

## **University Disciplinary Actions: 2018-19**

Presented to the Council of the University Senate on April 28, 2020

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, 2018 and June 30, 2019, [Area Disciplinary Committees](#) were convened to consider allegations brought against 15 students in 15 separate hearings.

In the **College**, three disciplinary hearings were convened involving three separate students. All three students were found responsible for violating University Policy. One student submitted a request for review, which did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.

1. A student was charged with unauthorized contact of another College student, thereby violating a No-Contact Directive that was in place with that student. The alleged student was found responsible for violating the Directive and was placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's time in the College.
2. A student was charged with behavior that threatens the health and safety of others, specifically, physical abuse, when the student allegedly assaulted two other College students. The Disciplinary Committee found the student responsible and issued a six quarter disciplinary suspension. The student requested a review of the Committee's decision. The request did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.
3. A student was accused of providing false information on the College admissions application related to prior disciplinary violations in high school. The Disciplinary Committee found the student responsible. The student was expelled from the University.

The **Chicago Booth School of Business** held 10 disciplinary hearings involving 10 accused students. None of the students found responsible for violating University Policy requested a review of the Disciplinary Committee's decision.

4. A student in the Executive Program (North America-Chicago) was alleged to have violated the Booth honor code in an exam. The Disciplinary Committee found the student not responsible.

5. A student in the Executive Program (North America-Chicago) was alleged to have plagiarized an assignment. The Disciplinary Committee found the student responsible for violations of the Booth honor code. The student was placed on disciplinary probation and received a failing grade for the course.
6. A student in the Executive Program (Europe-London) was accused of improperly using an outside source while completing a take-home final exam, in violation of exam rules. This student was found responsible and was placed on probation for the remainder of the student's time in the program. The Disciplinary Committee also recommended that the student receive a failing grade for the exam.
7. A student in the Executive Program (Europe-London) was accused of improperly using an outside source while completing a take-home final exam, in violation of exam rules. This student was found responsible and was placed on probation for the remainder of the student's time in the program. The Disciplinary Committee also recommended that the student receive a failing grade for the exam.
8. A student in the Executive Program (Asia-Hong Kong) was accused of improperly using an outside source while completing a take-home final exam, in violation of exam rules. This student was found responsible and was placed on probation for the remainder of the student's time in the program. The Disciplinary Committee also recommended that the student receive a failing grade for the exam.
9. A student in the Executive Program (Europe-London) was alleged to have violated the Booth honor code in an exam. The Disciplinary Committee found the student not responsible.
10. A student in the Executive Program (Asia-Hong Kong) was alleged to have violated the Booth honor code in an exam. The Disciplinary Committee found the student not responsible.
11. A student in the Executive Program (Asia-Hong Kong) was accused of improperly using an outside source while completing a take-home final exam, in violation of exam rules. This student was found responsible and was placed on probation for the remainder of the student's time in the program. The Disciplinary Committee also recommended that the student receive a failing grade for the exam.
12. A student in the Executive Program (North America-Chicago) was accused of improperly using an outside source while completing a take-home final exam, in violation of exam rules. This student was found responsible and was placed on probation for the remainder of the student's time in the program. The Disciplinary Committee also recommended that the student receive a failing grade for the exam.

13. A student in the Weekend MBA program was accused of plagiarizing assigned course material and submitting it as the student's own work. The disciplinary committee found the student responsible for violating the Booth honor code. The student was placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's time in the program. The Disciplinary Committee also recommended that the student receive a failing grade for the course.

The **Divinity School** held one disciplinary hearing involving a single student. The student was found responsible for violating University Policy and did not submit a request for review.

14. A student was accused of using plagiarized material on the student's qualifying examination. The student did not contest the allegation. The Disciplinary Committee found the student responsible and expelled the student from the University.

The **Harris School of Public Policy Studies** held one disciplinary hearing for one student. This student was found responsible for violating University Policy, and requested a review of the outcome of the hearing. The request for review was denied as it not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.

15. A student was accused of improper use of outside sources while completing a take-home exam. The Disciplinary Committee found the student responsible and suspended the student for eight quarters. The student requested a review of this outcome. The request was denied.

**Table 1. Student matters referred to area disciplinary committees, 2009-10 to 2018-19**

<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>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
<i>2018-19</i>	0	3	12	0	15

## **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, 2018 and June 30, 2019, the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee (Committee) was convened on nine occasions to consider allegations brought against seven students. Two of the respondents were heard on two separate occasions. Five of the students involved in these matters (three respondents and two complainants) requested reviews of the Committee's decisions.

