

The Association for Student Judicial Affairs Membership Survey

2009 Full Data Summary

Methodology

The 2008 ASJA Membership Survey was proposed by President Gary Dickstein in the spring of 2008 and later developed by Dr. Kelli Peck Parrott, Gary Dickstein, Executive Director Billye Potts, Dr. Darby Roberts, and doctoral student Lonnie Booker. The collection of survey items began in the summer of 2008 and culminated with the distribution of the survey to the membership on December 3, 2008. The survey was web-based and distributed via the Office of Student Life Studies at Texas A&M University. A reminder email was sent December 12, 2008 and the survey was closed on December 15, 2008.

All members of ASJA with active email addresses were surveyed. The survey was distributed through an email request to approximately 1691 members. 485 responses were received, resulting in a 27% response rate.

The Membership Survey contained 62 items. Most of the items (44) were created for the use of the Association to inform strategic planning. The remaining items were included in order to collect longitudinal data about the field of student conduct. Items included Likert scale, forced choice, and open-ended questions.

SPSS was used to provide simple descriptive statistics. Due to the large amount of data, analysis for correlation among items was not conducted; however, additional analysis could be provided if needed. Please note that in reporting the frequencies and percentages, non-respondents to individual items were not listed in order to keep the report as brief as possible while still reporting all of the data.

Additionally, at the time of the survey the new name of the organization (ASCA) had not been “officially” introduced and so it was determined that the Association would be referred to as ASJA for the purpose of the survey. In line with this decision, the Association is also referred to as ASJA throughout this report.

Data Analysis

Demographics

The majority of respondents (91%) identified themselves as professional members, with an additional 6% being student members. The respondents’ length of membership was fairly evenly distributed, 13% had been members less than a year, 20% 1-2 years, 22% 3-4 years, 13% 5-6 years, 17% 7-8 years, and 15% had been members for 9 years or more. Additionally, the

respondents were unequally distributed in terms of gender, with 53% identifying as female, 45% male, and 2% preferring not to respond. In regard to ethnicity and identification with underrepresented populations, 9% identified as African-American, 78% Caucasian, 3% Hispanic/Latino, 1% Asian Pacific Islander, 1% Native American, 2% Multiracial, 4.5% GLBT, 1% physical ability (differently abled) and 4% preferred not to respond. (Please note that respondents might be representative of several identities)

Outside of the Canadian Circuit which comprised only 1.5% (6) of respondents, circuit membership of the respondents was also fairly evenly distributed, with the highest percentage, 14%, (58) being from Circuit 9, and the lowest percentage, 5%, (18) being from Circuit 10. Every circuit was represented. Additionally, the respondents were also members of several other professional organizations, most commonly in NASPA (54%), ACPA (40%), and ACUHO-I (18%).

In regard to their institutions, respondents were most frequently employed at 4 year public universities (57%) or 4 year private universities (34%). Sizes of respondent institutions were more evenly distributed, with 25% at institutions under 5,000 students, 19% at institutions with 5,000-9,999 students, 17% with 10,000-14,999 students, and 30% with more than 20,000 students.

Most of the respondents had obtained a Master's degree (70%), though an impressive 18% had earned a PhD or EdD. Most respondents were employed full-time (92%), and 5% were employed as graduate assistants. Interestingly, salaries were also very well distributed. Salaries were listed in \$5,000 increments from \$20,000 to more than \$90,000. In most categories, between 5-8% of the respondents were represented. However, the largest segment of the respondents (13%) reported that their salaries were more than \$90,000. Additionally, the majority of respondents have been working in higher education full-time, and in student affairs for more than 5 years. The largest percentage of respondents have been working in student conduct between 3-10 years.

ASJA Involvement

Members were asked if they felt welcomed as a new member in the Association, with 70.3% (316) responding that they "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that they felt welcomed. Additionally, 22.3% (100) of the members responded neutrally, with 4.9% stating that they "disagreed" with the statement and that they did not feel welcomed as a new member. Only 1 person responded that they "strongly disagreed." When asked why they felt as they did, many responded positively, citing the friendliness of the conference, being listed as a new member on newsletters, having a ribbon on their nametags stating they were new members, etc, all made them feel welcomed as new members. There were many positive references to attending the conference and feeling welcomed, specifically through newcomers' receptions, "mentors," and the conference atmosphere. However, there were some references to the association appearing "cliquish" particularly at the leadership levels.

