### OUTLINE OF ISSUE

**Advice, Discussion, Information Item**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Proposed by</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>André Costopolos, Vice-Provost and Dean of Students</td>
<td>Craig Whitton, Residence Area Coordinator – Residence Services; Aman Litt, Assistant Dean of Students, Residence Life (Acting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>The Purpose of the item is (please be specific)</th>
<th>Timeline/Implementation Date</th>
<th>Supplementary Notes and context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provost and Vice-President (Academic)</td>
<td>To report on the discipline statistics from the University residences for the 2015-16 academic year.</td>
<td>May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2016</td>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Engagement and Routing: GFC CLRC - September 22, 2016

**Participation:**
(particles who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)

*<For further information see the link posted on [Governance Toolkit section Student Participation Protocol](#)>*

**Those who have been informed:**
- Resident students
- Residence Services
- Vice President, Facilities and Operations
- GFC Campus Law Review Committee – September 22, 2016
- University of Alberta Protective Services (UAPS)
- GFC Executive Committee – October 17, 2016
- General Faculties Council – November 21, 2016 (information report)

**Those who have been consulted:**
- Sarah Wolgemuth, Assistant Dean, Student Life
- Residence Services
- Ancillary Services
- Doug Dawson, Associate Vice President, Ancillary Services

**Those who are actively participating: Restorative Justice**
- Residence Life Staff and Student Staff
- Sarah Wolgemuth during her role as Assistant Dean of Student, Residence Life
- Aman Litt, Acting Assistant Dean of Student, Residence Life
- Craig Whitton, Residence Area Coordinator
- Salwa Kramps, Residence Life Administrative Assistant

### Alignment/Compliance

**Alignment with Guiding Documents**
For the Public Good, Institutional Values

**Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please quote legislation and include identifying section numbers)**

| 1. Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA): The PSLA give GFC responsibility, subject to the authority of the Board of Governors, over academic affairs and over student affairs, including authority concerning student discipline. (Sections 26(1) and 31) In addition, Section 26(1)(o) states GFC “has the authority to make recommendations to the board with respect to […] the regulation of residences and dining halls[…]” |

PSLA Section 31(1) – Student Affairs states “The general faculties
council has general supervision of student affairs at a university and in particular, but without restricting the generality, the general faculties council may […] (b) delegate its power to discipline students in any particular case or generally to any person or body of persons, subject to any conditions with respect to the exercise of any delegated power that it considers proper […]"

### 2. GFC Campus Law Review Committee Terms of Reference:

“Residence Discipline Reports: To receive annually reports from the student residence associations on the number and disposition of discipline cases in the residences, and forward the reports to the GFC Executive Committee. Any student residence with a code or similar set of regulations is required to report annually on the operation of that code to General Faculties Council through its Campus Law Review Committee and its Executive Committee.”


*Prepared by:* Craig Whitton, Residence Area Coordinator, [craig.whitton@ualberta.ca](mailto:craig.whitton@ualberta.ca)
Annual Report of Residence Discipline Statistics

2015/2016

Submitted to the Campus Law Review Committee, September 14th, 2016.

In accordance with the Campus Law Review Committee Terms of Reference the following Residence Discipline Report summarizes the period of May 1st, 2015 to August 30th, 2016.

Residence Services has been utilizing Restorative Justice for five years, and each year has shown marked improvement in both the utilization of Restorative Justice in our communities, as well as the quality of the restorative solutions. As in past years, we’ve seen a continued acceptance of Restorative Justice as simply “the way we address conduct” as opposed to a unique and novel concept that students struggle with. That being said, this past year highlighted the necessity of continued training on how to functionally use Restorative Justice in a residence community to ensure consistent application of RJ principles across our residence halls, including to address behavior previously thought to be the realm of the Residence Agreement.

While in previous years we struggled to generate consistent data due to a changeover in our Housing Management system, this year’s data was captured with the same methodology as seen in the 2014/2015 Annual Report. Unfortunately, in July of 2016 our Housing Management System provider announced they would be discontinuing support for the Judicial management module in which we compile these statistics. While that does not impact this year’s data, it may cause challenges for future reports. However, we continue to work with our Housing Management System provider to ensure our ability to report on our discipline statistics goes unchanged.

As with last year, we tracked our judicial statistics on two criteria: Violations, and Sanctions. This allows us to more accurately reflect restorative principles in our judicial statistics. A key factor of restorative justice is that it does not focus on a ‘rule’ that was broken; instead it focuses on the harms that come from a person’s actions. Accordingly, violations are based on the behaviour of the student that causes harm.

Sanctions are the results of those violations. In many cases, a single restorative sanction can address the harms of several violations (for example, an apology to an entire community may be sufficient to address multiple harms caused).

In 2015/2016, we had 1,064 unique incidents. This represents a 25% increase over last year’s number (851 unique incidents); this increase is largely due to increased use of Restorative Justice on East Campus to manage a wider range of cleanliness and operational issues. In the past, this type of student behavior was almost exclusively handled through our Operations unit but in keeping with our stated position that Restorative Justice is our preferred method of dealing with
student conduct, training on Restorative Justice was extended to our Assignment Coordinators and Unit Coordinators. As such, a significant number of incidents were dealt with via Restorative Justice. Using restorative justice for cleanliness issues is a new practice for us and we expect continued growth in its utilization in the future.

These incidents resulted in 1210 violations. Those violations were resolved using 668 sanctions, of which 83% were Restorative solutions (Community Resolutions, Apology Letters, Behavioural Agreements, or Restorative Agreements). This is a slight reduction from last year’s figure of 87%, but given the greater emphasis on Cleaning and Operations issues being dealt with through Restorative Justice, this drop is quite minor.

In 2014/2015, Lister Centre accounted for the majority of our conduct with 66% of our total incidents originating in Kelsey, Mackenzie, Henday, or Schäffer Hall. However, with the use of Restorative Justice for cleanliness issues in 2015/2016, the divide was right down the middle with exactly 50% of our conduct cases in each portfolio.

Last year’s report highlighted that we saw only 23% of total incidents directly related to alcohol, which was a 30% improvement over the year before. This year, that trend of improvement has continued with only 13% of total incidents directly related to alcohol. This trend of improvement can likely be attributed to a change in the cultural of alcohol use in Lister center over the past several years, such as limited alcohol-related events and preventing consumption in public spaces.

In last year’s report we began collecting the frequency with which students of concern were managed by our staff, and discovered that from October (when we started tracking) through to May of 2015, we had approximately 70 students at risk incidents (56 unique students). We tracked this figure again, and from May of 2015 to August of 2016 we found we had a marked increase to 172 students of concern that came to our attention, with 126 unique cases.
Sanctions Issued:

Note: None Specified = No Responsible Student Identified; No Sanction – Not Responsible = Student Identified, but found Not Responsible.

Incidents by Location: