

Exhibit B: Responses to Student Conduct Questions

The following supplemental information is provided to respond to questions raised by the Commission during the October 11, 2006 Campus Plan hearing.

Question: How do the number of community concerns correlate to the number of disciplinary actions reported in the September 21, 2006 filing?

Response: The calls captured in the “community concerns reported” – 144 in 2004-2005 and 215 in 2005-2006 – cover a variety of circumstances. One call might involve multiple students. One call might involve alleged student misconduct which could not be tied to a specific student. And one call might involve a concern unrelated to student conduct, e.g., construction noise. On the other hand, the “disciplinary actions reported” – 126 in 2004-2005 and 115 in 2005-2006 – each involved a specific student found to have been engaged in misconduct stemming from a call to the Hotline. Thus, depending on the nature of the incoming calls and the strength of the evidence connecting an act of alleged misconduct with a specific student, there may be little correlation between the number of calls and the number of disciplinary actions meted out. This can be seen in the 2005-2006 academic year during which the University increased its efforts to publicize the availability of the hotline, which resulted in an increased use of the Hotline for a variety of purposes. The increased number of calls, however, did not result in an increase in the identification of students involved in misconduct and as a result the number of disciplinary actions did not increase. Notwithstanding, the University followed up on all calls received, returned each call for which a call back number was provided, and responded fully to all issues raised – including those involving concerns other than student misconduct.

Question: What disciplinary actions were imposed on the three recidivists in 2004-2005 and the two in 2005-2006?

Response: In each case, the students – who were initially given a warning for the first offense – were subjected to increased levels of discipline pursuant to the University’s system of progressive discipline. Three of the students were brought before the Student Judicial System (“SJS”) on charges of misconduct. As a result of the SJS proceedings, these students were placed on disciplinary probation which restricts a student from participating in a variety of student activities and provides for automatic suspension or termination if the misconduct occurs again. Two of the students, whose acts of misconduct were considered far less severe, were censured by the University. Censure involves a meeting with a University official, followed by a written reprimand for the acts of misconduct which outlines the specific consequences of any future misconduct.