was impartial and fair,

reaffirming that the conduct process and the university's rules and regulations are legitimate. The outcomes of the questionnaire that measure success regarding this goal were a rating of 4 or 5 on the Likert scale for the following questions: (a) "To what extent did you receive the information needed for you to confidently participate in this process?" (b) "How much did the process include people who could offer you counsel and support?" (c) "To what extent did you feel respected throughout the process?" 4) "To what extent was the process fair to all parties?"

- Closure (i.e., "I'm ready to move on"): This parameter pertains to the respondent's satisfaction with the process, from facing their infraction to gaining closure and discussing positive future interactions. The outcomes of the questionnaire measure assessing success regarding this goal were a rating of 4 or 5 on the Likert scale for the following questions: (a) "Overall, how satisfied are you with the way this process was handled?" (b) "Overall, how satisfied are you with the outcomes of this process?" (c) "How much did the process help you bring closure to this situation?"

Methodology

I employed a quantitative methodology when conducting this study. A quantitative methodology emphasized objective measurements and statistical/numerical data via questionnaires/surveys, polls, or the quantification of pre-existing numerical data using computer techniques or systems. A quantitative methodology was chosen over a

qualitative methodology due to its ability to condense a large amount of data to answer the study's research questions.

When collecting data, cases were only included in the study if the respondent/in-violation student was found responsible/in-violation for the infraction. Only cases that included submissions of the respondent's survey were added to the dataset to remain in accordance with the STARR Project (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The identified research gap is the limited knowledge on the comparative efficacy of the model code and restorative justice. There is also no known data on the use of the mixed method model that combines both the model code and restorative justice, at an HBCU. The research questions for the study thus reflect the key objective, exploring the efficacy of both models in supporting student learning at an HBCU. The research questions and hypotheses were derived from existing literature on student conduct, restorative justice, and model code and from the STARR Project (2013).

RQ1. Will the coefficients for the six measures of student development reveal more significant regression results when the student underwent a traditional administrative hearing (model code) or an administrative hearing with restorative justice components (mixed method)?

*H*₁₁: The regression results will affirm that the model applied to a student's conduct process (model code and mixed method hearing) will significantly predict active measures of student development (just community/self-authorship, active accountability, interpersonal competence, social ties to institution, procedural fairness, and closure).

*H*₀₁: The regression results will not affirm that the model applied to a student's conduct process (model code and mixed method hearing) will significantly predict active measures of student development (just community/self-authorship, active accountability, interpersonal competence, social ties to institution, procedural fairness, and closure).

RQ2. Will the Likert scale responses to the six measures of student development in the student survey reveal that traditional administrative hearing processes (model code) score higher or lower than administrative hearings with restorative justice components (mixed method)?

*H*₁₂: Participants who reported their opinions via Likert scale responses on the six measures of student development will report gaining more learning opportunities (success) from administrative hearings with restorative justice components (mixed method) over the traditional administrative hearing process.

*H*₀₂: Participants who reported their opinions via Likert scale responses on the six measures of student development will not indicate a higher score for administrative hearings with restorative justice components (mixed method) over the traditional administrative hearing process.

Population

The target population of the study were students who were found in-violation/responsible for behavioral or academic conduct policy infractions at a 4-year public, 6,000 students populated HBCU located in the United States. The data pool consisted of 363 students who went through the conduct process during the 2019–2020

academic year. Based on a power analysis, 169 was the minimum sample size needed to meet the minimum size for detecting effect at .80.

Sampling and Sampling Procedures

The University is in North Carolina and a public university in the University of North Carolina System. This university was selected for the study due to the type of institution and demographic makeup of the students in attendance. The university's background, population size, demographic, and location was selected in an attempt to create a diverse range of data results for analysis that previously had not been included in past published studies, such as the STARR Project. Table 1 details the characteristics of institutions that participated in the STARR Project (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

Table 1

Characteristics of Participating Institutions in the STARR Project

School	No. of Cases	Public/Private	Size ^a	Religious	Process
1	31	Public	Medium	Secular	Model code
2	8	Public	Large	Secular	Model code/restorative justice
3	27	Public	Large	Secular	Model code/restorative justice
4	61	Public	Large	Secular	Model code/restorative justice
5	9	Public	Medium	Secular	Restorative justice
6	44	Public	Large	Secular	Model code/restorative justice
7	80	Private	Small	Religious	Model code/restorative justice
8	14	Public	Large	Secular	Model code
9	3	Public	Medium	Secular	Restorative justice
10	64	Private	Large	Religious	Restorative justice
11	41	Public	Large	Secular	Model code
12	57	Public	Large	Secular	Model code
13	47	Public	Medium	Secular	Model code/restorative justice

14	36	Public	Large	Secular	Model code
15	16	Public	Large	Secular	Restorative justice
16	10	Private	Small	Secular	Model code/restorative justice
17	62	Public	Medium	Secular	Model code
18	49	Public	Large	Secular	Model code
Total = 659					

^a Carnegie classifications define population size as the following: Small = 1,000–2,999; Medium = 3,000–9,999; and Large = 10,000+.

The sample population was selected from respondent/in-violation students who completed their student conduct process during the 2019–2020 academic year while in attendance of a public HBCU. The data pool was emailed a 28-item survey to collect descriptive data and student development measures. The survey responses were analyzed via the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Several independent variables were collapsed to increase the effect and power size for the statistical analyses. These steps were implemented to remain in congruency with the STARR Project’s steps of implementation (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

The data were evaluated using inferential and descriptive statistical procedures such as *t* tests, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and multiple binary regression (Karp & Sacks, 2014). The application of standard multiple regression was used to verify the accuracy of the six student development outcomes (Karp & Sacks, 2014). A missing data analysis was also conducted to ensure that the results would be equivalent with or without imputation of data; therefore, all analyses would be completed without data imputation (Karp & Sacks, 2014). The tool utilized to calculate the inferential statistical procedures was SPSS Statistics.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

Due to the use of the STARR Project's questionnaire and data collection process, I did not have to recreate a recruitment process. Since only one university was utilized in my study, I minimized the recruitment process by creating a generalized email petitioning selected students to complete the questionnaire. The email was disseminated via the university list serve to each individual student's email account. The participation pool was students who went through the conduct process during the 2019–2020 academic year. The participation pool consisted of students who have had adjudicated cases for any academic misconduct and behavioral conduct. There were 363 students within the participation pool. The pre-existing questionnaire and consent form was utilized are from the STARR Project study. The questionnaire was modified to incorporate demographic information and type of hearing. There was no specific identifiers added to the survey to maintain anonymity. To gain permission to reuse the contents of the study for my dissertation, I submitted a one-question electronic form to Copyright Clearance Center on the Rights Link page of Taylor & Francis Publishing Group. Taylor & Francis Group gave immediate permission to reuse the contents for a thesis or dissertation for free, contingent on resubmission of the permission form if I choose to publish my final dissertation. No formal letter was needed to ask for permission (see Appendix A).

To gain access to the 28-item student questionnaire, I first visited the website for the STARR Project (www.campusrj.com) that was listed in the study. The questionnaire was not available for public viewing. Therefore, I contacted Dr. David Karp, co-author and creator of the STARR Project study, via the phone number listed on the University of

San Diego's School of Leadership and Educational Sciences faculty page. However, I received an email from Dr. Karp, who stated that due to wanting to simplify the website aesthetics, he had removed the link to the study's questionnaire. He provided all questionnaires used in the study (see Appendix B).

Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs

There was one questionnaire that was used for the study. The questionnaire is from the STARR Project and was created by Dr. David Karp and Dr. Casey Sacks (Karp & Sacks, 2013). In this study, the survey was completed by students who went through the conduct process during the 2019–2020 academic year. The questionnaire was recreated with the assistance of the HBCU's Office of Institutional Assessment and Research so that their university system can facilitate the process for survey completion. This ensured validity of the questionnaire dissemination and void the process of the ability to tamper with any student questionnaire responses. The 28-item questionnaire allowed students to report specific demographic information and responses related to student development. This method follows the directives of the STARR Project (Karp & Sacks, 2014). The contents of the email were submitted to student participants. The 28-item questionnaire questions were also categorized to reflect the six measures of student development. This is displayed via Table 2, below.

Table 2*Cronbach's Alpha's for the Six Measures of Student Development*

Measures	Questions	Cronbach Alpha's
Just Community/Self Authorship	2, 4, 9,	($\alpha=.79$)
Active Accountability	10, 11, 17, 19,	($\alpha=.71$)
Interpersonal Competence	5, 7, 8, 22,	($\alpha=.75$)
Social ties the Institution	16, 20, 21,	($\alpha=.76$)
Procedural Fairness	1, 3, 6, 14,	($\alpha=.74$)
Closure	12, 13, 18,	($\alpha=.87$)

Threats to Validity

The scales that were utilized in this study were originally created for the STARR Project as measures of student development and draw directly from student development theories and RJ theories (Karp & Sacks, 2014). To ensure that the study is applied to the HBCU correctly, the same scales were used. The six scales were created to measure specific indicators in student development that promote student learning (Karp & Sacks, 2014). There is little threat to validity, as the six scales were specifically constructed for theoretical validity and practical application to administrators in the realm of student conduct (Karp & Sacks, 2014). In the STARR Project, the statistical reliability of the scales was calculated via Cronbach's alpha (Karp & Sacks, 2014). Therefore, for the application of the questionnaire to the HBCU participants, the statistical reliability of the scales was also calculated via Cronbach's alpha. Threats to validity will also be minimized through the use of a pre-existing construct, non-transformed data for the analysis, and the lack of univariate outliers (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

