

## **Student Disciplinary Actions: 2021-2022**

Presented to the Council of the University Senate on April 25, 2023  
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 26, 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, 2021 and June 30, 2022, [Area Disciplinary Committees](#) were convened to consider allegations brought against 39 students in 23 separate hearings.

In the **College**, 16 disciplinary hearings were convened involving 31 students. The Area Disciplinary Committee (“ADC”) found 23 students responsible for violating University Policy. The remaining eight students were found not responsible. Two students submitted a request for review, of which one met the criteria for convening a Review Board.

1. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student received unpermitted assistance to complete and submit two separate midterm exams. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued a five-quarter suspension. The student requested a review of the ADC’s decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.
2. Three students were charged with cheating, specifically the students inappropriately collaborated with one another in order to complete two exams. The ADC concluded that the students were responsible and issued each student a four-quarter suspension.
3. A student was charged with failing to comply with the directive of a University official, specifically the student violated a no contact directive by entering the private residence of the individual with whom the student was to have no contact and proceeded to behave in a threatening manner. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued a five-quarter suspension.
4. A student was charged with cheating. The ADC found the student not responsible.
5. Two students were charged with cheating, specifically the students collaborated with one another to complete a class assignment. The ADC concluded that the students were responsible and issued each student disciplinary probation for four quarters.

6. Four students were charged with cheating, specifically the students inappropriately collaborated with one another to complete a midterm exam. The ADC concluded that the students were responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension for each student.
7. Four students were charged with cheating, specifically the students inappropriately collaborated with one another to complete an exam. The ADC concluded that two students were responsible and placed both students on disciplinary probation until graduation. The ADC found the other two students not responsible.
8. Three students were charged with cheating, specifically the students copied off a fourth student to complete an exam. The ADC concluded that two students were responsible and placed both students on disciplinary probation for seven quarters. The ADC found the third student not responsible.
9. A student was charged with theft, specifically the student took a clothing item from a party, discarded its contents, and did not return the item to the owner. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension. The student requested a review of the ADC's decision based on new and material information unavailable to the ADC that bore significantly in the student's favor. The request was granted, and a Review Board was convened. The Review Board upheld the finding of responsibility but modified the sanction to disciplinary probation for six quarters.
10. A student was charged with physical abuse, specifically the student assaulted another College student. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued an eight-quarter suspension.
11. A student was charged with plagiarism, specifically the student did not properly cite sources in a homework assignment. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and placed the student on disciplinary probation until graduation.
12. A student was charged with cheating. The ADC found the student not responsible.
13. A student was charged with cheating. The ADC found the student not responsible.
14. A student was charged with plagiarism, specifically the student utilized the online textbook manual to complete a homework problem set. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension.
15. Five students were charged with cheating, specifically the students accessed a course Canvas site during the final exam, even though students were not allowed to use outside materials. The ADC concluded that three students were responsible and issued each of them disciplinary probation for four quarters. The ADC found the two other students not responsible.
16. A student was charged with behavior that threatens the health and safety of others,

specifically the student posted on a social media platform that they planted five bombs in a campus residence hall (no bombs were planted). The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued disciplinary probation for two years.

The **Chicago Booth School of Business** held two disciplinary hearings involving three students. All three students were found responsible for violating University Policy. None of the students requested a review of the Area Disciplinary Committee's decision.

17. Two students were charged with violating Booth's honor code, specifically one student assisted the other student in the completion of a final project. The ADC concluded that both students were responsible. One student was issued a four-quarter suspension, a recommendation for a failing grade in the course, an educational assignment, and upon return to the program, disciplinary probation through graduation. The second student was placed on disciplinary probation through graduation and given an educational assignment.
18. A student was charged with violating Booth's honor code, specifically the student represented the work of others as their own and accessed unauthorized material during a final exam. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued disciplinary probation through graduation.

The **Law School** held one disciplinary hearing involving one student. The student was found responsible for violating University Policy. The student submitted a request for review, which was denied.

19. A student was charged with plagiarism, specifically the student used substantial portions of work from sources in a final paper and did not cite sources in other parts of the final paper. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible, issued a one-quarter suspension, recommended a failing grade for the course, and required that all future papers be reviewed by the Dean of Students prior to submission. The student requested a review of the ADC's decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.

The **Harris School of Public Policy** held three disciplinary hearings involving three students. The ADC concluded that all three students were responsible for violating University Policy. Two students submitted a request for review. One request met the criteria for convening a Review Board.

20. A student was charged with cheating, specifically the student looked at the computer screen of another student during a final exam. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued a two-quarter suspension and upon reinstatement, disciplinary probation until graduation.

21. A student was charged with physical or verbal abuse that threatens the health or safety of others and violating the professional expectation that all Harris students uphold the dignity and respect of every person in the Harris community. Specifically, the student made a credible threat to harm a University staff member and traumatized the staff member's family. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued an expulsion. The student requested a review of the ADC's decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.
22. A student was charged with plagiarism, specifically the student submitted an essay they did not write for an assignment and attempted to gain credit for assignments they did not complete. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued a two-quarter suspension and, upon reinstatement, disciplinary probation until graduation. The student requested a review of the ADC's decision. The request was granted and a Review Board was convened. The Review Board determined that there were deviations from prescribed procedures in the process applied to the student and gave the student the opportunity to submit additional materials for the ADC to consider in determining a sanction. The ADC reconvened to review the new information, and upheld the sanction as initially determined.

