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The Mission:

OSCR
The Office of Student Conflict Resolution
Division of Student Affairs
University of Michigan

Build Trust
OSCR builds trust by conducting an operation that is educationally focused, student-driven, and community-owned through:

- Supporting the amendment process of the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities that is revised and approved by students, faculty and staff
- Collaborating with students, student groups, student leaders and campus departments

Promote Justice
OSCR promotes justice by facilitating conflict resolution for the Michigan community and creating a just and safe campus climate through:

- Administering the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities with compassion, integrity, and fairness
- Implementing related university policies and developing procedures that provide alternative dispute resolution

Teach Peace
OSCR teaches peace by serving as a campus resource for conflict management through:

- Providing proactive and preventive educational programming for students, student groups and campus departments
- Striving to set the national standard for campus conflict resolution
The Goals:

The OSCR Team developed the following goals this year (with a target completion date of 2010). Each of these goals align with and contribute to the Division of Student Affairs mission and goals.

Provide educational, accessible, timely and fair conflict resolution processes that enable students to:

- create a more socially just and inclusive campus
- learn about, reflect on, practice skills and behaviors, and develop values and beliefs that enable them to succeed during and after their University experience
- learn and practice immediate and lifelong behaviors that promote positive physical, emotional, social, intellectual, mental and spiritual health
- foster an environment that respects and appreciates the value of both differences and similarities and supports the well-being and success of all community members

Develop and implement comprehensive assessment, research and evaluation to measure performance and delivery on departmental goals and inform initiatives.

Develop a Team that obtains a deeper understanding of diversity, social identity and privilege and how these concepts relate to individuals and the implementation of conflict resolution services.

Serve as the premier resource for training and development in campus conflict resolution within the Michigan Community and the professional field.

Increase community ownership and awareness of the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities and related services provided by the Office of Student Conflict Resolution to ensure consistent access to services and response to conflict across campus that is in alignment with the values of the University community.
The Year:

In academic year 2007-08, OSCR delivered on many important objectives. The foundation for this success was the Team’s ability to live into a revised department structure supported by DSA leadership.

A primary goal of this staffing realignment was to better equip the department to deliver on a new vision outlined by the unit in August of 2006. This vision focused on providing services to the students, staff and faculty in a way that would build trust, promote justice and teach peace within this community and align with the values of this institution. A crucial step toward realizing this vision was the development of meaningful alternatives to the formal conflict resolution services outlined in campus policy.

This move was rooted in the awareness that this community is clear on one important guiding principle: providing student-driven, educationally focused and socially just conflict resolution services is not possible if you have a “one-size-fits-all” process for every incident that happens on campus.

To live into this vision of providing more meaningful and effective alternatives to formal process, OSCR has worked to develop a full-spectrum menu of conflict resolution pathways available for U-M community members to use to address and resolve concerns.

As new pathways for resolution developed, the Team revised intake processes so that participants seeking services can better understand the menu of options available to them. Working with a “peer” intake facilitator, participants identify a preferred pathway based on desired objectives.

While the Statement’s “formal conflict resolution” process remains an important and educational venue for many incidents, the OSCR Team experience demonstrates that many conflicts call for a less formalized approach. When appropriate, this less formal approach can be offered to provide a more timely, effective and satisfying experience for all parties in a conflict.

The OSCR Team is now equipped with individual staff teams devoted to offering both fully developed pathways for resolution.

These Teams include:

- **Team Justice** providing Formal Conflict Resolution (FCR)
- **Team Peace** providing Alternative Conflict Resolution (ACR)
- **Team Trust** providing administrative support for FCR & ACR
The new OSCR approach works. In 2006-07, only 4% of cases referred to OSCR were resolved in ACR. The rest were resolved through formal conflict resolution. In 2007-08, over 70% of cases were resolved in ACR.

A review of the individual Teams’ work and accomplishments to follow demonstrates that as part of this realignment, OSCR has also achieved important success in providing more effective student-driven programming, outreach, growing partnerships with stakeholders and staff development.

With a clear vision, a committed department team and the support of the DSA, this was a successful year. It is with enthusiasm for the year ahead that we share this report.

Sincerely,

Jennifer M. Schrage, J.D.
Director

---

**Case Numbers 2007-08:**

**399** Cases Opened in OSCR.

**78** Cases resolved exclusively in Formal Conflict Resolution Process.

**281** Cases resolved exclusively in Alternative Conflict Resolution Process.

**31** Cases travelled through Formal Conflict Resolution and Alternative Conflict Resolution Processes prior to resolution. Of these 31 cases, 17 were successfully resolved (16 in ACR and 1 in FCR).

