Introduction
In November 2012, the Educational Advisory Council passed the following resolution:

“The Student Rights and Policy on Student Conduct were approved with the caveat [th]at the SDC will review the procedure for the disciplinary process (section 12).”

The Student Development Committee formed the Disciplinary Process Review Committee to conduct the inquiry. This group consisted of seven campus and district student services professionals, two students, and two administrators in an ex-officio capacity.

Current Process
The following diagram illustrates section 12 of the Policy on Student Conduct:

- Reporting. Administration learns of a concern via a variety of formal and informal methods (Student of Concern Report form, other written communication, Public Safety reports, or phone calls).
- Investigation. The Dean of Student Development or designee investigates the potential violation.
- Informal Resolution. The concern may be resolved when a student and PCC agree on an outcome or the case may move directly to the next step.
- Formal Resolution. The Dean of Student Development or designee meets formally with the student.
- Decision. The Dean of Student Development or designee may (1) Terminate the proceedings, exonerating the student, (2) Dismiss the case, or (3) Impose sanction(s).
- Appeal. The student may appeal the decision to the Campus President only if due process rights were violated.

Review Components
The committee’s review included the following components:
- studied the current disciplinary process (section 12 of the Policy on Student Conduct)
- learned about the Maxient data collection software system
- interviewed district practitioners to understand how the system is functioning in real life
- invited practitioners, students, faculty, and staff to evaluate the system
- researched the current disciplinary process structures used by our “sister colleges” throughout the nation

Themes
Six key themes emerged from this study:

1. PCC uses several positive practices to manage the complex, multi-layered disciplinary cases being presented today. These include:
   - An emphasis on student developmental outcomes, whenever possible
• An evidence-based model to assess violence risk
• Behavioral Intervention Teams
• Student Conduct and Retention Coordinators on two campuses

2. PCC uses the Maxient student conduct management system to track and report disciplinary cases. Used since 2009, data incongruities make it impossible to draw any conclusions. Opportunities exist to maximize the system to provide accurate and detailed data reports.

3. PCC has many employees throughout the district involved in the disciplinary process but there is no district oversight or direction. These individuals have a wide range of training, skills, and experience which leads to a wide range of techniques and case resolutions. They include:
   • Cascade Campus: Dean of Student Development, Associate Dean of Student Development, Student Conduct and Retention Coordinator, and Public Safety officers
   • Rock Creek Campus: Dean of Student Development, Associate Dean of Student Development, Dean of Student Development Administrative Assistant, and Public Safety officers
   • Southeast Center: Dean of Student Development, Associate Dean of Student Development, and Public Safety officers
   • Sylvania Campus: Dean of Student Development, Associate Dean of Student Development, Student Conduct and Retention Coordinator, and Public Safety officers

4. There is a tremendous confusion throughout the district regarding the entire disciplinary process, especially in the areas of:
   • Clarification between a student of concern/welfare issue and a conduct violation
   • Appropriate classroom management strategies that are allowed prior to submitting a Student of Concern Report form
   • Possible resolution scenarios

5. PCC faculty and staff expressed serious concerns about the balance between their personal safety and student confidentiality when a Student of Concern Report form is submitted.

6. PCC’s Sister Colleges use a variety of disciplinary process structures. Of the thirteen researched, two colleges use procedures similar to PCC, while eleven colleges use some form of panel to review cases at the initial stage or appeal stage. These governing bodies consist of some combination of student, faculty, staff, and administrator representatives.
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