1. A student in the College was referred to the Committee to respond to an allegation of sexual assault of another student. The Committee found this student responsible for violating University Policy. The student was placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's time in the College. Additionally, the student was required to participate in an educational program with a focus on consent. The Committee also determined that the student could not register for classes in which the complainant was registered and could not represent the University in any official capacity or hold a leadership position on campus while enrolled as a student. The respondent requested a review of the Committee's decision on the basis that prescribed procedures were not followed. This request was denied for not meeting the criteria for convening a Review Board.
2. The same student in the aforementioned case (#1) was referred to the Committee regarding a second allegation of sexual assault. The Committee found the student responsible for violating University Policy. The student was suspended for eight quarters. Additionally, the student was instructed to complete an educational program with a focus on consent before resuming studies in the College. A No-contact Directive between the student and the complainant will remain in effect for the duration of their degree programs. 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. This request was denied for not meeting the criteria for convening a Review Board.
3. A student in the College was referred to the Committee for an allegation of sexual assault of another student. This student was found not responsible for violating University Policy.
4. A graduate student was referred to the Committee for an allegation made by another student of stalking. The Committee found the student to be responsible and placed the student on disciplinary probation until the end of Spring Quarter, 2020. The Committee also required that the student complete an educational program by October, 2019, and participate in an intake appointment with a licensed mental health provider to discuss the possibility of attending regular sessions. A No-contact Directive between the student and the complainant will remain in effect for the duration of their degree programs.

5. The student referenced above (#4) was again referred to the Committee for allegedly stalking a second student. The Committee found this student responsible for violating University Policy. The student was placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's degree program. The student was also required to complete an educational program and restricted in accessing certain academic workspaces to accommodate the complainant. A No-contact Directive between the student and the complainant will remain in effect for the duration of their degree programs.
6. A graduate student was accused of sexually assaulting another student. The Committee found this student responsible and issued a three quarter suspension. The Committee also required the student to complete an educational program with a focus on consent by January, 2020. A No-contact Directive between the student and the complainant will remain in effect for the remainder of their degree programs. The complainant requested a review of the Committee's decision on the grounds that the sanction issued to the respondent was disproportionately lenient. The Review Board upheld the original decision and outcome. The respondent also requested a review of the Committee's decision claiming that prescribed procedures were not followed. This request was denied for not meeting the criteria for convening a Review Board.
7. A student in the College was accused of sexually assaulting another student. The Committee found the student responsible and issued a three quarter suspension. The Committee also required the student to complete an educational program with a focus on consent before resuming studies at the University. Upon return, the student would not be permitted to register for classes in which the complainant was registered. Additionally, the Committee required the respondent to complete an intake appointment with a licensed mental health provider to discuss the possibility of attending regular sessions. A No-contact Directive between the student and the complainant will remain in effect for the remainder of their degree programs. The respondent submitted a request for review of the Committee's decision claiming that the sanction issued by the Committee was disproportionately severe. The Review Board decided to uphold the sanctions issued by the Committee.
8. A graduate student was accused of sexual assault. The Committee did not find the student responsible for violating University Policy.
9. A student in the College was referred to the Committee for an alleged sexual assault of another student. The Committee found this student responsible and placed the student on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's time in the College. The Committee also required that the student complete an educational program with a focus on consent. Additionally, the student was prohibited from visiting any University residence hall and restricted to one designated dining hall until the student graduated. Absent prior written permission by the University Dean of Students (or designee), the student was barred from all University property from June 17, 2019 until June 30, 2021. A No-contact Directive between the student and the complainant will remain in effect for the remainder of their degree programs. The complainant requested a review of the Committee's decision on the grounds that the outcome was disproportionately light given the nature of the Policy

violation(s). The Review Board subsequently determined that the length of the respondent's post-graduation campus ban was insufficient to ensure that the complainant does not encounter the respondent on campus property for duration of the complainant's remaining time at the University. Accordingly, the Review Board increased the duration of the respondent's post-graduation campus ban by 18 months (to December 31, 2022).

**Table 2. Student matters referred to the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee, 2014-15 to 2018-19<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Year</b>	<b>College</b>	<b>Graduate 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

---

<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 graduate 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, 2018 and June 30, 2019, an Ad Hoc Disciplinary Committee (Committee) drawn from the University-wide Standing Committee on Disruptive Conduct was convened once. The student heard on this one matter requested a review of the Committee's decision. The request for review was denied on the basis that it did not meet the criteria for convening a Review Board.

1. A graduate student alleged to have engaged in disruptive conduct as defined under University Statute 21 was referred to a hearing of the Committee. The Committee concluded that the student's actions obstructed, impaired, and interfered with a University event, causing multiple participants, including several who left because of the student's actions, to not benefit from the event. The Committee suspended the student for nine quarters. Before resuming studies at the University, the student must submit a statement addressing specific questions delineated by the Committee. The student requested a review of the Committee's decision citing that prescribed procedures were not followed. The request was denied on the basis that there was no evidence of deviation from prescribed procedures.

**Table 3. Student matters referred to an Ad Hoc Disciplinary Committee of the University-wide Standing Committee on Disruptive Conduct, 2017-18 to 2018-19**

<b>Year</b>	<b>College</b>	<b>Graduate Divisions/Schools</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>2017-18</i>	0	0	0
<i>2018-19</i>	0	1	1