**9** Cases resolved by consultation (without referral to FCR or ACR).

**271** Cases closed.

**149** Requests for records information.

Over 700 additional cases involving alleged Statement violations were referred to the Residence Education conflict resolution process for handling.
Overview - Team Trust

The 2007-08 Team Trust Members include:

- Claudette Brower
  Office Supervisor

- Sandy Lymburner
  Office Specialist

- Front Desk Student Team
  - Sophia Chang
  - Eileen Clark
  - Agustina De Majo
  - Jenna Keefe
  - Amethyst Saldia
  - Galine Torossian

Team Trust Functions

- Provide the administrative support needed by the office to administer the University of Michigan's *Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities* and related services and outreach.
- Greet those who come to seek out our services.
- Schedule appointments with Intake Facilitators and Student Resolution Coordinators.
- Create and maintain a physical and electronic file for every contact and/or inquiry made to our office.
- Process requests for any type of background check by either prospective employers or by graduate schools.
- Provide data for reporting in compliance with federal laws and related institutional reports.
- Audit and “close” each electronic and paper file when it has been determined that the case is completed.

Team Trust Accomplishments

The focus of the team this year was to establish administrative processes to align with the goals, objectives and values of the department. Team Trust worked to provide support to a significant departmental shift in processing cases involving alcohol and other drugs. Team Trust also worked to improve database functioning to align with the mission and philosophy of the office.
Team Trust Summary of Services

In 2007-08, the front office team created 399 case files and 272 cases were closed. There were 149 requests for records information (background checks, subpoena, etc). The bulk of the requests were generated by prospective employers and initiated primarily by the United State Office of Personnel Management and the Federal Bureau of Investigations; other requests came from graduate schools, study abroad programs, state bar associations and subpoena requests that were made via the UM Registrar’s Office.

List of background check requestors include:

- Office Personnel Management
- US Dept of Defense
- Federal Investigative Services
- US Agency for International Development
- University Semester at Sea
- Customs and Border Protection
- Board of the Supreme Court of Florida
- Rackham School Student Services
- US Agency for International Development
- US Customs and Border Protection
- Federal Bureau of Investigation
Overview – Team Justice

Team members 2007-2008:
- Akilah Jones, Assistant Director
- Carrie Landrum, Student Conflict Resolution Coordinator
- Stacy Vander Velde, Temporary Student Conflict Resolution Coordinator
- Romanda Kindle, Temporary Student Conflict Resolution Coordinator
- Nicholas Smith, Undergraduate Intern
- N. J. Akbar, Graduate Intern
- Lara Kovacheff-Badke, Graduate Intern

Team Justice administers OSCR’s Formal Conflict Resolution (FCR) process. Tasks associated with this responsibility include:
- Administering the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (Statement)
- Conducting interviews, reviewing complaints and facilitating formal conflict resolution
- Managing the administrative tasks associated with FCR cases
- Recruiting, selecting, and training volunteer Resolution Panelists and Resolution Officers

Team Justice provides the following FCR pathways for use in conflict resolution:
- **Agreement (Acceptance of Responsibility):** Most parties involved with the FCR process as respondents are able to achieve resolution by coming to an agreement about what happened and how best to respond to the situation and restore the community. If it is determined that there was a policy violation, this agreement is documented and considered a disciplinary record on file with the University. These parties exit the resolution process by implementing a set of educational measures (sanctions) which they help to design.
- **Arbitration (Hearing):** When parties involved in the FCR process are unable to reach agreement about what happened and/or how to handle it, the matter will be resolved through Arbitration whereby a third party arbiter reviews the matter in a hearing venue and determines the appropriate resolution. A pool of volunteer Resolution Officers (faculty and staff arbiters), Student Panelists (student arbiters), and Advisors (students, faculty and staff) provide essential leadership and support in this process.
- **Referral to the Alternative Conflict Resolution (ACR) Process:** If all parties personally and directly affected by the conflict agree to resolve the complaint through ACR and if the RC believes that ACR is an appropriate form of resolution, then the RC will coordinate the transfer of the case to the ACR staff (Team Peace). A case resolved in ACR will not be formally documented as a disciplinary record.
Team Justice Summary

In 2007-2008 Team Justice managed 71 cases from beginning to end (7 cases were pending as of June 30, 2008). These cases involved 96 alleged Statement violations. The most frequently alleged violation was “illegal possession or use of alcohol”, which accounted for approximately 30% of all alleged violations handled exclusively by the FCR team. The next most frequently alleged Statement violation was “stalking and harassment”, followed by “stealing, vandalizing, damaging, destroying, or defacing property”.

Complaints were submitted from various populations within the University community. Complaints submitted by Residence Education accounted for 37% of cases, students submitted complaints in 36% of the cases, DPS accounted for 14%, and other University Staff accounted for 13% of the cases managed.

In 2007-2008 academic year, there was a rise in the number of cases that went through an arbitration hearing. In past years, on average, three cases per year went to arbitration. In 2007-2008, ten cases were resolved through arbitration (one of these cases was initially referred to ACR). Students were found responsible in 50% of these cases. Of the cases that went through arbitration, Residence Education served as the complainant for 60% of the cases, another 20% were initiated by other university employees, and 20% were student-to-student conflicts.

All of the student-to-student conflicts resolved through arbitration alleged stalking or harassment, and 60% of all arbitrated cases alleged some form of harassment (five alleged stalking or harassment, one alleged sexual harassment). Most of the harassment complaints coming through FCR, and many of the other complaints, stemmed from conflict in an interpersonal relationship such as a friendship, romantic relationship, or a student organization relationship.

Cases involving exclusively alleged alcohol violations constituted 30% of the cases resolved through arbitration. Other alleged violations resolved through arbitration included physically harming another person, theft of personal property, possession of a weapon, and obstructing or disrupting classes.
Team Justice Services

Major Activities, Programs and Services

During 2007-08, Team Justice was responsible for managing the following programs and services.

a. Overview of Team’s major activities, programs & services during 2007-2008

Team Justice spent 2007-2008 facilitating conflict resolution and creating a just and safe campus climate for the Michigan community by administering the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities with compassion, integrity, and fairness. The team strived to provide educational, accessible, timely and fair conflict resolution services to students and other community members.

As part of this goal, a key objective for the past academic year was to promote skill development through training and professional development, particularly as all full and part-time members on Team Justice were new to OSCR in 2007-2008. As evidence of this, team members were represented at the Association for Student Judicial Affairs national conference, the Big Ten Student Conduct Officers conference, many Division of Student Affairs conferences/symposiums/professional development events, and of course OSCR’s 2nd Annual Social Justice Mediation Training. In addition to enhancing their own skills, the team also provided training to OSCR employees including student staff, student interns and professional staff throughout the year.

In 2007-2008 team members also participated in the search process (including serving on search committees) for Residence Education professional staff, MESA professional staff, the Dean of Students, and OSCR professional staff positions.
b. Overview of FCR Cases

i. Statement Violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Violation</th>
<th>Alleged Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Physical Harm</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Sexual Assault</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Hazing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Stalking/Harassment</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Weapons</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Fire/Safety</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Illegal Possession/Use of Alcohol</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) Illegal Distribution of Alcohol</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) Illegal Possession/Use of Drugs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) Illegal Distribution of Drugs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) Falsely Reported Emergency</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M) Theft/Vandalism</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N) Disruption of Classes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O) Falsified University Documents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P) Identity Assumption</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q) Failure to Leave Premises</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R) State/Federal Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S) Misuse of Statement/Failure to Comply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T) Violation of University Computer Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Alleged Violations Graph]
ii. Origin of Conflict

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResEd</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Univ Staff</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. Notable Demographics of Complainants

Staff members in Residence Education were the most frequent complainant. Many of our student complainants initiated conflict resolution due to a relationship/interpersonal conflict. Of the student respondents who went through a formal arbitration, 50% were students of color. (All but one of them was found not responsible.)
iv. Resolution Process

The following data reflects the resolution process used for cases resolved solely through OSCR’s FCR process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Process</th>
<th>% of cases</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Only</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement/Acceptance of Responsibility</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Withdrew from School</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Dismissed</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
v. Case Outcomes

The following data reflects the resolution outcome for cases resolved solely through OSCR’s FCR process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings/Outcomes</th>
<th>% of cases</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Violations Assigned</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement/Acceptance of Responsibility</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found Responsible through Arbitration (2 by a Resolution Officer and 2 by a Student Panel)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Responsible through Arbitration (3 by a Student Panel and 1 by a Resolution Officer)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Withdrew from School</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Dismissed</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Pie chart showing the distribution of case outcomes]
vi. Agreed-Upon Educational Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflection Essay</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Probation</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Project</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Student Body</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASICS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFLECTIONS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Apology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contact</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass from Res Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Counseling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Hall Contract Termination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Contract</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reapplication to Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/Workshop</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restitution</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restriction of Privileges</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vii. Number of Appeals = One

In past years, a majority of cases travelling through the Formal Conflict Resolution Arbitration process would continue through the Appeals stage. This year only one in nine of the cases going to arbitration resulted in an appeal by the parties. Satisfaction with outcome and issue resolution may explain the sharp decrease in appeals.

viii. Completion Time

In 2007-08, 26 cases were resolved through Agreement, meaning the student accepted responsibility and a sanction package was designed accordingly. Of these 26 cases, five (19%) were resolved within four weeks; seven (27%) took five-eight weeks to be resolved; nine (35%) cases took nine-twelve weeks; and five (19%) cases took more than three months.