Members were asked if they were involved in specific areas of the organization within the past 24 months, with the results shown in Table 1. It is important to note that these numbers and

percentages are representative of the involvement levels of those who responded to the survey and may not be reflective of the entire membership.

Table 1

Position	Frequency	Percentage
Board of Directors	17	3.8
Circuit Representative	23	5.1
Circuit Volunteer	35	7.8
Committee Chair	14	3.1
Committee Member	43	9.6
Member Interest Council Head	5	1.1
Member Interest Council Member	10	2.2
Conference Committee	24	5.3
Conference Educational Session Presenter	37	8.2
Conference Volunteer	50	11.1
Academy Faculty	14	3.1
Academy Committee	7	1.6
Task Force Member	20	4.5
Prefer Not to Answer	10	2.2

Additionally, 49 members selected “other” and listed conference attendance and academy attendance, as well as involvement with the listserv, circuits, and other venues which they interpreted as involvement.

To ascertain more specific involvement, members were asked if they had been involved with a list of areas. The results are listed below in Table 2.

Table 2

Area	Frequency	Percentage
Awards	24	5.3
Diversity	23	5.1
Elections	13	2.9
IT Advisors	2	.4
Educational Foundation	6	1.3
Publications	11	2.4
Research	12	2.7
Resolutions	5	1.1
CAS Liaison	0	0
Legislative Advisory	12	2.7
Finance	8	1.8
Substance Abuse Liaison	1	.2
Member Interest Council	21	4.7
Membership	20	4.5

To determine perceptions of involvement in ASJA, respondents who had indicated that they were involved in either a position or areas previously listed, were asked to complete the statement “Becoming involved in ASJA is” Of the 180 respondents who were involved, the majority (115) responded that it was either “very easy” or “somewhat easy” to get involved. 20 members responded that it was “neither easy nor difficult,” 30 responded that it was “somewhat difficult” and 2 believed it was “very difficult” to become involved. Of the remaining, 1 did not respond, and 12 “didn’t know.”

Members, who did not list involvement in either a position or area of ASJA, were asked why they were not involved. 89 (19.8%) members responded that they simply “chose not to be involved;” 64 (14.3%) responded that they “did not know how to become involved;” and 9 (2%) answered that they “tried to get involved, but no one responded.” Respondents were allowed the opportunity to write in additional reasons they chose not to be involved, with the primary themes being that they were either new to the Association or new to their jobs. Other reasons included being too busy, no longer having primary judicial responsibilities, and family and graduate study commitments. A very small number of responses alluded to having volunteered but being turned away or issues with the leadership.

All members were asked if they believed there were sufficient opportunities for being involved. Over 61% of respondents, either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that there were sufficient opportunities for involvement. An additional 32.2% were “neutral.” Only 5.4% (23) “disagreed,” and 1 member (.2%) “strongly disagreed.”

When asked if they were satisfied with their involvement with ASJA, 49.2% (210) either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they were satisfied. 27.4% (117) responded neutrally, while 21.1% (90) “disagreed,” indicating they were not satisfied with their involvement. An additional

1.9% (8) “strongly disagreed,” indicating they were perhaps very dissatisfied with their involvement.

When asked for their suggestions for involving more members in ASJA, several themes emerged. Many responded that they volunteered for committees or circuits and then after the conference they never heard anything else. Several requested more information about the committees and what they do, and that this information be distributed regularly. Some suggested state representatives and smaller groupings than the circuits to make travel and involvement more financially and geographically accessible. There were also some complaints about navigating the website and accessing involvement information. There also seems to be a perception that the same group of people get asked to volunteer. There were several requests that the leadership at all levels ask others repeatedly (both personally and via web and email) to volunteer.