Ethical Procedures

To remain consistent with the STARR Project, the consent form used in this study was the STARR Project's consent form. A general email was sent out to the pool of students who went through a conduct case during the 2019–2020 academic year via the HBCU's list serve system. Within the contents of the email, it stated the purpose of the questionnaire, informed participants that they can withdrawal their questionnaire at any time, that their information will remain confidential, and that the information gathered from the questionnaire will only be used for the study. The study's participants were treated in a fair and amicable manner throughout their questionnaire submission time frame and will not be pressured to complete the questionnaire. My ethical concern is that if incentives such as gift cards or reduction of sanctions were offered to students who participate, then bias could occur in responses. Therefore, there was no compensation given to those who participated in order to ensure honest responses. Institutional permissions were not required for the present study as I work at the current institution and used a participation pool from the HBCU I am currently work at.

Regarding the confidentiality of the students, only basic demographic information was collected from the participants and no identifiers that could be used to identify individual students was gathered. A general waiver of confidentiality was created and submitted to participants at the beginning of the survey. The data was collected, stored, and disseminated, via the HBCU's Office of Institutional Assessment and Research. Finally, there were no ethical concerns pertaining to the work environment in which the study was conducted.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to quantitatively determine, through comparing six measures of student development, whether model code or mixed method hearing is a more effective sanctioning tool at an HBCU to promote student learning and accountability and to compare the learning outcomes of the conduct processes. This study assessed the estimated 300 responses of students who have had conduct cases adjudicated, behavioral and academic cases, from the 2019–2020 academic year. The responses from the 28-item questionnaire for students, that was created for the STARR Project, were quantified. This study applied the model used in the STARR Project to determine if there was a significant change in responses based on the six indicators of student learning and development.

The types of hearings that were assessed are broken down into two categories of sanctioning: 1) Model code hearings, which are consistent with best practices in the field, focus on determining responsibility and administering sanctions ranging from warnings to expulsion of the accused student/respondent. Model code hearings are adjudicated administratively (one on one between the accused student/respondent and conduct officer) or before a conduct board (accused student/respondent and a panel of conduct members such as faculty, staff, or students) and 2) Mixed method model, which is a restorative-oriented administrative hearing, being a mixture of model code hearings, restorative justice practices, and with the holistic approach of restorative justice practices in a one-on-one structure of MC hearings (Karp & Sacks, 2014).

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to quantitatively determine, through examination of six measures of student development, whether model code or mixed method is a more effective sanctioning tool to promote student learning and accountability for students matriculating through the student conduct process. There were 363 students that matriculated through the student conduct process from the 2019–2020 academic year while in attendance of a 4-year public HBCU with a population of 6,000 students located in the United States.

Data Collection

The participation pool was composed of students who went through the conduct process during the 2019–2020 academic year. After receiving IRB approval (No. 01-28-21-0364381) to commence the study, using the data pool software that I had internal access to, I was able to determine a more accurate number of students who had cases adjudicated for academic and behavioral conduct. In total, there were 363 students who qualified to be within the participation pool (see Table 3). The pre-existing questionnaire and consent form from the STARR Project study was redrafted into a Google document. The questionnaire was modified to incorporate demographic information and to create the ability to identify the type of hearing the student matriculated through (refer to Appendix B). An invitation email was submitted to the participation pool's university email address.

The Google document for the questionnaire were open and accessible from February 17 to March 10, 2021. In total, 191 participants completed the questionnaire.

Based on a power analysis, 169 was the minimum sample size needed to meet the minimum size for detecting effect at .80. The sample of 191 students was a sufficient sample for this study. The independent variables of the participants that are being used in the study can be referred to in Table 3. The six measures are hearing process, race, primary violation, sex, seriousness of case, and classification.

Treatment and/or Intervention Fidelity

The intervention fidelity of the project went better than expected, as I assumed that due to the climate of COVID-19, students would not respond as quickly as they did. Yet, because of the electronic environment that society has been forced to adapt to this past year, students have had to become acclimated to an all-online platform where email communication has become essential. This has then made it mandatory for students to constantly check their emails, which may have increased responses and response time to the questionnaire. This attentiveness to electronic communication appeared to have increased my initial goal and target outcome.