OSCR handled 10 arbitrations during the 2007-08 academic year. Of those cases, one (10%) took four weeks to reach a resolution, four (40%) took ten-twelve weeks to reach a resolution and five (50%) took more than three months to reach a resolution.
Team Justice Evaluation & Assessment

During 2007-2008 OSCR implemented a new formalized tool for assessment of our work. OSCR remains committed to community feedback as it is critical to improving processes and interactions with students, faculty and staff.

Of the over several hundred individuals involved with over 255 cases, only 37 individuals responded to our evaluation survey distributed at the close of the academic year. Of the 37 people who responded to this online assessment tool, 19 (51%) went through our Formal Conflict Resolution process.

Q1: Did you find the process you experienced to be fair?

- 22 of the 37 (59%) stated that they found the process to be fair.
- 11 of the 37 (30%) stated that they did not find the process to be fair
- 4 of the 37 (11%) were not sure if they experienced a fair process

Q2: How were you treated by OSCR staff at all stages of your process?

- 1 of 37 (3%) stated they were treated in a negative way
- 12 of 37 (32%) stated they were treated in a neutral way
- 24 of 37 (65%) stated they were treated in a positive way

Q3: Did the process unfold as it was described in written or oral statements (such as websites, brochures, or staff descriptions)?

- 26 of 37 (70%) stated yes the process is what was described
- 1 of 37 (3%) stated no the process is not what was described
- 10 of 37 (27%) were not sure

Q4: Considering your various social identities, did you feel that you were provided with attractive, meaningful and effective pathways for resolving your conflict?

- 21 of 37 (57%) stated yes they felt they were provided with these pathways
- 9 of 37 (24%) stated no they did not feel they were provided with these pathways
- 7 of 37 (19%) were not sure
Team Justice Accomplishments

- As discussed, a major accomplishment for Team Justice was the successful management of a significant caseload during the academic year.

- Team Justice also successfully managed the “end of year transfer of cases” from the housing community. Of the 15 cases that were originally transferred from Housing, 8 were returned to the Housing Office of Student Conflict Resolution based on lack of support of the complaint. Of the remaining 7 cases, 5 were referred to Team Peace for ACR for AOD (Tier II), 1 was dismissed for being baseless and unsupported and 1 is on hold until students return for the Fall semester. This allowed the 2 temporary staff members hired to assist with this portion of the caseload to contribute to other case work and related projects throughout the summer.

- Team Justice worked to revise forms so that language and framing aligned with department philosophy. This included revising intake forms for complainants, respondents and Resolution Coordinator meetings. Arbitration Guidelines for Student Panelist and Resolution Officers were also updated. In addition, we have updated language on our letters in PAVE to reflect our current philosophy.

- Team Justice completed the development of an assessment tool that evaluates services that are offered at OSCR. This was a joint project with Team Peace.

- Team Justice assisted with OSCR’s Intake Facilitation training for student interns.

- Team Justice completed a successful search process for a new Student Conflict Resolution Coordinator (Term Appointment).

In 2008-09, Team Justice plans to move forward with a complete team intact. Areas of focus for the upcoming year include:

- Living into the structure with a new Assistant Director and building relationships within Teams Peace, Justice and Trust
- Continuous improvement of FCR process and administrative support systems
- Building relationship with Michigan Student Association and the campus community as the Statement revision year approaches
- Working with Team Peace in the development of an assessment tool that evaluates all services being offered at OSCR
- Undergoing a successful Arbiter training with Panelists and Resolution Officers
- Monitoring casework closely as it relates to exploring the “business case” for shifting the 1-year term position to a permanent position
Overview – Team Peace

Team members assigned to Team Peace during part or all of the 2007-08 academic year:

- Robert Coffey, Assistant Director
- David Votruba, Ph.D., Student Conflict Resolution Coordinator
- N. J. Akbar, Graduate Student Intern
- Jessica Waddell, Graduate Student Intern
- Benjamin Peters, Undergraduate Student Intern
- Rokimas Putra Soeharyo, Undergraduate Student Intern

Team Peace administers OSCR’s *Alternative Conflict Resolution (ACR)* pathways. Tasks associated with this responsibility include:

