

## University Disciplinary Actions: 2015-16

Presented to the Council of the University Senate on April 25, 2017

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 2015-16, 67 Area Disciplinary Committees were convened to consider allegations brought against 64 students.

In the **College**, 35 disciplinary hearings were convened involving 34 accused students. One student was heard on two separate and unrelated charges, resulting in two distinct outcomes. There were no reviews requested of any of the disciplinary committee decisions in the College.

1. A student was accused of cheating in a final examination, specifically copying answers from another student. The student was found responsible and suspended for two quarters.
2. A student was accused of academic dishonesty, specifically representing the work of another student as their own. The student was found responsible and given a warning.
3. A student was accused of vandalism, specifically writing with marker on the seat of a bicycle that belonged to another student. At the time of the incident, the bicycle had been secured to an ADA-accessible ramp. The accused student was found responsible for vandalism and given a warning.
4. A student was accused of engaging in behavior that threatened the health and safety of others, as well as general misconduct. Specifically, the student was observed to have been disruptive, causing damage to University property and endangering the safety of others in a University building. The student was found responsible and suspended for two quarters.
5. A student was accused of theft. Specifically, a fellow student reported that some personal belongings, as well as those belongings of other roommates, were missing. Those belongings were identified either as items sold, or for sale, on the UChicago Marketplace web site. The student was found responsible and placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of the student's time in the College.
6. A student was suspected of copying another student's work on a final exam. The student was found responsible for cheating and given a four-quarter suspension.

7. The aforementioned student was accused of creating and using a variety of email aliases to impersonate administrators and business units at the University. The same committee heard this second matter. The student was found responsible for falsification. In light of the prior academic misconduct, the committee decided to expel the student from the University.
8. A student was accused of academic misconduct, specifically colluding with a class partner to copy the work of another student pair. The committee found the student responsible and gave the student a warning.
9. The class partner of the student in the aforementioned case was heard in a separate hearing by the same disciplinary committee for the same charge of academic misconduct. This student was also found responsible and given a warning.
10. A student was accused of academic dishonesty (plagiarism) and lying to a University official regarding the circumstances of the incident. The student was found responsible for both allegations. The committee imposed probation with a recommendation that the student seek some form of intervention or counseling.
11. A student was accused of physical abuse (behavior that threatens or endangers the health or safety of others), specifically in regard to the student's involvement in a physical altercation with another student of the University. This student was alleged to have struck the face of the other student. The student was found responsible, placed on probation, banned from College Housing, and directed to obtain counseling.
12. A student was accused of physical abuse (behavior that threatens or endangers the health or safety of others), specifically concerning this student engaging in a physical altercation with an unknown student. When a University security officer attempted to intervene, this student was alleged to have struck the security officer in the face and throw the officer to the ground. This student was found responsible, placed on probation for the rest of this student's time in the College, and advised to seek counseling. During probation, this student also lost varsity athlete participation privileges.
13. A student was accused of academic misconduct (cheating), specifically using case materials previously submitted for a grade and passing off the material as the student's own. The student was found responsible and placed on probation for the remainder of the student's time in the College.
14. A student was accused of academic misconduct (cheating). The student's instructor suspected that the student cheated on a series of quizzes. The student was observed to be looking at an electronic device during quizzes. The student was found responsible and placed on probation for the remainder of the student's time in the College.
15. A student was accused of academic misconduct (cheating), specifically cheating on a midterm exam. The student was found responsible and placed on probation for the

remainder of the student's time in the College.

16. A student was accused of general misconduct, specifically that this student purposefully interfered with and obstructed a conversation a UCPD officer was having with another individual when attempting to address a city noise ordinance infraction. This student was arrested by police and charged with obstruction. The committee found the student not responsible for any University policy violation.
17. A student was accused of verbal and physical abuse based on an incident where the student engaged in a verbal altercation with a Chicago Police officer and subsequently was arrested for battery of a police officer. The committee found the student not responsible for any policy violation.
18. – 23. A disciplinary committee held six separate hearings involving six College students, each accused of general misconduct and theft. It was alleged that on one or more occasions, the six respondents was part of a group of individuals who made unauthorized entry to one or more University buildings, observed or participated in the removal of University property, and returned with said property to their place of residence. Those items were later reported missing to UCPD by various University units. The outcomes are as follows:
  - a. One student found responsible on both charges and given a four-quarter suspension.
  - b. One student found responsible on both charges and given a two-quarter suspension.
  - c. One student found responsible for general misconduct and not responsible for theft. This student was placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of their College career.
  - d. One student found responsible for general misconduct and not responsible for theft. This student was placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of their College career.
  - e. One student found responsible on both charges and given a two-quarter suspension.
  - f. One student found responsible on both charges and given a two-quarter suspension.
24. A student was accused of academic misconduct, specifically plagiarizing a large portion of a submitted essay. The student was found responsible and placed on disciplinary probation for the remainder of their College career.
25. A student was accused of academic dishonesty. An exam the student submitted for re-grading had significant discrepancies from the version originally submitted. The differences indicated that answers had been changed in the interim. The student was found responsible and given a warning.
26. A student was accused of academic dishonesty (cheating and plagiarism). The committee

found the student responsible for plagiarism and not responsible for cheating on a final exam. The student was placed on probation.

