

not suggesting that a specific set of values is preferable but it helps to know where one stands. This is not to say that the R.A. should judge others or impose his values on others; conversely he must not hide them. This is one of the most unsure areas of the average student and it is of immeasurable value when the R.A. can approach them from a solid, well-defined posture.

AN R.A. LOOKS AT A
RESIDENCE HALL JUDICIAL SYSTEM
by Winnifred Weeks

Institutional response to the relatively recent student demand for self-governance and increased self-responsibility takes many forms. The Indiana University Residence Hall Judicial System is one salient example. Each Residence Center has a selected student hearing body, Judicial Board. When a student is reported for an alleged violation, he may choose to have his case heard by either the Judicial Board, composed of peers from the same living environment, or by the Coordinator of the hall. Reports may be submitted by Resident Assistants and by students.

As a Resident Assistant in one of Indiana University's Residence Halls, I am involved in the enforcement and interpretation of rules and regulations, and often must explain and describe the Judicial system to students. I have become concerned by what often appears to be an apathetic and indifferent attitude toward the judicial system among students.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was to determine some of the most prevalent attitudes toward one center's Judicial System, and to perhaps determine a few of the perceived issues.

Method

Two interview instruments were devised. Interviews were conducted with 20 randomly selected students who had never been personally involved with the judicial system, and 15 randomly selected students who had been personally involved by appearing before either judicial board or a professional staff member. The students interviewed were selected by knocking on random doors.

In addition to the above, I discussed the judicial system with its graduate advisor and observed one hearing. I also had the opportunity to participate in two mock cases, used for training judicial board members, in which I played the role of a student "defendant."

Because of the confidential nature of judicial matters and because some students are reluctant to discuss their cases, I was somewhat limited.

Characteristics of Interview Subjects

The students interviewed all lived in an all female Residence Hall. Therefore, all student and staff respondents are female. In addition, 65% of the Residents are Freshman and Sophomore. Most students move to coed halls, to apartments or to sorority houses after one or two years. The residence center, therefore, has a rather transient population.

From discussion with students and staff in some other residence halls, however, I would surmise that the attitudes evident in the following discussion are fairly typical.

Discussion

The study, limited as it is, does raise some important issues.

Information regarding the purpose and function of the judicial system is almost non-existent, particularly among those who have never personally experienced it. Students seem to be operating with a great deal of mis-information if they have any at all. It is interesting to note that even among those students interviewed who have experienced the system, there were still 5 who could not describe the process involved.

When both groups were asked what the judicial system involved, none of the respondents mentioned the educative aspects and purposes of the board. Board members, however, see that goal as primary. Such disparate attitudes between those who sit on the board and those who must appear before the board might create some of the scorn and indifference indicated by most of the students interviewed.

Most of the comments associated with the question, "Was the sanction warranted?" indicated that the sanctions are meaningless. Students who responded "yes" stated that the sanctions were equitable because they were essentially no sanction at all. In other words, sanctions such as "verbal warning," "warning," "formal warning" are perceived as meaningless. Several students made comments like, "It won't stop me," "means nothing," "I don't know why they bother," and view the hearing as only a necessary and temporary nuisance.

Membership on the board is also seen as an issue. Six students indicated that the members are "too straight," that the members should have been previously "busted," and that the selection process should have non-member input. It seems that some students do not view the board as being from their reference group. It is, therefore, suspect and to be ignored. Interesting too is the fact that both groups indicated that they were not very interested in becoming a member of J-Board. The few individuals who had considered it came to the conclusion that "one person can't do much good anyway," since the group is selected by old members and by staff. They do not see the board as being a part of student government in the residence center.

Students also mentioned that behavior deemed a "violation" is not consistent. One student interviewed was reported for using a sunlamp, another for littering the hall. Therefore, the question of the validity of such a violation being heard by a judicial board which sees its function primarily as educative particularly when the board also hears drinking, marijuana, and open-visitation violations, seems most critical.

Noteworthy too is the fact that students interviewed had been written up by R.A.'s, the maid, students and the Housing Manager. Perhaps such diverse personnel should not have the authority to send a student through the system. The Housing Manager and the maids are members of the managerial staff and should function as such.

Two students indicated to me that they felt some discrepancy between sanctions given when several individuals were alleged to have violated the same regulation, at the same time, and with essentially the same behavior. In one case the sanctions were given by the same staff member. In another, the cases were handled by two staff members, each taking some of the interviews. One staff member was considerably more lenient than the other. The student involved questioned the "justice" of receiving a harsher sanction for the same "crime." Not only does such a situation give the students a bad impression, but it makes it very difficult for other staff members to justify and interpret the judicial system to other students.