- Responding to requests for information about ACR
- Facilitating intake meetings with potential disputants
- Managing the administrative tasks associated with ACR cases
- Recruiting, selecting, and training volunteer mediators and *Restorative Justice Circle (RJC)* facilitators

Team Peace also leads departmental education and outreach efforts, in partnership with the rest of the OSCR Team. Tasks associated with this responsibility include:

- Representing OSCR at major campus outreach events (e.g., Festifall, Northfest)
- Developing and delivering educational workshops to campus audiences
- Introducing ACR services to new and current stakeholders as part of OSCR “road shows”
- Managing and updating content on the department website
Team Peace provides the following ACR pathways for use in conflict resolution:

- **ACR for Alcohol and Other Drugs (ACR for AOD)** provides students involved in AOD-related incidents with an opportunity to resolve the conflict outside the formal conflict resolution pathway.
- **Facilitated Dialogue (FD)** refers to a constructive (direct or indirect) conversation designed to explore the possibility of a negotiated resolution to a conflict.
- **Restorative Justice Circles (RJC)** provide parties responsible and those impacted by their actions with an opportunity to reach a common understanding of the incident and its consequences, as well as what the responsible parties must do to repair the harm.
- **Social Justice Mediation (SJM)** refers to an emerging mediation practice in which volunteer mediators use a social justice lens while helping parties reach mutually agreeable solutions.
- **Shuttle Negotiation (SN)** refers to a process in which a facilitator works with parties in separate, private caucuses to generate a negotiated agreement that resolves a conflict.

**Team Peace Summary**

The successful implementation of a full-spectrum array of Alternative Conflict Resolution (ACR) pathways was Team Peace’s most important accomplishment in 2007-08.

Building on the successful delivery of last year’s Social Justice Mediation Training, Team Peace introduced the **Social Justice Mediation** pathway in September of 2007. This was followed by implementation of a **Restorative Justice Circle** pathway. The first Circles held under OSCR’s auspices occurred in October. Though requested less often, OSCR staff facilitated **Shuttle Negotiations** and **Facilitated Dialogues** as a means of helping parties address and resolve conflicts.

The **ACR-for-AOD** pathway currently manages the highest volume of OSCR’s case traffic. Grounded in the principles that inform OSCR’s work, this pathway represents a thoughtful and creative response to cases that involve allegations associated with the University’s alcohol and other drug (AOD) policies.

Team Peace also supported the introduction of OSCR’s new **intake meeting** process, in which parties meet with a student intern for a brief orientation to the CR options available to them through OSCR. This meeting provides the opportunity for a peer-to-peer dialogue in which they have the space to examine and consider each CR option.
Team Peace Services

Major Activities, Programs and Services

During 2007-08, Team Peace was responsible for managing the following programs and services.

- **Alternative Conflict Resolution (ACR) Program Assessment**
  During 2007-08, Team Peace initiated a project to develop and deliver a series of survey instruments designed to assess student experiences with OSCR’s CR pathways. This effort, which represents a solid beginning, has thus far resulted in the development and/or use of the following survey tools:
  - ACR/FCR Assessment
  - ACR-for-AOD Assessment
  - Subjective Assessment of Motivational Interviewing Confidence (SAMIC)
  - SJM Training Evaluation

- **ACR Staff Development and Training**
  Throughout 2007-08, Team Peace worked collaboratively to develop the administrative systems associated with this new array of CR services. Team Peace’s professional staff members (led primarily by David Votruba) prepared and delivered a year-long training curriculum to prepare student interns to fill their roles as facilitators. Jessica Waddell also made substantive contributions to the Intake Facilitator (IF) and ACR-for-AOD Facilitator training regimen.

  Of particular note is the Motivational Interviewing (MI) training provided by Dr. Votruba on an ongoing basis to the entire team.

- **ACR Volunteer Facilitator Training**
  In May of 2007, Team Peace took lead on planning and recruitment efforts for OSCR’s Second Annual Social Justice Mediation Training. 26 participants from across the University successfully completed a 40-hour mediation certification program, led by Drs. Deepika Marya (Southern Maine) and Leah Wing (Massachusetts-Amherst). When combined with participants from the 2007 cohort, OSCR now has a robust pool of over 50 faculty, staff, and student volunteer mediators.

- **Education Workshops**
  During 2007-08, Team Peace members responded to several requests for educational workshops on topics related to conflict and conflict resolution. Requestors included:
  - Adelia Cheever Program
“Greek Leadership 101” Class (Office of Greek Life)
College of Literature, Science and the Arts (LSA)
Michigan AmeriCorps Partnership
Residence Education
Summer Bridge, Comprehensive Studies Program (LSA)
Telluride Association
University Housing, Lawrence Technological University

Professional and student staff members from the OSCR Team presented to a total of approximately 550 people over the course of the entire year.