After gathering the 191 responses from the Google form questionnaire, the responses were coded, and scores notated via a Microsoft Excel form. Data were then run through IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 28.0) with the tolerance statistics exceeding 0.1 for all variables. Data were also analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical procedures, including *t* tests, ANOVA, and multiple binary regression. Standard multiple regression was conducted to determine the accuracy of the independent variables predicting the six student development outcomes.

Independent Variables

The type of hearing process, type of violation, the seriousness of the violation and respondent's demographics – race, sex, and class year were controlled for in this study. Table 3 provides descriptive statistics for these independent variables. Of note, most cases examined used a mixed method model hearing (55%), drug misuse was identified as the primary violation in 31.9% of all cases, most cases were considered moderately serious violations (42.9%), and most of the respondents were African American (85.3%), female (63.9%), and freshmen or sophomores (78.1%).

Table 2*Independent Variables for Conduct Cases*

Variable	No. of respondent cases (Solicited)	No. of respondent cases (Participating)	Percentage %
Hearing process			
Mixed method model hearing	191	105	55.0
Model code hearing	172	86	45.0
Total:	363	191	100.0
Respondent's Race			
African American	340	163	85.3
Hispanic	22	14	7.3
White	6	6	3.1
Other	16	8	4.2
Primary violation			
Academic integrity	0	0	0.0
Alcohol	54	38	19.9
Person	44	31	16.2
Property	54	16	8.4
Drug	124	61	31.9
Other	87	45	23.6
Respondent's sex			
Male	134	70	36.6
Female	229	121	63.4
Transgender	0	0	0.0
Did not disclose	0	0	0.0
Seriousness of case			
Not serious	92	40	20.9
Mildly serious	118	65	34.0
Moderately serious	145	82	42.9
Very serious	8	4	2.1
Respondent's classification			
Freshmen	155	83	43.5
Sophomore	98	66	34.6
Junior	57	30	15.7
Senior	53	12	6.3

ANOVA and Independent *t*-test Analysis

Based on the results of the ANOVA Analysis the mean for student development (just community/self-authorship, active accountability, interpersonal competence, social ties to institution, procedural fairness, and closure) there was no significant difference between the model code and mixed method model hearing process, $F(1,189) = 2.106$, $p = .148$, > 0.05).

Table 3

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Student Development by Hearing Process

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between groups	1	.053	.053	2.106	.148
Within groups	189	4.737	.025		
Total	190	7.790			

The results of the independent samples *t* test revealed that, when examining student development, the data suggest that students gained more learning opportunities (success) from the mixed method model than the model code hearing process, ($\bar{X} = 3.09$, $SD = .151$). This difference was not statistically significant ($p = .148$) or statistically important ($d = .158$) as it only had a small effect/impact on student development.

Table 4*Independent Sample t-test for Hearing Process and Student Development*

Student development	X	SD	t	Sig.	d
Hearing process					
Model Code	3.05	.166	-1.451	.148	.158
Mixed Method	3.09	.151			

Multiple Binary Regression Analysis

Regression results indicate that the independent variables (i.e., violation, process, seriousness, race, sex, and class year) did not significantly affect student development model. However, these variables accounted for 5.3% effect on interpersonal competence ($R^2_{adj} = .053$, $R^2 = .230$, $F(6, 191) = 1.710$, $p = .121$, $> .005$). Table 6 indicates that race significantly impacted interpersonal competence in the student development process.

Table 5*Coefficients of Interpersonal Competence*

Coefficients	B	β	t	p	Partial r
Violation	.535	.133	1.591	.113	.117
Process	.034	.009	.116	.908	.009
Seriousness	.577	.144	1.730	.085	.127
Race	-1.276	-.166	-2.268	<.024	-.165
Sex	.070	.017	.231	.817	.017
Class Year	.124	.026	.349	.728	.026

Note. Categorical variables were transformed into binary variables.

Regression results indicate that the independent variables (i.e., violation, process, seriousness, race, sex, and class year) did not significantly affect procedural fairness ($R^2_{adj} = .057$, $R^2 = .087$, $F(6, 191) = 2.922$, $p = .010$, $> .005$). This accounts for 5.7% of

procedural fairness effect on student development. Table 10 indicates that class year significantly effects procedural fairness in the student development process.

Table 6

Coefficients of Procedural Fairness

Coefficients	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial <i>r</i>
Violation	-.361	-.157	-1.905	.058	-.139
Process	-.031	-.013	-.186	.853	-.014
Seriousness	-.194	-.084	-1.031	.304	-.076
Race	-.285	-.065	-.898	.370	-.066
Sex	.045	.019	.266	.791	.020
Class Year	.638	.230	3.179	<.002	.228

Note. Categorical variables were transformed into binary variables.

