

## University Disciplinary Actions: 2014-15

Presented to the Council of the University Senate on April 26, 2016

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. In 2014-15, Area Disciplinary Committees were convened on 35 occasions to consider allegations brought against 34 students.

In the **College**, 28 disciplinary hearings were convened involving 27 accused students. Eight of the accused students requested a review of the committee's decision.

- Two students were brought before a disciplinary committee, separately, each for an allegation of theft and property damage. Both students were accused of stealing a video camera from a fraternity house. The disciplinary committee found both students responsible and placed each of them on disciplinary probation for the remainder of their enrollment in the College.
- A student was brought before a disciplinary committee for an allegation of not following the directive of a University official. In the previous academic year, this student was directed not to have contact with another College student. A University official complained that this student did not stay away from the other College student as directed. The disciplinary committee found the student responsible and placed the student on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's enrollment in the College.
- A student was brought before a disciplinary committee for an allegation of academic misconduct. Specifically, the student was accused of plagiarism. The student was found responsible for plagiarism and suspended for two quarters.
- Three students were accused of physically assaulting a fourth College student. Disciplinary hearings were held separately for each accused student. In each hearing, the accused student was *in absentia*. The disciplinary committee found all three students not responsible for physical assault.
- A student was brought before a disciplinary committee for allegedly assaulting a Chicago police officer while intoxicated. This student was found responsible for not adhering to the expectations the University has of its students and issued the student a disciplinary warning.

- Two students were accused of academic misconduct in the same course, specifically for cheating on a homework assignment. The disciplinary committee heard each student separately and found both students responsible for academic dishonesty. The committee decided that neither student could contest the grade assigned by the professor for the assignment in question.
- A student was brought before a disciplinary committee for allegedly using plagiarized material in a BA paper proposal. The committee found the student responsible and suspended the student for four quarters.
- A student who previously appeared before a disciplinary committee for not following the directive of a University official was brought before another disciplinary committee for physically assaulting a College student. The student was found responsible for physical assault and was sanctioned with a four quarter suspension. The original No-Contact Directive remained in place and another No-Contact Directive was imposed on this student and the individual the student assaulted. The student requested a review of the outcome, citing that prescribed procedures were not followed and that new and material evidence would bear significantly in the student's favor. The request for review was denied.
- Three students were brought separately before a disciplinary committee for possible trespass of a University-owned building. The committee decided that the students were responsible for trespassing. All three students were placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of their time in the College.
- A student accused of changing responses on two examinations before submitting them to the professor, thereby resulting in an inappropriate grade assignment, was brought before the disciplinary committee. The committee found the student responsible for academic misconduct and imposed a nine quarter suspension. The student asked for a review of the outcome based on new and material evidence that would bear significantly in the student's favor. The request for review was denied.
- A student accused of helping the aforementioned College student cheat on examinations was brought before the disciplinary committee. The committee determined that this student was not responsible for academic misconduct.
- Eight students were brought before a disciplinary committee accused of hazing and actions that threaten the safety and well-being of the University community. Over the course of eight separate hearings, the disciplinary committee found five of the students responsible and imposed on each of them a two quarter suspension. Three of the students were found not responsible for hazing. The five students found responsible each requested a review of the decision and sanction. In each instance, the original decision of the committee was sustained.
- A student accused of plagiarism was brought before a disciplinary committee. The

student did not contest the charge of plagiarism. The student was suspended for four quarters.

- Two students accused of hazing were heard separately by a disciplinary committee. Each student was found responsible and assigned a four quarter suspension. One of the students requested a review of the outcome. The committee's decision was sustained.

The **Chicago Booth School of Business** held six disciplinary hearings involving six accused students. One hearing occurred in the full-time MBA program, two hearings took place in the Executive MBA Program in Europe, one hearing took place in the Executive MBA Program in Asia, and two hearings took place in the Executive MBA Program in the US. There were no requests for review.

