

University Disciplinary Actions: 2017-18

Presented to the Council of the University Senate on May 28, 2019

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, 2017 and June 30, 2018, 23 Area Disciplinary Committees were convened to consider allegations brought against 22 students in 23 separate hearings.

In the **College**, 12 disciplinary hearings were convened involving 11 accused students. One student was heard on two separate occasions, for different charges, resulting in additional sanctions against the student. Three students requested reviews of committee decisions. None of these requests was found to meet the criteria for convening a review board.

1. A student who submitted a paper containing material allegedly plagiarized from two outside sources was heard by the disciplinary committee. The student was found responsible and placed on academic probation for the remainder of the student's time in the College.
2. A student was accused of academic dishonesty and lying to the College dean of students regarding alleged misconduct. The student was found responsible for accessing Chalk during an exam and placed on academic probation for the remainder of the student's time in the College.
3. A student, charged with cheating on an online oral comprehension assignment and lying about not following the professor's instruction, was found not responsible.
4. A student, accused of cheating and charged with accessing Chalk without permission during an exam, was found responsible and suspended for two quarters.
5. A student, charged with cheating on a quiz, was found responsible and suspended for one quarter. The student requested a review of the committee's decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a review board.
6. A student accused of initiating a physical altercation with another student was found responsible and placed on disciplinary probation for six quarters. Additionally, the disciplinary committee recommended that the student seek counseling for anger management.

7. The aforementioned student was later accused of plagiarism and found responsible. The committee issued a two quarter suspension. The student requested a review of the committee's decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a review board.
8. A student, accused of being involved in a physical altercation with another student, was found responsible and placed on disciplinary probation for one quarter.
9. A student was charged with colluding with a student from another university and making arrangements to have this individual take an in-class exam on the alleged student's behalf. The student was found responsible and was suspended for one quarter.
10. A student, charged with vandalism and physical or verbal abuse that threatens or endangers the health or safety of others, was found responsible for vandalism and verbal abuse and placed on disciplinary probation for two quarters. The student requested a review of the committee's decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a review board.
11. A student accused of utilizing a primary source without proper citation was found responsible for plagiarism. The student was suspended for two quarters.
12. A student accused of attempting to represent the work of a peer as the student's own for a class assignment was charged with plagiarism. The student was found responsible and placed on disciplinary probation for four quarters.

The **Chicago Booth School of Business** held seven disciplinary hearings involving seven accused students. None of the students requested a review of the disciplinary committee's decision.

13. A student in the Executive Program in Asia was alleged to have looked at another student's paper during an examination. The student was found responsible for violating the Booth honor code. The student was suspended for one quarter.
14. A full-time MBA student admitted to referring to another student's answer sheet while taking an at-home exam. The student was placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's time at Chicago Booth.
15. A second student in the full-time MBA program collaborated with the aforementioned student (#14) in providing an answer sheet for the at-home exam. This student was also placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's time at Chicago Booth.
16. A third student in the full-time MBA program colluded with the previous two students (#14 and #15) in cheating on the same at-home exam. This student was placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's time at Chicago Booth.

17. A student in the Evening/Weekend Program was accused of collaborating with another student on a take-home exam. The student was found responsible and placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's time in the program. Additionally, the committee recommended that the student receive a 0 for the exam.
18. A second Evening/Weekend Program student was accused of collaborating with the aforementioned student (#17) on a take-home exam. This student was also placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's time in the program. Additionally, the committee recommended that the student receive a 0 for the exam.
19. An Evening/Weekend Program student was accused of violating the Booth honor code for self-misrepresentation. The student was accused of not disclosing a prior admittance into another MBA program. Additionally, it was discovered this student had been dismissed from this other MBA program. The student was found responsible and placed on probation for one quarter.

The **Divinity School** held one disciplinary hearing involving a single student. The student did not submit a request for review.

20. The student's dissertation committee alleged that the student's dissertation included plagiarized material. The student was found responsible and suspended for one quarter. Additionally, the student was required to submit a new dissertation.