Summary

A total of 191 students participated in this study to explore methods of sanctioning, namely the model code and mixed method model, and to examine their impact on the student learning experience for minority students who attend an HBCU. The analyses revealed that most cases examined used a mixed model code hearing. Also, drug misuse was identified as the primary violation, most cases were considered moderately serious violations, and most of the respondents were African American, female, and underclassmen (i.e., freshman and sophomore).

The binary regression analysis also revealed that in testing the model of student development (just community/self-authorship, active accountability, interpersonal competence, social ties to institution, procedural fairness, and closure). Interpersonal competence and procedural fairness were found to be the only variables significantly impacting the model. The following chapter will provide a discussion, conclusion and recommendations for future studies on model code and mixed method model code

hearings to promote learning and accountability for students transitioning through the student conduct process.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This study quantitatively determined, through the examination of six measures of student development, whether MC or HM is a more effective sanctioning tool to promote student learning and accountability for students matriculating through the student conduct process. The study utilized the responses of 191 participants out of a pool of 363 respondent students who matriculated through the student conduct process from the 2019–2020 academic year while in attendance of a 4-year public HBCU with a population of 6,000 students located in the United States.

Interpretation of the Findings

The purpose of this study was to explore methods of sanctioning, namely the MC and HM, and to examine their impact on the student learning experience for minority students who attend an HBCU. The study was interested in understanding how different student conduct approaches influence students' identities and motivation to engage in desired behavior after matriculating through the student conduct sanctioning process. Furthermore, the study sought to understand how different approaches applied to an HBCU, shape students' outlooks on accountability. To achieve this objective, the study examined the overall effectiveness of MC hearings, and HM hearings in higher education via data that was collected from a quantitative assessment that was previously used in the STARR Project.

The sample for this study included 191 students to explore methods of sanctioning, namely the model code and mixed method model code, and to examine their impact on the student learning experience for minority students who attend an HBCU.

The majority of students were African American, female, and enrolled as freshmen or sophomores. In terms of their cases, the majority of the students identified drug misuse as the primary violation. Most cases were also considered moderately serious violations.

There were two research questions explored for this study. RQ1 was Will the coefficients for the six measures of student development reveal more significant regression results when the student underwent a traditional administrative hearing model code or a mixed method model code? A model and composite measure of student development (i.e., just community/self-authorship, active accountability, interpersonal competence, social ties to the institution, procedural fairness, and closure) was tested using multiple binary regression in this study. The analyses conducted for this study revealed that only two measures (i.e., interpersonal competence and procedural fairness) in the student conduct process was found to be significant in predicting active measures of student development.

This means that upper class students experienced a greater amount of procedural fairness in their student conduct process, which is an indication that the process was fair and helped them in their openness to listen to others' perspectives, articulate remorse, and put forth effort to repair relationships that were damaged to maintain community. The regression results affirmed that the model applied to a student's conduct process (model code or mixed method) did significantly predict active measures of student development for interpersonal competence and procedural fairness but not for just community/self-authorship, active accountability, social ties to institution, and closure.

The second research question explored in this study was Will the Likert scale responses to the six measures of student development in the student survey reveal that traditional administrative hearing processes model code score higher or lower than mixed method model code? Overall, the student responses to the six measures of student development in the disciplinary process revealed that the traditional model code score was lower than the mixed method model score; However, there was no significant difference between the two models among student development process measures. Therefore, students reported gaining more learning opportunities (success) from mixed method model code over the traditional administrative hearing process model code.

Limitations of the Study

Due to the data pool not being as large as I would have preferred and having majority freshmen and sophomores respond to the questionnaire, the overall data pool was not as diverse as I would have hoped. The major limitation in the study was a lack of responses from respondents of suspension level cases. This was the same issue from the original study. Since the student development outcome, procedural fairness, was the primary outcome to produce significance in predicting active measures of student development, students who were suspended/expelled may have been unlikely to participate due to not wanting to acknowledge the accuracy of the process.

Recommendations

For the future, I would apply this study to a larger HBCU that implements both methods of conduct hearings, a community college that not only utilizes both hearing processes but also has a more diverse student demographic, and a PWI that uses both

hearing processes, but has at least a 10% or more minority population. Applying the study to these three specific types of institutions should create a robust data pool that would assist in the process of determining which six measures affect active measures of student development. The findings could then revolutionize the educational sanctioning processes used in the realm of conduct, but also create more intentional and impactful proactive education.

