

## **Student Disciplinary Actions: 2020-2021**

Presented to the Council of the University Senate on March 29, 2022  
Michele Rasmussen  
Dean of Students in the University

Annually, the Council of the University Senate asks Campus and Student Life to provide a report of all student disciplinary proceedings, as required by actions taken by the Council on May 23, 1970 and June 8, 1976.

### **I. Area Disciplinary Systems**

Campus and Student Life reports to the Council on disciplinary matters that have occurred in the academic units during the year. Between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021, [Area Disciplinary Committees](#) were convened to consider allegations brought against 32 students in 25 separate hearings.

In the **College**, 20 disciplinary hearings were convened involving 26 students. The College Area Disciplinary Committee (CADC) concluded 19 of these students were responsible for violating University Policy while the other seven were not responsible. Three students submitted a request for review, none of which met the criteria for convening a Review Board.

1. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student collaborated with another student during a quiz for a class. The CADC concluded the student was responsible and issued disciplinary probation for four quarters.
2. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student collaborated with another student during a quiz for a class. The CADC concluded the student was responsible and issued disciplinary probation for four quarters.
3. A student was charged with cheating. The CADC concluded the student was not responsible.
4. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student accessed materials on Canvas during an exam. The CADC concluded the student was responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension. The student requested a review of the CADC's decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.
5. A student was charged with cheating. The CADC concluded the student was not responsible.
6. A student was charged with cheating. The CADC concluded the student was not responsible.

7. A student was charged with academic dishonesty. The CADC concluded the student was not responsible.
8. A student was charged with academic dishonesty. The CADC concluded the student was not responsible.
9. A student was charged with plagiarism, specifically the student plagiarized substantial portions of a final paper. The CADC concluded the student was responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension.
10. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student gave and received assistance from another student in order to complete a final exam. The CADC concluded the student was responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension.
11. A student was charged with plagiarism and cheating, specifically the student plagiarized information by collaborating inappropriately with another student on course assignments. Additionally, the student gave and received assistance from another student in order to complete a final exam in a separate class. The CADC concluded the student was responsible and placed the student on disciplinary probation until graduation.
12. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student gave and received unpermitted assistance with another student during a final exam. The CADC concluded the student was responsible and issued a five-quarter suspension.
13. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student received a copy of a final exam from another student, prior to being administered the final exam. The CADC concluded the student was responsible and placed the student on disciplinary probation until graduation.
14. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student gave a copy of a final exam to another student, prior to that student being administered the final exam. The CADC concluded the student was responsible and placed the student on disciplinary probation until graduation.
15. A student was charged with plagiarism, specifically the student plagiarized substantial portions of a final paper in a class and then plagiarized three more papers in a subsequent class in the course sequence. The CADC concluded the student was responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension. The student requested a review of the CADC's decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.
16. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student submitted answers to a quiz that were substantially similar to answers submitted by other students. The

CADC concluded the student was responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension.

17. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student inappropriately collaborated with another student in order to complete and submit a final exam. After being confronted about the matter the student attempted to distort the facts by amending their study guide and making deceptive statements to the CADC. The CADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension. The student submitted a request for review of the CADC's decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.
18. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student inappropriately collaborated with another student in order to complete and submit a final exam. After being confronted about the matter the student attempted to distort the facts by amending their study guide and making deceptive statements to the CADC. The CADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension.
19. A student was charged with cheating in two separate classes, specifically the student inappropriately collaborated with another student to complete four quizzes in one class and inappropriately collaborated with another student to complete the final exam of another class. The CADC concluded the student was responsible and placed the student on disciplinary probation until graduation.
20. Seven students were charged with violating the University Health Pact and City of Chicago's public health orders, specifically the students held a party at their off-campus residence that failed to comply with restrictions on social gatherings and expectations for social distancing. In a combined proceeding, the CADC concluded five students were responsible, and placed one student on disciplinary probation for eight quarters, two students on disciplinary probation for six quarters, and two students on disciplinary probation for four quarters. Two students were found not responsible.

The **Chicago Booth School of Business** held two disciplinary hearings involving three different students. The Area Disciplinary Committee (ADC) found all three students responsible for violating University Policy. None of the students submitted a request for review.

21. Two students were charged with violating Booth's honor code and their cases were considered in a single proceeding. One student submitted the work of other individuals for homework and a final project. The ADC concluded the student was responsible, issued disciplinary probation through graduation, and required the student to complete an educational sanction. The second student submitted the work of other individuals for homework and shared their final project with another student. The ADC concluded the student was also responsible, issued disciplinary probation through graduation, and required the student to complete an educational sanction.

22. A student was charged with violating Booth's honor code, specifically the student consulted outside sources to research a case. The ADC concluded the student was responsible, issued disciplinary probation for one quarter, and removed the student from a Booth leadership position.

The **Law School** held one disciplinary hearing involving a single student. The Area Disciplinary Committee (ADC) found the student responsible for violating University Policy. The student did not submit a request for review.