- **Stakeholder Presentations**

This past year, Team Peace members led department-wide efforts to help educate current and new stakeholders about OSCR programs and services. Logistical direction for this effort was provided by Jessica Waddell with support and assistance from N.J. Akbar and Benjamin Peters. Stakeholder audiences for OSCR “road shows” included:

- Black Undergraduate Law Association (BULA)
- Greek Leadership 101 Class
- Office of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Affairs (LGBTA)
- Michigan Student Assembly
- Multicultural Greek Council
- Rackham Student Government
- Residence Education
- Students of Color at Rackham (SCOR)

- **Major Campus Outreach Events**

Team Peace coordinated efforts for the OSCR Team to staff information tables and organizational fairs during both academic terms. Community members could expect to find friendly and knowledgeable OSCR staff and volunteers at the following events:

- Festifall
- Northfest
- New Staff Orientation (Division of Student Affairs)
- Winterfest

OSCR also participated in a presentation for parents organized by the Office of New Student Programs (ONSP) as part of Summer Orientation. The 55 minute “MI Community” session included representation from UHS and SAPAC as well as OSCR. Repeated over 30 times during June, July, and August, “MI Community” provided an opportunity for OSCR staff to educate the parents of incoming students about OSCR’s programs and services.
Contacts/Cases

During 2007-08, Team Peace assisted with a total of 281 cases.

- **Summary of Origin of ACR Referrals**

  The Department of Public Safety (DPS) represented the largest referral source (144 cases, or 53%) for ACR services, with AAPD (95 cases, or 35%) as second largest. University Faculty/Staff served as the referral source for 27 cases or 10%. U-M students served as the referral source for 11 cases, or 4% of the total, while Housing Security for 4 cases, or 1% of the total.
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- **Outcomes**

  In the clear majority of cases (262 out of 281), ACR pathways were used successfully to resolve the concern. 3 cases have continued into the 2008-09 academic year.
**Resolution Methods (Process Used for Resolution)**

During 2007-08 U-M students successfully used the ACR-for-AOD pathway 248 times to address and resolve concerns related to alcohol and other drug use. This case traffic accounts for 95% of the total caseload Team Peace managed. Restorative Justice Circles and Social Justice Mediations account for the remaining 5% of case traffic (14 cases and 1 case, respectively) that Team Peace managed entirely (Please note that all requests for Facilitated Dialogue and Shuttle Negotiation were cases that were co-managed by Team Justice, and information about these cases can be found in that section of the report).
Graph represents only those cases resolved exclusively within the ACR process. Other ACR cases that also travelled through FCR prior to resolution are discussed in the next section.

- **Agreements**

The same range of AOD educational programs available within the FCR process is available to students in the ACR-for-AOD pathway. These include:

- B.A.S.I.C.S.
- MyStudentBody.com
- A.S.A.P.

Students participating in a Tier II ACR-for-AOD meeting work with a student facilitator to build consensus on the most appropriate outcome. Students exit this process with an obligation to participate in an AOD educational program. If students meaningfully participate in this process, then no disciplinary record is created.

While each Agreement reached as the outcome of an ACR pathway is unique, typical Agreements may include provisions regarding:

- Contact between parties
- Expectations of future behavioral conduct
- Return or exchange of personal property
- Apologies
Team Peace Evaluation & Assessment

Summary

Team Peace is committed to continuously improving its programs and services. As discussed elsewhere in this report, Team Peace dedicated much of 2007-2008 to the expansion of the number and types of programs and services it offers to the University community; e.g., the Alternative Conflict Resolution for Alcohol and Other Drugs (ACR for AOD) program, Social Justice Mediation, Restorative Justice Circles, Facilitated Dialogues, and various trainings and workshops.

Throughout this period of expansion, questions of how to assess and improve these programs and services have been consistently considered. It is only recently, however, that these questions have begun to be translated into the development of robust and coordinated assessment measures.

Two instruments, the **Social Justice Mediation (SJM) Training Evaluation** and the **Subjective Assessment of Motivational Interviewing Confidence (SAMIC)**, were developed and implemented during 2007-2008.

The **SJM Training Evaluation** was created and implemented to assess the May 2008 SJM Training in order to inform and improve future training efforts for OSCR’s team of social justice mediators and other volunteers.

The **SAMIC** was created and implemented to assess the confidence of Team Peace’s interns’ confidence in their knowledge and application of motivational interviewing theory and practice in the context of the ACR for AOD program. The results of both assessments are summarized below.