Implications

This research could show the diverse students' perspective of what they have obtained from having a collaborative sanctioning process. If this research produces a solid level of significance, it has a strong ability to increase student learning and engagement, create and increase inclusion in colleges and universities, reduce recidivism rates, and enhances an individuals' sense of community in self. This study also has the potential to change how colleges and universities administer their sanctioning process which could eventually decrease the school to prison pipeline statistics for not only minority students, but for statistically lower income students who are more likely affected long term by the sanctioning process.

Conclusion

Overall, this study can create a major impact with student conduct administration as they are creating educational processes focused on learning outcomes that are long-term impactful. The study also showed the importance of implementing evidence-based practices in not only our educational curriculum as a part of institutions' proactive education, but also have it incorporated in our restorative education in the aftermath of

the actions. This study also showed that while model code hearings and sanctioning processes do not produce as much student learning significance as mixed method model hearings and sanctioning processes, there is still a need for implementation especially when there are respondents who refuse to take ownership for their part in the infraction. Egregious infractions also need to have a balance of punitive and restorative components to encourage any form of reduced recidivism. By implementing a mixed method model hearing and sanctioning process in all colleges and universities, regardless of demographics and institution type, it could reduce the “one size fits all” conduct mentality that is too often plaguing higher education.

References

- Abelman, R., Atkin, D., Dalessandro, A., Snyder-Suhy, S., & Janstova, P. (2007). The trickle-down effect of institutional vision: Vision statements and academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 27(1), 4-21. <https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-27.1.4>
- Astin, A. W. (1996). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(2), 123-34. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ527217>
- Bach, J. J. (2003). Students have rights, too: The drafting of student conduct codes. *Brigham Young University Education & Law Journal*, 2003(1), Article 2. <https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1152&context=eli>
- Baldizian, E. M. (2006). The TCC model: Ethics in action. *Student Affairs Law and Policy Weekly*, 4(8).
- Bazemore, G., & Elis, L. (2007). Evaluation of restorative justice. In G. Johnstone & D. W. Van Ness (Eds.), *Handbook of restorative justice* (397-425). Routledge.
- Bloom, D. (2016, November 08). *Instead of detention, these students get meditation*. CNN. <https://www.cnn.com/2016/11/04/health/meditation-in-schools-baltimore/index.html>
- Bodenhorn, N. (2006). Exploratory study of common and challenging ethical dilemmas experienced by professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling*, 10(2), 195-202. <https://doi.org/10.5330/prsc.10.2.e1734087234675u4>
- Bradshaw, C. P., Koth, C. W., Thornton, L. A., & Leaf, P. J. (2009). Altering school

climate through schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports:

Findings from a group-randomized effectiveness trial. *Prevention Science*, 10(2), 100-115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-008-0114-9>

Braithwaite, J. B. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge University Press.

Braithwaite, J. B. (1999). Restorative justice: Assessing optimistic and pessimistic accounts. *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, 25, 1-127.

<https://doi.org/10.1086/449287>

Calhoun, A., & Pelech, W. (2013). The impact of restorative and conventional responses to harm on victims: A comparative study. *British Journal of Community Justice*, 11(1), 63-84.

<https://www.proquest.com/openview/a729066d26915cd64f8c178dca510c4c/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=38621>

Chickering, A. W., & Kytle, J. (1999). The collegiate ideal in the twenty-first century. In J. D. Toma & A. J. Kezar (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the collegiate ideal (New directions for higher education*, Vol. 105, pp. 109-120). Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Dannells, M., & Lowery, J. W. (2004). Discipline and judicial affairs. In F. J. D. MacKinnon & Associates (Eds.), *Student affairs functions in higher education* (3rd ed., pp.152-217). Charles C. Thomas.

Davis, M. (2015). *Restorative justice: Resources for schools*. Edutopia. Retrieved March

8, 2014, from <https://www.edutopia.org/blog/restorative-justice-resources-matt-davis>

Duderstadt, J. (2000). *A university for the 21st century*. University of Michigan Press.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student Development in College*. Jossey-Bass.

Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (2008). *Research methods in the social sciences* (7th ed.). Worth.

Fusch, D. (2012). *Applying a restorative justice approach to student conduct*. Academic Impressions. <https://www.academicimpressions.com/blog/applying-a-restorative-justice-approach-to-student-conduct/>

Gardner, S. (2009). Student development theory: A primer. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 34(6), 15-28. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ835648>

Hamlin, J. B. (2011, December). Restorative justice: An answer to the call of the gospel of St. Mark for service and reconciliation. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(19), 277-285.

<https://www.sandiego.edu/conduct/documents/ReligionandRJ.pdf>

Harper, S. R., Harris, F., III, & Mmeje, K. (2005). A theoretical model to explain the overrepresentation of college men among campus judicial offenders: Implications for campus administrators. *NASPA Journal*, 42(4), 565-588.