Circuits

Respondents were asked if they had received information from their circuit representative within the last year. Over 65% responded that they had heard from their circuit rep, while 21% responded that they had not. 14% responded that they did not know whether they had heard from their circuit rep or not. Additionally, 40.6% (173) responded that they had attended a circuit event, though 58.9% (251) had not. More specifically, the 173 members who responded that they had attended a circuit event were asked if they had attended a circuit event within the past three years. 78% (135) responded that they had attended an event within the last three years, while 20% responded they had not, and 2% did not know.

Those members who responded that they had not attended a circuit event were asked why, and the majority stated they were not aware of the circuit events. Several others responded that budget, time and scheduling restrictions, or attending other offerings limited their ability to attend. Additionally, several responded that they were new members and had not yet had the opportunity.

Suggestions for future circuit activities provided a plethora of specific topic suggestions which I would encourage circuit leadership to view. However, themes of encouraging drive-in conferences, state conferences, and some means for making travel more accessible, including webinars, emerged.

Membership

Membership fees

Members were asked specifically if the cost of membership in ASJA was worth the services and programs provided. Overwhelmingly, 78% of respondents (331) either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that cost of membership was worth the services and programs provided. 18% (75) responded neutrally, and only 4% (17) stated that they “disagreed,” membership was not worth the cost. No one responded that they “strongly disagreed.”

When asked who paid for their membership, 70% (298) responded that their institution covered their membership costs, while 28% (120) paid for their own membership (an additional 2% either “didn’t know” or had other means). The 120 who responded that they paid for membership themselves were additionally asked if membership were part of conference registration fees, would their institution pay for membership. 35.8% (43) responded that their institution would pay membership fees if they were included with conference fees, while 28.3% responded “no,” their institution would still not pay membership fees, and 35.8% (43) did not know whether it would affect their institutions’ willingness to pay for their membership.

Additionally, when members were asked if renewing their membership was dependent upon whether their institution would pay for the membership, results were pretty evenly split. 48.1% (204) responded “yes,” renewing their membership depended upon their institution paying for membership, while 43.9% (186) responded “no,” their continued membership did not depend upon who paid the membership fees. An additional 8% (34) responded that they “didn’t know.”

Elements of membership

The survey asked members to indicate the importance of several aspects of their membership in ASJA. Those elements of membership that were ranked as most important (combined “very important” and “important” responses) were: exposure to literature, research, and contemporary thought in student conduct (95.3%); opportunities to discuss larger issues related to student conduct (92.9%); opportunities to learn new practices and skills (92.6%); opportunities for professional development (88.3%); and networking opportunities with colleagues (86%). With regard to job placement respondents were divided in their opinions, 35% responded this service was “not important at all,” while 26% saw it as “somewhat important” and 23% saw it as “important.” While fewer members thought the opportunity to present or the opportunity for leadership was “very important,” most members found it to be “important” or “somewhat important.” Similarly, respondents (71.3%) found opportunities to research only “somewhat important,” while 20% found it “not at all important.”

Use and awareness of services

Respondents were asked about their awareness and use of several services of the Association. Overwhelmingly, respondents stated that they were very aware or aware (80%+) of the Law and Policy Report, ASJA Weekly Updates, the annual conference, the Gehring Academy, Webinars with ResLife.Net, legislative updates, individual vote in association wide decisions, ASJA awards, and the ASJA website. Though the majority of respondents were still aware of the following services, large percentages were unaware of the *Journal of Student Conduct Administration* (32%), the Yahoo! Listserv (31%), on-line forums (48%), career center (30%), career connections (28%), circuit programs (20%), and member interest councils (34%).

In terms of services used, use seems to be related to knowledge of the service in many cases. However, though the majority of respondents knew about the Gehring Academy and the webinars, a surprisingly high number have never used these services. The specific findings are listed in Table 3 below.