In light of the above, however, it is interesting that the response to the question, "Would you rather have your cases heard by Judicial Board or a Staff Member?" was usually "staff." Reasons given were, "I like the one-to-one relationship," "easier to discuss with one person," "staff are more experienced," and "students don't know anyway."

When asked if students who assume and perform some regulatory role on the floor are viewed differently than other students, the response was an overwhelming "yes." Comments associated with this question would suggest that students who assume such a role are often viewed negatively.

Recommendations

1. More effort must be made to publicize the purpose and intent of Judicial Board and the system as a whole.
2. The selection of Judicial Board members should be re-evaluated and examined.
3. The sanctions available to Judicial Board be examined and be revised in accordance with the relative severity of the violation.
4. More attention should be paid to consistency both in the area of enforcement of rules and regulations and in regard to sanctions given to several individuals involved in the same violation.
5. The Housing Staff's role in discipline in the Residence Hall should be re-examined.
6. Students should be encouraged to take more responsibility for the atmosphere of their individual unit.

Conclusion

It is obvious that in a paper of this scope it is impossible to deal with the variety of issues that were raised by the students in more than a brief manner. I would suggest that judicial boards take it upon themselves to carefully examine their function and role. Perhaps if they conducted a study of the system as part of their training they might become more aware of the attitudes prevalent toward the board.

About the Authors

Helen Mamarchev received her B.A. degree in Sociology and Social Science from Southern Methodist University. She is presently an Assistant Coordinator at McNutt Residence Center, working on her Masters in College Student Personnel Administration and Counseling.

Elaine Green is presently an Assistant Coordinator at Foster Residence Center, working on her Masters in College Student Personnel Administration. She graduated from Oklahoma University with a B.A. in Psychology.

Jonathan Hess received his B.A. degree in Sociology from Wheaton College. He is currently an Assistant Coordinator at Men's Residence Center, working on his Masters in College Student Personnel Administration and Counseling.

Winnifred (Freddie) Weeks received her B.A. degree in English from Coe College. She is working on a Masters in College Student Personnel Administration and Counseling and is also an Assistant Coordinator at Forest Residence Center.

SUMMER INTERNSHIPS: CAN YOU HELP?

For some time graduates of the Indiana University student personnel program have rated most highly the practical experiences available to them as they complete their graduate work. These practical experiences have taken three forms: On-campus Internships, Off-campus Internships and On-campus Practicums. During the past three years increasingly more students are seeking and taking advantage of summer Internships. This allows many to complete an On-campus Internship, to participate in the increasing On-campus Practicums and to have an Off-campus experience. A summer experience allows that student to participate in the many things which must be carried out during the summer to be ready for students to arrive in the fall. Evaluations indicate students have benefited greatly from the summer opportunities and the participating institutions have received additional professional help. For the most part Interns on the summer experiences have been paid on an hourly basis.

If you can use a summer Intern contact Dr. E.A. Greenleaf, School of Education, 319, Indiana University. She will send you more details and be happy to discuss the program with you.

PLANS FOR SUMMER 1973

On campus the Department is making plans for the 1973 Summer Student Personnel Institute. The three workshops of last year will be continued: Inter-Fraternity Workshop, June 17-23; Trends in Residence Halls, July 15-20 and Institutional Governance, Policy Formation and Decision Making, July 15-20. It is planned to add two additional workshops: 1) New Directions for the Activities Adviser, July 29-August 3 and 2) Student Cultures in Varied National Environments, June 24-July 14 with the exception of the workshop on Student Cultures costs for room and board, workshop supplies, etc. will be approximately \$100. Plans for the latter workshop include a 10-12 day stay at Harlaxton Manor, Grantham, England. This is a center owned by the University of Evansville. By bus it will be possible for the group to spend a full day on each of four different type campuses. Plans call for work groups to be able to interview students and administrative staff and to investigate printed materials. Time will be spent in London to have contact with the British Student Union Movement. The workshop will spend the last 5 to 7 days at an institution on the continent or a Scandinavian institution. Preliminary estimate of costs indicate approximately \$750 for all expenses.

From 1 to 3 hours of academic credit may be earned for each workshop.

To assure your receiving fuller details drop a line to Dr. Greenleaf indicating workshop(s) in which you have an interest.