<https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1541>

Hoffman, M. T. (2006). Issues in school violence research [Review of the book *Issues in school violence research*, by M. Furlong, G. Morrison, R. Skiba, & D. Cornell,

- Eds., and the book *Kids and violence: The invisible school experience*, C. Dulmus & K. Sowers, Eds.]. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics*, 27(6), 509. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004703-200612000-00011>
- Karp, D. R. (2004). Introducing restorative justice to the campus community. In D. Karp & T. Allena (Eds.), *Restorative justice on the college campus: Promoting student growth and responsibility and reawakening the spirit of campus community* (pp. 5-15). Charles C Thomas.
- Karp, D. R. (2009). Reading the scripts: The restorative justice conference and the student conduct hearing board. In J. Meyer Schrage & N. Geist Giacomini (Eds.), *Reframing campus conflict: Student conduct process through a social justice lens* (pp. 155-174). Stylus Publishing.
- Karp, D. R., & Conrad, S. (2005). Restorative justice and college student misconduct. *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal*, 5, 315-333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-005-5094-7>
- Karp, D. R., & Sacks, C. (2014). Student conduct, restorative justice, and student development: Findings from the STARR Project (Student Accountability and Restorative Research Project). *Contemporary Justice Review*, 17(2), 154–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2014.915140>
- Kohlberg, L., & Mayer, R. (1972). Development as the aim of education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 42(4), 449-496. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.42.4.kj6q8743r3j00j60>
- Lancaster, J. M., & Waryold, D. M. (2008). *Student conduct practice: The complete*

guide for student affairs professionals. Stylus Publishing.

Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The effectiveness of restorative justice practices: A meta-analysis. *The Prison Journal*, 85(2), 127-144.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885505276969>

Levit, A. (2015, March 28). Make way for Generation Z. *The New York Times*.

https://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/29/jobs/make-way-for-generation-z.html?_r=0

Lewis, S. (2009). *Improving school climate: findings from schools implementing restorative practices*. International Institute on Restorative Practices.

Lipka, S. (2009, April 17). With 'Restorative justice,' colleges strive to educate student offenders. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://chronicle.com/article/With-Restorative-Justice-/30557>

Morrison, B. (2005). Practicing restorative justice in school communities: The challenge of culture change. *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal*, 5(4), 335-357.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-005-5095-6>

Ortiz, A. M. (1999). The student affairs establishment and the institutionalization of the collegiate ideal. In J. D. Toma and A. J. Kezar (Eds.), *New directions for higher education: Vol. 105: Reconceptualizing the collegiate ideal* (pp. 47-57) Jossey-Bass.

Pavela, G. (1979). Limiting the "Pursuit of Perfect Justice" on Campus: A Proposed Code of Student Conduct. *Journal of College and University Law*, 6, 137-160.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ219793>

Reindl, T. (2004). The Quiet crisis: How higher Education is failing America. *College*

and *University*, 80(2), 58-59.

<https://www.proquest.com/openview/4dbdfd878c60ebbe5929b46fc5489f6d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=1059>

Restorative Justice: Students' Voice (2010). In *Michigan State University: Department of Student Life-Restorative Justice*. <https://studentlife.msu.edu/fall-welcome/events-fall-welcome/sl-full-version-2020-web-pdf.pdf>

Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2007). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content* (3rd ed., pp. 87-115). SAGE.

Sandeen, A. (1991). *The Professional Student Affairs Administrator*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sandeen, A., & Barr, M. (2006). *Critical issues for student affairs: Challenges and opportunities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Slee, P. T. (1995). Peer victimization and its relationship to depression among Australian primary school students. *Personality and Individual Differences* 18(1), 57-62.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(94\)00114-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)00114-8)

Smith, J. A. (2012). Can Restorative Justice Keep Schools Safe? *GGSC*.

http://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/can_restorative_justice_keep_schools_safe

- Stimpson, M., & Stimpson, R. (2008). Twenty-seven years of student conduct literature: Implications for practice, scholarship and ASJA. *Journal of Student Conduct Administration, 1*(1), 14-31. <https://www.theasca.org/files/Publications/SJC%20-%20Spring%202008.pdf#page=14>
- Strang, H., Sherman, L., Angel, C. M., Woods, D. J., Bennett, S., Newbury-Birch, D., & Inkpen, N. (2006). Victim evaluations of face-to-face restorative justice conferences: A quasiexperimental analysis. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*, 281-306. https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/23335/2/01_Strang_Victim_evaluations_of_2006.pdf
- Sumner, M. D., Silverman, C. J., & Frampton, M. L. (2010). *School-based restorative justice as an alternative to zero-tolerance policies: Lessons from West Oakland*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, School of Law.
- Swinton, D. (2008). An analysis and overview of student disciplinary scholarship in higher education. *Journal of Student Conduct Administration, 1*(1), 45-60. <https://www.theasca.org/files/Publications/SJC%20-%20Spring%202008.pdf#page=45>
- Thomas, W. (2002). The moral domain of student affairs leadership. *New Directions for Student Services, 98*, 61-70. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.50>
- Umbreit, M. S. (1999). Victim-offender mediation in Canada: The impact of an emerging social work intervention. *International Social Work, 42*, 215-227. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/intsocwk42&div=>