Table 3

Service	Never	Once or Twice	Occasionally	Frequently
Law and Policy Report	23 (5.6%)	42 (10.2%)	117 (28.3%)	214 (51.8%)
Journal of Student Conduct Administration	162 (39.2%)	83 (20.1%)	91 (22%)	34 (8.2%)
ASJA Weekly Updates	19 (4.6%)	50 (12.1%)	161 (39%)	156 (37.8%)
Annual conference	89 (21.5%)	66 (16%)	71 (17.2%)	159 (38.5%)
Gehring Academy	193 (46.7%)	108 (26.2%)	49 (11.9%)	37 (9%)
Webinars with Res.Life.net	238 (57.6%)	106 (25.7%)	34 (8.2%)	3 (.7%)
Yahoo! Listserv	157 (38%)	40 (9.7%)	78 (18.9%)	108 (26.2%)
On-line forums	290 (70.2%)	44 (10.7%)	25 (6.1%)	6 (1.5%)
Career Center (on-line)	229 (55.4%)	90 (21.8%)	52 (12.6%)	14 (3.4%)
Career Connections (at the conference)	287 (69.5%)	59 (14.3%)	20 (4.8%)	7 (1.7%)
Circuit programs	177 (42.9%)	104 (25.2%)	62 (15%)	33 (8%)
Legislative Updates	33 (8%)	104 (25.2%)	149 (36.1%)	98 (23.7%)
Individual vote in association decisions	67 (16.2%)	90 (21.8%)	81 (19.6%)	148 (35.8%)
ASJA awards	249 (60.3%)	73 (17.7%)	40 (9.7%)	20 (4.8%)
Membership interest councils	242 (58.6%)	93 (22.5%)	35 (8.5%)	8 (1.9%)
ASJA Website	7 (1.7%)	53 (12.8%)	222 (53.8%)	114 (27.6%)

When asked to respond concerning their satisfaction with the Association providing specific services, overall the most frequent response was that they were “satisfied” with the services being provided. However, a significant portion of the respondents also responded that they were “neither satisfied or dissatisfied” with the services being provided for some services such as publishing valuable research, administer ASJA awards, administer on-line career center, and identify and respond to member needs. This response is difficult to interpret without more

information. It may be that many respondents are indifferent to particular services and as a result are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. For example, previously in the survey, respondents were divided in their opinions regarding the importance of job placement as a member service. On the other hand, identifying and responding to member needs is a more general service one might assume would be important to all members. Responses to each of the items are listed below in Table 4.

Table 4

Service	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied
Forums/Listserv	3 (.7%)	20 (5%)	147 (36.5%)	154 (38.2%)	68 (16.9%)
Alert members of important trends	2 (.5%)	16 (4%)	61 (15.1%)	133 (57.8%)	81 (20.1%)
Provide Legislative Updates	2 (.5%)	18 (4.5%)	47 (11.7%)	225 (55.8%)	101 (25.1%)
Provide Networking	2 (.5%)	19 (4.7%)	123 (30.5%)	180 (44.7%)	66 (16.4%)
Conduct Annual Convention	4 (1%)	7 (1.7%)	84 (20.8%)	148 (36.7%)	149 (37%)
Conduct targeted webinars & workshops	2 (.5%)	17 (4.2%)	139 (34.5%)	170 (42.2%)	62 (15.4%)
Administer ASJA Awards	2 (.5%)	18 (4.5%)	259 (64.3%)	85 (21.1%)	29 (7.2%)
Publications	2 (.5%)	22 (5.5%)	111 (27.5%)	192 (47.6%)	59 (14.6%)
Administer on-line career center	3 (.7%)	16 (4.0%)	251 (62.3%)	107 (26.6%)	16 (4%)
Publish valuable research	4 (1%)	37 (9.2%)	195 (48.4%)	127 (31.5%)	28 (6.9%)

Service	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied
Identify and respond to member needs	2 (.5%)	32 (7.9%)	173 (42.9%)	151 (37.5%)	35 (8.7%)
Offer high quality ed. programs	2 (.5%)	14 (3.5%)	97 (24.1%)	206 (51.1%)	74 (18.4%)
Appoint/elect people to leadership fairly	7 (1.7%)	21 (5.2%)	126 (31.3%)	172 (42.7%)	66 (16.4%)
Appoint/elect effective and competent people	7 (1.7%)	17 (4.2%)	143 (35.5%)	154 (38.2%)	69 (17.1%)
Provide informative publications and resources	3 (.7%)	14 (3.5%)	79 (19.6%)	203 (50.4%)	90 (22.3%)
Provide opportunities for involvement	15 (3.7%)	43 (10.7%)	124 (30.8%)	157 (39%)	53 (13.2%)

When asked whether members believed the core values of ASJA were appropriate, 91% (367) responded affirmatively, while only 5% (21) responded negatively, and 4% preferred not to answer. Of those few that responded negatively, they cited reasons such as the values being too broad and vague.