- An Executive MBA (US) student was accused of violating the honor code with regards to a homework assignment. The matter was heard by a disciplinary committee, which decided that the student was in violation of the Chicago Booth honor code. The student was suspended for four quarters and the committee made a recommendation of a lower grade assignment for the class.
- An Executive MBA (US) student accused of cheating on a homework assignment was found responsible for violating the Chicago Booth honor code. The disciplinary committee imposed a four quarter suspension.
- An Executive MBA (Europe) student was accused of cheating in a final examination. The disciplinary committee found the student responsible for violating the Chicago Booth honor code and suspended the student for three quarters.
- An Executive MBA (Asia) student was accused of sharing answers on a final examination with a colleague in the program. The disciplinary committee found the student responsible for violating the Chicago Booth honor code and imposed a sanction of disciplinary probation until December 31, 2015. In addition, the committee assigned the student 50 hours of community service to be completed by December 31, 2015.
- An Executive MBA (Europe) student was accused of utilizing notes from the professor in one of the student's written class assignments. The committee found this student responsible for violating the Chicago Booth honor code and issued a disciplinary warning.
- A full-time MBA student was accused of cheating on a midterm examination. The disciplinary committee determined the student was responsible for violating the Chicago Booth honor code and placed the student on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's enrollment.

The **Division of Physical Sciences** convened one disciplinary hearing. The accused student requested a review of the disciplinary committee's decision.

- A doctoral student in Chemistry was accused of selling ghostwriting services and academic work, supposedly done by current students in the University. The student allegedly used images of current students, who were not affiliated with the services, on a website to market and sell papers and grades. The disciplinary committee reviewed the matter with the student *in absentia*. The student was found responsible for not adhering to behavior expected of a University student and was expelled. The student requested a review of the outcome. The request was denied.

**Student cases referred to area disciplinary committees, AY 2005-06 – AY 2014-15**

Year	College/ Academic Matter	College/ Other Matter	Graduate/ Academic Matter	Graduate/ Other Matter	Total
2005-06	3	6	8	3	20
2006-07	7	6	3	2	18
2007-08	3	6	9	2	20
2008-09	1	5	12	2	20
2009-10	2	4	8	2	16
2010-11	4	3	3	3	13
2011-12	4	9	10	2	25
2012-13	1	9	5	2	17
2013-14	2	12	6	3	23
2014-15	7	21	6	1	35
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>21.4</b>

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

Campus and Student Life also reports to the Council on matters referred to the University-wide Student Disciplinary System for conduct involving possible violations of the Unlawful Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Policy.<sup>1</sup>

In 2014-15, the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee was convened on four occasions to consider allegations brought against three students. Three of the students involved in these matters (one complainant and two respondents) requested a review of committee decisions.

- A College student was brought before the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee for alleged orchestration of a staged hack on a popular social media

---

<sup>1</sup> The Unlawful Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Policy was replaced by the University Policy on Harassment, Discrimination, and Sexual Misconduct on July 1, 2015

site. The specific charges included violation of the Unlawful Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Policy; knowingly providing false information to a University official; disruptive behavior; and misuse of the University network. The committee concluded that the student was responsible for the first three of these four allegations. The committee imposed a two quarter suspension on the student.

- A student in the Law School was brought before the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee regarding an allegation of dating violence. The complainant, also a Law School student, accused the respondent of physical, mental, and emotional abuse during the course of a romantic relationship. The committee found the respondent responsible for dating violence, a violation of the Unlawful Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Policy. The committee's sanctions included a No-Contact Directive; course registration restrictions; University program and event restrictions; and counseling. The respondent asked for a review of the committee's decision on the basis that new and material information unavailable at the time of hearing would bear significantly in the respondent's favor. The Review Board upheld the disciplinary committee's decision.
- A Law School student, the respondent in the matter summarized above, was brought before the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee a second time for allegedly not following directives of the sanctions imposed following the original hearing. The respondent was found responsible for not adhering to the directives and was suspended for one quarter.
- A College student was brought before the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee for alleged sexual harassment and sexual misconduct of another student in the College. The committee determined that the respondent was responsible for sexual assault and issued a disciplinary warning. Both parties requested a review of the committee's decision. The complainant claimed prescribed processes were not followed. The request for review was denied. The respondent claimed prescribed processes were not followed and that new and material information unavailable at the time of hearing was now available and would bear significantly in the respondent's favor. The Review Board upheld the committee's decision and sanction.