[22&id=&page=](#)

Walker, M. (2008). Working with College Students & Student Development Theory

Primer. https://srs.ucsd.edu/files/theory/student-development-theory_m-walker.pdf

What is an HBCU?. (n.d.). In *U.S. Department of Education White House Initiative on*

Historical Black Colleges and Universities. <https://sites.ed.gov/whhbcu/one-hundred-and-five-historically-black-colleges-and-universities/>

Wilson, M. E. (2006, May/June). Restorative Justice on the College Campus: Promoting

Student Growth and Responsibility and Reawakening the Spirit of Campus

Community. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(3), 355-359.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2006.0040>

Wise, S. (2017). Chickering's theory and the seven vectors of development. In *Killam,*

W., & Degges-White, S., College student development: Applying theory to

practice on the diverse campus (pp. 101-110). Springer Publishing Company.

Woodard, D., Love, P., & Komives, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Leadership and Management:*

Issues for a new century. Jossey-Bass.

Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Good Books.

Appendix A: Consent to Reuse Content



Student conduct, restorative justice, and student development: findings from the STARR project: a student accountability and restorative research project

Author: David R. Karp, , Casey Sacks

Publication: Contemporary Justice Review

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

Date: Apr 3, 2014

Rights managed by Taylor & Francis

Thesis/Dissertation Reuse Request

Taylor & Francis is pleased to offer reuses of its content for a thesis or dissertation free of charge contingent on resubmission of permission request if work is published.

BACK

CLOSE

Appendix B: Respondent Questionnaire

1. To what extent did you receive the information needed for you to confidently participate in this process?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

2. To what extent were you given options in how the case would be handled?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

3. To what extent was the process fair to all parties involved?

- Not at all
- Just a little
- A fair amount

-
- A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

4. How much were you able to communicate your thoughts and feelings about the incident?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

5. How much did the process help you to understand the point of view of those most affected?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

6. To what extent did you feel respected throughout the process?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

7. To what extent did the process offer an opportunity to give a sincere apology to those most affected?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

8. To what extent was a sincere apology offered during this process?

- Not at all
- Just a little
- A fair amount

- A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

9. To what extent was the outcome tailored for you and your situation?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

10. How much did the outcome focus on repairing the harm that was caused by this incident?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

11. To what extent did the outcome create opportunities to respond to larger social issues that are relevant to the incident (such as relevant community service, research on alcohol issues, etc)?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

12. How much did the process help you to bring closure to the situation?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the way this process was handled?

- Not at all
- Just a little
- A fair amount

- A great amount
- Not sure/not applicable

14. How much did the process include people who could offer you counsel and support?

- Not at all
- Just a little
- A fair amount
- A great amount
- Not sure/not applicable

15. How much were you able to meaningfully contribute your ideas toward the outcome?

- Not at all
- Just a little
- A fair amount
- A great amount
- Not sure/not applicable

16. How much did the process help you understand your responsibilities as a member of the community?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

17. How much did the process help you to take responsibility for the consequences of the incident?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

18. Overall, how satisfied are you with the outcome of this process?

- Not at all
- Just a little

-
- A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

19. How much did this process help reduce the likelihood that this incident will be repeated?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

20. As a result of this process, how much appreciation do you have for the campus administrators involved in your case (such as deans, residential life staff, conduct officers)?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

21. As a result of this process, how much appreciation do you have for the campus safety officers?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

22. To what extent would you now feel comfortable seeing the others involved in the incident around campus or in the community?

- Not at all
 - Just a little
 - A fair amount
 - A great amount
 - Not sure/not applicable
-

23. Sex

- Male
- Female
- Transgender

Do not wish to identify

24. Age

- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24 or older
-

25. Classification

- First Year
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

26. Race

- American Indian or Alaska Native
 - Asian
 - Black or African American
 - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander
 - White
 - Other
-

27. Ethnicity

- Hispanic
 - Non-Hispanic
-

28. What type of hearing did you have: Model Code (punitive) or Hybrid Model (punitive and restorative)?

- Model Code
- Hybrid Model

Submit

Page 1 of 1