The membership was also asked if they believed they were adequately informed of the actions taken by the Board of Directors, with 67% (271) responding “yes” and 30% (121) responding “no.” Interestingly, the next item asked about suggestions for publications, but most responses (36) were in regard to the Board of Directors. Overwhelmingly, they requested published minutes of Board meetings or reports and more transparency. One member specifically requested newsletter updates, “I used to like Dave Parrott’s regular updates. I’d like to see something like that again.”

In sum, when asked whether they felt that the Association met their needs as members, over 83% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the Association met their professional needs. In regards to suggestions for better meeting member needs, the responses were highly varied and difficult to discern themes; however, several were mentioned more than once: move the conference location to be more accessible, have improved membership packets with information about involvement, update website, provide opportunities (perhaps applications) for others to serve in leadership and as faculty to the Academy, and more regional and state activities.

Central Office

In order to solicit feedback about the Central office, several items were included concerning the work and effectiveness of the Central Office. It is important to note when looking at the percentages and numbers on the following items, that many members responded that the items were not applicable to them, or in other words, they had not used the service. Not using a service does not equate to the Central Office being unresponsive. In fact, on all of the items, the majority of respondents indicated that they were either “satisfied” or “highly satisfied” with the service from the Central Office. Detailed responses are listed below in Table 5.

When asked how many times the respondents had had contact with the Central Office excluding registration for the annual conference, most responded they had been in contact 1-2 times a year (42.9%), with zero contact being the next most frequent response (38.7%).

Table 5

Service	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	Not Applicable
Responsive-ness to concerns	12 (3%)	8 (2%)	73 (18.2%)	106 (26.4%)	79 (19.7%)	113 (28.2%)
Responsive-ness to member needs	12 (3%)	11 (2.7%)	75 (18.7%)	112 (27.9%)	83 (20.7%)	99 (24.7%)
Customer service	15 (3.7%)	12 (3%)	57 (14.2%)	111 (27.7%)	119 (29.7%)	75 (18.7%)
Communi- cate accurate information	16 (4%)	5 (1.2%)	61 (15.2%)	122 (30.4%)	122 (30.4%)	63 (15.7%)

Items for Consideration

- When asked about satisfaction with the Association's ability to identify and respond to member needs, most frequent response was "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (173 or 42.9%).
- Throughout the survey there were many requests for published Board meeting minutes or regular newsletters and updates about Board decisions and activities.
- Though not a large number, some members who are currently paying their own membership fees may benefit from having membership fees assessed with conference registration.
- There seems to be a perception among some members, though how many or few is unclear, that the leadership is "cliquish" and only those connected to the leadership are invited to volunteer, serve as Academy faculty, etc. There is a call for the leadership to ask others outside of their circle to volunteer.
- 98 members responded that they were dissatisfied with their level of involvement.
- There was a call for individual state representatives, or smaller segments of the organization than circuits, to ease travel and ability to convene.
- There seems to be a lack of awareness of member interest councils, Yahoo! Listserv, the *Journal*, and the on-line forums. Many requests were made that information about committees, member interest councils, the listserv, and other venues for involvement be regularly distributed, not just to new members.
- There is a sizable number (89) of respondents who have never attended a conference. Repeatedly, members who felt welcomed cited experiences at their first conferences (newcomers' reception, mentors, etc.) serving to make them feel welcomed. These experiences are missing for those who have not attended a conference.
- There is a large number (193) of respondents who have never attended a Gehring Academy. There may be potential room for growth.
- There appears to be great potential for growth among two-year colleges, HBCUs, and historically Hispanic serving institutions.