The **Division of the Humanities** held one disciplinary hearing involving one student.

21. A doctoral student was charged with violating the expectation of civil behavior by students in a university setting. Specifically, a student in another division accused the student of maligning the reputation of the other student. The accused student was found not responsible.

The **Division of the Physical Sciences** held one disciplinary hearing regarding a charge made against a single student. The student did not participate in the hearing and did not submit a request for review.

22. A doctoral student was accused of distributing an inappropriate video, via a social media application, to other members of this student's laboratory. The committee was charged to evaluate whether the student violated behavior expected of a student at the University. The student was found responsible and suspended for five quarters. Additionally, the student was required to complete an educational session and write a letter of reflection addressed to the disciplinary committee.

The **Graham School of Continuing Liberal and Professional Studies** held one disciplinary hearing involving one student. The student did not submit a request for review.

23. A Master's student was charged with violating the expectation of civil behavior by students in a university setting. Specifically, the student was alleged to have sent an inappropriate e-mail to fellow students, copying program staff. The student was found responsible and placed on probation for the remainder of the student's time in the program. Additionally,

the student was required to submit a letter of apology to the impacted students and the course instructor.

Table 1. Student cases referred to area disciplinary committees, 2008-09 – 2017-18

Year	College/ Academic Matter	College/ Other Matter	Graduate/ Academic Matter	Graduate/ Other Matter	Total
<i>2008-09</i>	1	5	12	2	20
<i>2009-10</i>	2	4	8	2	16
<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

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 (see Appendix).

Between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018, the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee (Committee) was convened on 12 occasions to consider allegations brought against 12 students. One student was heard on two separate occasions and two students were heard concurrently by the same Committee. Six of the students involved in these matters (four respondents and two complainants) requested reviews of Committee decisions.

1. A College student was referred to the Committee for two separate allegations of sexual assault involving two complainants. Two consecutive disciplinary hearings were held to resolve each complaint. In the first hearing, the respondent was found responsible and sanctioned with a three quarter suspension, required to complete an educational program and restricted to particular geographical areas on campus. The Committee also required that the existing no-contact directives between both parties remain in effect. In the second hearing, the respondent was also found responsible for sexual assault. The Committee expelled the respondent from the University.
2. A graduate student accused of sexual assault was found not responsible. The complainant requested a review of the Committee's decision on the basis that prescribed disciplinary procedures were not followed. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a review board.
3. A College student was accused of emotional abuse and was found responsible. The student

was placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's time at the University, was restricted from registering in the same courses as the complainant and was required to complete an educational program. The respondent requested a review of the Committee's decision on the basis that prescribed procedures were not followed and that the sanction was disproportionate to the policy violation. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a review board.

4. The respondent in the aforementioned matter (#3) made a counter-complaint against the other party, also a student in the College, alleging emotional abuse. In a separate hearing, the Committee found the latter student responsible and issued a sanction of disciplinary probation for the student's remaining time at the University. The Committee also required that the existing no-contact directives between both parties remain in effect. The complainant requested a review of the Committee's decision, citing that prescribed procedures were not followed, that new and material information previously unavailable to the Committee bore significantly in the complainant's favor and the sanction was disproportionate to the respondent's policy violation. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a review board.
5. A graduate student was accused of engaging in non-consensual sexual activity with the same complainant on two separate occasions. The respondent was found not responsible for the first allegation and responsible for the second allegation. The Committee imposed a two quarter suspension and required that the respondent complete an educational program after which the respondent must write a reflection paper. The Committee also required that the existing no-contact directives between both parties remain in effect for the remainder of the students' time at the University.
6. A graduate student was accused of sexual assault and found not responsible.
7. A student in the College was accused of sexual assault. The Committee found the student responsible and suspended the student for one quarter. Additionally, the Committee required that the respondent complete an educational program and be subject to geographic housing and dining limitations upon re-enrollment. The Committee also required that the existing no-contact directives between both parties remain in effect. Both the respondent and complainant requested reviews of the Committee's decision. The respondent requested a review citing that prescribed procedures were not followed, that new and material information previously unavailable to the Committee bore significantly in the respondent's favor and the sanction was disproportionate to the respondent's policy violation. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a review board. The complainant requested a review on the basis that the sanction issued to the respondent was disproportionate to the policy violation. The complainant's request was referred to a review board, which subsequently modified the sanction by increasing the suspension to three quarters.
8. A College student accused of sexual assault was found responsible. The Committee required the respondent to complete an educational program. The Committee also required that the existing no-contact directives between both parties remain in effect for the remainder of the students' time at the University.
9. A student in the College was accused of stalking another student. The Committee found the student responsible and issued a nine quarter suspension. The respondent was also required