23. A student was charged with failing to uphold the standards expected of a University of Chicago student, specifically the student purposefully misrepresented information to the Law School and a federal judge. The ADC concluded the student was responsible, issued a three-quarter suspension, and required follow-up with the Law School's dean of students, prior to reenrollment.

The **Harris School of Public Policy** held one disciplinary hearing involving a single student. This student was found responsible by the Area Disciplinary Committee (ADC) for violating University Policy and did not request a review of the outcome.

24. A student was charged with cheating on an exam and lying to University officials. The ADC concluded the student was responsible and issued a two-quarter suspension.

The **Humanities Division** held one disciplinary hearing involving a single student. The Area Disciplinary Committee (ADC) found the student responsible for violating University Policy. The student did not request a review of the outcome.

25. A student was charged with lying, failure to comply with the directives of a University official, and breaches of standards of behavior expected of University students, specifically the student made false statements to a disciplinary committee and to faculty and administrators across the University. The student also sent numerous unwelcome, inappropriate, and harassing emails to faculty and staff, after being directed to cease sending communication. The ADC concluded the student was responsible and issued a two-quarter suspension.

**Table 1. Student matters referred to area disciplinary committees, 2010-11 to 2020-21**

<b>Year</b>	<b>College/ Academic</b>	<b>College/ Other</b>	<b>Graduate/ Academic</b>	<b>Graduate/ Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>2010-11</i>	4	3	3	3	13
<i>2011-12</i>	4	9	10	2	25
<i>2012-13</i>	1	9	5	2	17
<i>2013-14</i>	2	12	6	3	23
<i>2014-15</i>	7	21	6	1	35
<i>2015-16</i>	19	16	28	4	67
<i>2016-17</i>	15	7	7	1	30
<i>2017-18</i>	9	3	7	4	23
<i>2018-19</i>	0	3	12	0	15
<i>2019-20</i>	24	3	2	3	32
<i>2020-21</i>	19	7	4	2	32

## **II. University-wide Student Disciplinary System**

Campus and Student Life reports to the Council on matters referred to the [University-wide Student Disciplinary System](#) for conduct involving alleged violations of the University Policy on Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Misconduct.

Between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021, the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee (Committee) was convened on three occasions to consider allegations brought against three students. Two of the students involved in these matters requested reviews of the Committee’s decisions, neither of which met the criteria for convening a Review Board.

1. A graduate student was referred to the Committee for allegations of sexual harassment, stalking, breaching confidentiality, and retaliation toward a member of the University community. The Committee concluded the student was responsible for breaching confidentiality and retaliation, specifically the student disclosed confidential information about a disciplinary proceeding to a third-party and also sent numerous emails to faculty and administrators about the proceeding. The Committee concluded the student was responsible and assigned disciplinary probation until the student graduates and banned the student from campus. The student requested a review of the Committee’s decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.
2. A student in the College was referred to the Committee for an allegation of sexual assault of another College student, specifically the respondent initiated sexual activity without seeking verbal consent, as agreed to by both students. The Committee concluded the student was responsible and assigned disciplinary probation for two quarters and an educational session.
3. A student in the College was referred to the Committee for an allegation of stalking, harassment, and violating a no-contact directive with another student. Specifically, the

respondent engaged in conduct that included sending unwanted messages on social media and making unwanted calls, with the goal of starting a romantic relationship, after being told to stop. The Committee concluded the student was responsible and issued a six-quarter suspension, assigned disciplinary probation for two quarters upon reenrollment, required an intake session with a mental health professional, assigned an educational program, banned the respondent from living on campus, restricted the respondent’s visitation to residence halls, and restricted the respondent from registering for classes in which the complainant is enrolled, or joining student organizations in which the complainant is a member. The student requested a review of the Committee’s decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.

**Table 2. Student matters referred to the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee, 2014-15 to 2020-21<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Year</b>	<b>College</b>	<b>Divisions/Schools</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>2014-15</i>	2	2	4
<i>2015-16</i>	4	1	5
<i>2016-17</i>	9	3	12
<i>2017-18</i>	9	3	12
<i>2018-19</i>	5	4	9
<i>2019-20</i>	4	2	6
<i>2020-21</i>	2	1	3

<sup>1</sup> Table 2 displays student matters based on the affiliation of the respondent (i.e., as a student in the College or in one of the divisions/professional schools)

### **III. University Disciplinary System for Disruptive Conduct**

Starting in 2017-18, Campus and Student Life reports annually to the Council on matters referred to the [University Disciplinary System for Disruptive Conduct](#), which was established in 2017 and addresses conduct involving alleged violations by students of University Statute 21.

Between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021, the University-wide Standing Committee on Disruptive Conduct (USCDC) was not convened.

**Table 3. Student matters referred to the University-wide Standing Committee on Disruptive Conduct, 2017-18 to 2019-20**

<b>Year</b>	<b>College</b>	<b>Divisions/Schools</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>2017-18</i>	0	0	0
<i>2018-19</i>	0	1	1
<i>2019-20</i>	2	0	2
<i>2020-21</i>	0	0	0