The **Division of Social Sciences** held one disciplinary hearing involving one student. The student was found responsible for violating University Policy. The student did not request a review of the outcome.

23. A student was charged with plagiarism, specifically the student did not cite and attribute ideas of others appropriately in a paper. The ADC concluded that the student was responsible and issued disciplinary probation for four quarters.

**Table 1. Student matters referred to area disciplinary committees over the past decade.**

<b>Year</b>	<b>College/ Academic Matter</b>	<b>College/ Other Matter</b>	<b>Graduate/ Academic Matter</b>	<b>Graduate/ Other Matter</b>	<b>Total</b>
<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
<i>2021-22</i>	27	4	7	1	39

## 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, 2021, and June 30, 2022, the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee (Committee) was convened on 11 occasions to consider allegations brought against eight students. Four of the students involved in these matters requested reviews of the Committee's decisions, of which one met the criteria for convening a Review Board.

1. A student in the College was referred to the Committee for an allegation of sexual assault of a College student, specifically the respondent used force to engage in non-consensual sexual activity. The Committee concluded that the respondent was responsible and issued an expulsion. The respondent 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 and physical violence against a College student. The Committee concluded that the respondent was responsible and issued a one-quarter suspension, assigned disciplinary probation until graduation upon reenrollment, required an alcohol screening, assigned an educational program, and banned the student from living on campus. The respondent requested a review of the Committee's decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.
3. A student in the College was referred to the Committee for an allegation of sexual assault and sexual abuse of a College student. The Committee concluded that the respondent was responsible and issued a three-quarter suspension, prohibited the respondent from registering for classes in which the complainant is enrolled, and prohibited the respondent from participating in graduation activities.
4. The same student (i.e., from "3" above) was referred to the Committee for an allegation of sexual assault of a College student. The Committee concluded that the respondent was responsible and issued an expulsion.
5. The same student (i.e., from "3" and "4" above) was referred to the Committee for an allegation of sexual assault of a College student. The Committee concluded that the respondent was responsible and issued an expulsion.
6. A student in the College was referred to the Committee for an allegation of sexual assault of a College student. The Committee found the respondent not responsible for violating University Policy.
7. A student in the College was referred to the Committee for an allegation of sexual assault of a College student. The Committee concluded that the respondent was responsible and issued a three-quarter suspension, assigned disciplinary probation until graduation upon

reenrollment, required an alcohol screening, and assigned an educational program.

8. A student in the College was referred to the Committee for allegations of sexual assault and sexual harassment of a College student. The Committee found the respondent not responsible for violating University Policy.

9. A graduate student was referred to the Committee for an allegation of sexual assault, sexual abuse, and sexual harassment of a graduate student. The Committee concluded that the respondent was responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension and assigned an educational program. The respondent requested a review of the Committee’s decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.

10. The same graduate student (i.e., from “9” above) was referred to the Committee for an allegation of sexual abuse and sexual harassment of another graduate student. The Committee concluded that the respondent was responsible and issued a three-quarter suspension and prohibited the student from being on campus after reenrollment. The respondent requested a review of the Committee’s decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.

11. A student in the College was referred to the Committee for an allegation of dating violence and domestic violence against an individual not affiliated with the University. Specifically, the respondent engaged in a physical fight with the complainant on two separate occasions. The Committee concluded that the respondent was responsible and issued a four-quarter suspension and assigned an educational program. The respondent requested a review of the Committee’s decision on the basis of the sanction being disproportionate to the policy violation. The request was granted, and a Review Board was convened. The Review Board upheld the finding of responsibility, reduced the suspension to one quarter, and added a four-quarter campus ban.

**Table 2. Student matters referred to the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee, 2014-15 to 2021-22.<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
<i>2021-22</i>	9	2	11

<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 or 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, 2021, and June 30, 2022, 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 2021-22.**

Year	College	Divisions/Schools	Total
2017-18	0	0	0
2018-19	0	1	1
2019-20	2	0	2
2020-21	0	0	0
2021-22	0	0	0

### IV. Administrative Disciplinary Actions

University policy allows for the administrative resolution of less serious disciplinary matters when the student(s) involved agree to the proposed resolution of the incident(s) in question. If students are found responsible, they can be sanctioned with a warning, disciplinary probation, loss of privileges, discretionary sanctions, or some combination thereof. Disciplinary suspension, disciplinary expulsion, or revocation of the degree are not permissible sanctions within the administrative resolution framework. The table below represents the number of times administrative action was taken in the area disciplinary process and University disciplinary system for disruptive conduct in 2021-2022.

**Table 4. Student matters resolved through administrative action, 2021-22**

Year	College/ Academic Matter	College/ Other Matter	Graduate/ Academic Matter	Graduate/ Other Matter	Disruptive Conduct	Total
2021-22	71*	5**	54	0	0	130

\* Thirty-two of the 71 academic matters in the College were resolved via a **Confidential File**, which is an informal warning and resolution option. Confidential files are not recorded in the student’s educational record and are destroyed upon graduation if no further violations of University Policy occur.

\*\* Three of the 5 “other” matters in the College were resolved via a Confidential File (as defined above).