to complete an educational program and was restricted from being physically present on certain parts of the University campus. If re-enrolled, the respondent was also barred from attending convocation ceremonies. The Committee also required that the existing no-contact directives between both parties remain in effect.

10. A student in the College was accused of sexual assault and was found responsible. The Committee suspended the student for five quarters. The Committee also mandated that the respondent complete an educational program and stipulated that the respondent could not hold any leadership positions on campus. The Committee also required that the existing no-contact directives between both parties remain in effect. The respondent requested a review of the Committee's decision on the basis that the sanction was disproportionate to the policy violation. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a review board.
- 11-12. Two students in the College were referred to the Committee following allegations by each toward the other of policy violations. The matters were heard by the same Committee concurrently. In the first matter, the respondent was accused of physical abuse, emotional abuse and sexual assault. The respondent was found responsible for all allegations and sanctioned with expulsion. In the second matter, the other student was accused of physical abuse and sexual harassment and was found not responsible. In both matters, the Committee required that the existing no-contact directives between both parties remain in effect. The respondent in the first matter requested a review of the Committee's decision citing that prescribed procedures were not followed, that new and material information previously unavailable to the Committee bore significantly in the respondent's favor and the sanction was disproportionate to the respondent's policy violation. 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 – 2017-18¹

Year	College	Graduate Divisions/ Schools	Total
<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

¹ 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 graduate divisions/professional schools).

III. University Disciplinary System for Disruptive Conduct

Starting this year, Campus and Student Life will report 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 (see <http://studentmanual.uchicago.edu/page/disciplinary-system-disruptive-conduct>).

Between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018, the University-wide Standing Committee on Disruptive Conduct was not convened.

Appendix

Sexual Misconduct

The University Policy on Harassment, Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct includes definitions of the various forms of sexual misconduct addressed by the University-wide Student Disciplinary System:

Sexual misconduct encompasses a range of conduct, from sexual assault (a criminal act that the U.S. Department of Education defines as a form of sexual harassment) to conduct such as unwanted touching or persistent unwelcome comments, e-mails, or pictures of an insulting or degrading sexual nature, which may constitute unlawful harassment, depending upon the specific circumstances and context in which the conduct occurs.

In compliance with the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (“VAWA”) and the Clery Act, the University uses the State of Illinois Criminal Code's definitions of sexual assault and sexual abuse. The University incorporates the State's definitions of several other important terms, including domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking and recognizes that sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking are not gender-specific crimes.

Definitions can be found here:

<http://studentmanual.uchicago.edu/page/policy-harassment-discrimination-and-sexual-misconduct>

Sanctions

The University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee has broad discretion to apply any of the sanctions listed in the *Student Manual* (alone or in combination) when it finds a respondent responsible for violating University Policy. When determining sanctions, the Committee will consider the following elements for individual respondents: (i) The details and extent of the specific Policy violation(s); (ii) the impact of the respondent's actions on the complainant; (iii) the steps necessary to stop, remedy and prevent future occurrences of the respondent's behavior; (iv) the safety of the University community; and (v) the extent to which the respondent understands and acknowledges the impact of their actions.

University sanctions are described here:

http://studentmanual.uchicago.edu/university_dicip_system