Also developed were the **Alternative Conflict Resolution and Formal Conflict Resolution (ACR/FCR) General Assessment**, intended to assess the full range of OSCR’s conflict resolution services; and the **ACR for AOD Assessment**, intended to assess OSCR’s Alternative Conflict Resolution for Alcohol and Other Drugs program. Both assessment instruments will be used during the 2008-09 academic year. During the 2007-08 year, participants in OSCR’s ACR processes were provided with copies of an older **General Assessment Instrument**. The results of these, less robust and coordinated, assessments are synopsized below.
Qualitative of Cases and Programs

SJM Training Evaluation: 20 of the 26 faculty, staff, and students who participated in OSCR’s annual SJM Training (SJMT) completed a post-training evaluation. By most accounts, the SJMT was well received by participants. Notable responses include:

- 95% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the SJMT “met my expectations”
- 95% of respondents “would recommend this SJM Training to other University staff and students”

The survey and results are reproduced in the quantitative section below.

SAMIC – ACR for AOD: The SAMIC was completed by a total of four ACR for AOD Facilitators. Two of these Facilitators completed both the January and the June Administrations of the SAMIC, while one completed only the January Administration and one only the June. Facilitators’ responses to these items during the January Administration of the SAMIC were used to inform training and practice activities during the Winter Semester of 2008. Facilitators were then asked to complete the SAMIC again at conclusion of this semester in order to determine the extent to which these training exercises had helped them to gain a greater understanding of motivational interviewing concepts and greater confidence in implementing these concepts during the ACR for AOD process. In general, the SAMIC proved helpful in informing the development of the ACR for AOD program. Some quantitative results and implications of this pilot study are discussed below.

General Assessment Instrument: In general, respondents to the open-ended questions (n = 5) reported positive experiences with OSCR’s ACR processes. (Please note that respondents’ comments are reproduced verbatim.) For example:

Why did you agree to participate in the ACR process?

- “In hope that the student would understand the community impact.”
- “Mainly b/c the student & [residence hall] facilities agreed. It was, in my opinion an alternative conflict resolution option that made sense.”
- “I thought it was the most appropriate way to deal with our situation.”
- “Because the student was trying to work things out within Housing and not denying his responsibility.”
- “I definitely wanted the chance to resolve any issues with the school and avoid any sort of disciplinary record.”

Did the ACR process meet your expectations?

- “Yes. It all worked out well.”
Was the outcome of your ACR reasonable?

- “Yes. It came from both parties involved (resident & facilities) which was great!”
- “It was reasonable. I was treated fairly and with respect and everything we had to say was listened to and it all worked out well.”
- “Yes. I feel like we were given the opportunity to apologize & were not reprimanded to [sic] greatly for the type of issue we had.”
- “Yes. He was willing to pay for the damage and acknowledge he was wrong in his doing and apologized to all parties.”

Do you have any thoughts for improving the ACR process?

- “Not @ this time. I like how it was facilitated by students. They did a solid job!”
- “No it was a good, positive experience.”

Two respondents offered the following constructive criticisms:

Do you have any thoughts for improving the ACR process?

- “Allow us to address the events that happened (at the beginning fact portion).”
- “There needs to be students involved w/ process. There were no students involved in circle. The two Hall Directors present created a strange dynamic w/ the accused student.”

Quantitative of Cases and Programs

SJM Training Evaluation:

**SAMIC – ACR for AOD:** In general, the results of this pilot study suggest that OSCR’s ACR for AOD facilitators feel somewhat confident when employing a motivational interviewing-based approach to the ACR for AOD process (e.g., mean full scale = 4.18). That said, there are several items where one or more facilitators either rated their confidence as “not sure”, “somewhat not confident”, or “not very confident”, or indicated that they did not understand the item.

Specifically, facilitators reported a need for additional training regarding open-ended questions and reflective listening; assessing ACR for AOD participants’ readiness for change and states of change; recognizing, eliciting, exploring, and strengthening participants’ change talk; motivating participants to complete additional or follow-up AOD interventions; and motivating participants to utilize the University’s Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), if necessary.

These aspects of the motivational interviewing-based approach may require additional attention and training during future academic terms.
General Assessment Instrument:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Response (out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I found ACR was a safe way to discuss my concerns.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was treated with respect.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My expectations of privacy were met.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt listened to.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gained greater insight into my concern.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was helped to develop the ability to address my concern.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ACR process met my expectations.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend ACR to others as a conflict resolution process.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team Peace Accomplishments

Team Peace made important contributions in support of departmental goals and objectives during 2007-08. Departmental initiatives are designed to intentionally advance the OSCR mission: Build Trust, Promote Justice, Teach Peace.

- Team Peace participated in OSCR’s efforts to help develop new web content that more comprehensively describes OSCR programs and services to a variety of key audiences. A robust ‘FAQ’ section with sections for different audiences provides another means for browsers to quickly access the information they need. Team Peace member Benjamin Peters provided the technological assistance needed to upload and place the new content.

- “Building the bridge as we go” might best describe the ambitious agenda Team Peace members tackled: designing administrative processes and protocols to support the new ACR services on offer this year. All Team Peace members made substantive contributions to the system design, from training protocols to the invite letters sent to disputants.

- OSCR was invited by the Office of New Student Programs (ONSP) to continue involvement with Parent Orientation. ONSP spearheaded the creation of a new video designed to introduce parents to critical topics and U-M resources related to campus conflict, alcohol use, and sexual assault. Team Peace staff developed and refined a script, cast presenters from among the OSCR staff, and worked with ONSP to arrange for filming. The new video, currently in use for the 2008 Summer Orientation season, will ultimately be viewed by tens of thousands of U-M parents and guests over its (estimated) three year lifespan.

- All three departmental teams contributed to this important deliverable: a new go-forward approach to managing and resolving alcohol-related violations.
• As of 30 May 2008, all full-time professional staff save one have successfully completed the 40-hour Social Justice Mediation Training (SJMT) program. Both returning Team Peace undergraduate student interns have completed the SJMT, and have served as Restorative Justice Circle facilitators and ACR-for-AOD facilitators.

• Team Peace led efforts for staging OSCR’s Social Justice Mediation Training in May 2008, nearly doubling the size of the volunteer pool and extending the program’s reach to key stakeholders like:
  o College of Engineering
  o Office of Academic Multicultural Initiatives
  o Inter-Cooperative Council
  o Office of New Student Programs
  o Office of the Ombuds
  o Housing Security
  o International Center
  o School of Social Work

In 2008-09, Team Peace aims to consolidate and expand gains made during this past year. Areas of focus for the upcoming year include:

• Continuous improvement of ACR pathways, administrative support systems
• Development of survey instruments to support team and departmental assessment needs
• Continued expansion of network of stakeholders
• Development and implementation of conflict resolution workshops for campus audiences
• Staging of the Third Annual Social Justice Mediation Training
• Development of program marketing plan to promote ACR services to U-M campus
Cases Managed by Both Team Justice and Team Peace

31 cases travelled through both Formal Conflict Resolution (“FCR”) and Alternative Conflict Resolution (“ACR”).

Of these cases there were:

17 successful resolutions (16 ACR, 1 FCR):
- 6 cases resulted in successful resolution through ACR-for-AOD (ACR);
- 2 cases resulted in successful resolution through Facilitated Dialogue (ACR);
- 3 cases resulted in successful resolution through a Restorative Justice Circle (ACR);
- 2 cases resulted in successful resolution through Shuttle Negotiation (ACR);
- 3 cases resulted in successful resolution through Social Justice Mediation (ACR);
- 1 case resulted in successful resolution through Arbitration (FCR).

13 unsuccessful resolutions:
- 2 cases referred to FCR after ACR were unsuccessful and are currently pending.
- 5 cases referred to FCR after ACR were unsuccessful, at which point the complaints were withdrawn.
- 1 case referred to FCR after ACR was unsuccessful, at which point the complaint was dismissed.
- 1 case resulted in the request for ACR being withdrawn after ACR was unsuccessful.
- 1 case resulted in the request for ACR being withdrawn before it was attempted.
- 1 case resulted in the request for ACR being withdrawn after the other party declined to participate.
- 2 cases resulted in a consult with both ACR and FCR teams, but did not result in either a complaint or a request for ACR services.

1 pending:
- 1 case is on hold pending the student’s re-enrollment.
The Year Ahead:

In addition to the individual Team focus areas previously highlighted for the year ahead, areas of investment for the 2008-09 OSCR Team include:

- Continued innovation in case resolution methods that increase effectiveness, improve the educational experience and utilize a social justice lens to ensure access for the entire community.
- Increased efforts to infuse “restorative justice practices” in our FCR process.
- Increased outreach to improve relevancy and awareness of OSCR across campus.
- Increased staff training to improve Resolution Coordinator skills and ensure a commitment to the “fundamental” student development work in providing services.
- Improved coordination in ACR & FCR referrals and timeliness for case management.
- Continuous work with evaluation and assessment.
- Strengthened partnerships with DSA and institutional stakeholders.
- Continued presence and contribution to the field on the national level.