27. A student was accused of lying, specifically enlisting an unknown person to impersonate the student's mother in fulfilling a required parental contact for a previous infraction. The student was found responsible and given a warning.
28. A student accused of academic dishonesty, specifically modifying answers to an exam and requesting a regrade, was found responsible. The student was given a warning.
29. A student accused of academic dishonesty, specifically cheating on a midterm exam, was found responsible. The student was placed on probation for the remainder of their College career.
30. A student accused of academic dishonesty, specifically plagiarizing the bulk of a final paper, was found responsible. The student was placed on probation for the remainder of their College career.
31. A student accused of academic misconduct, specifically cheating on a final exam, was found responsible. The student was given a warning.
32. A student accused of academic misconduct, specifically representing another student's work as their own, was found responsible. The student was placed on probation for the remainder of their College career.
33. A student was accused of cheating and failing to comply with the directives of a University official. Specifically, this student was accused of copying answers from an online source and passing off the answers to the instructor as the student's own work. Additionally, the student was accused of failing to attend a required summons meeting with a dean. This student was found responsible and suspended for one quarter.
34. A student was accused of academic misconduct, specifically plagiarism. The student allegedly submitted written material without proper attribution. The student was found responsible and suspended for one quarter.
35. A student was accused of lying, behavior that threatens or endangers the health or safety of others, violation of an administrative department's regulations, and general misconduct. Specifically, the student was alleged to have engaged in premeditated and dishonest behavior to gain entry to a University building, thereby creating an unsafe situation in the building. The student was found responsible and placed on probation.

The **Chicago Booth School of Business** held 29 disciplinary hearings involving 27 accused students. One student requested a review of the disciplinary committee's decision.

1. – 6. Six students, all from the same Executive Program-Europe cohort, were heard separately about the same allegations. All six students were accused of academic misconduct, specifically the use of and copying of unauthorized materials from an online source for a final exam. All six students were found responsible and the committee recommended that the instructor give each student a 0 for the exam.
7. – 11. Five students, all from the same Executive Program-Asia Cohort were heard separately about the same allegations. All five students were accused of copying unauthorized materials either from an online source, from another student, or both. The five students were found responsible and the committee recommended that the instructor give each student a 0 for the exam and that each student be placed on probation for the remainder of their time in the program.
12. One of the aforementioned students in the Asia program was later accused of again utilizing unauthorized online sources for a final exam. Taking the prior disciplinary incident into consideration, the committee found the student responsible and expelled the student.
13. A student in the Executive Program-USA was accused of utilizing unauthorized material from an online source for a final exam. The student was found responsible and suspended for two quarters.
14. A student in the Executive Program-USA was accused of utilizing unauthorized material from an online source for a final exam. The student was found responsible and placed on probation.
15. – 21. In a separate set of hearings, seven Executive Program-USA & Europe students were accused of copying unauthorized material from an online source for their final exam. The students were found responsible, given a 0 for the final exam and placed on probation.
22. A student in the Executive Program-Europe was accused of violating Chicago Booth's standards of professionalism by borrowing money from two students under false pretenses. This student was found responsible and placed on probation.
23. Subsequently, this same student tried to borrow money from classmates again. The student was found responsible for violating Booth's standards of professionalism, and was expelled. The student requested a review of the outcome. It was determined that the request for review did not meet the criteria for convening a review board. The decision to expel was upheld.
24. A student in the Executive Program-Europe was accused of plagiarizing a paper. The student was found responsible and placed on probation.

25. A Booth doctoral student was accused of plagiarism. The student admitted to plagiarizing. The committee decided to expel the student from the Ph.D. program.
26. – 27. Two students in the Booth Evening/Weekend Program were heard separately on the charge that both submitted papers that had similarities to each other. Both students were found responsible for violating the Booth Honor Code, given a 0 for the course and placed on probation.
28. A student in the Executive Program-USA was accused of utilizing unauthorized materials from an online source for a group project. The student was found responsible and was placed on probation. The committee recommended that the professor lower the grade for the course by one letter grade.
29. A full-time MBA student was accused of plagiarizing a paper. The committee found the student responsible, placed the student on probation and asked the student to write and submit a paper addressing academic integrity.

The **Graham School** convened one disciplinary hearing involving one student.

A Graduate Student-at-Large exhibited a series of concerning behavior in various administrative offices within Chicago Booth and the Graham School. The student was given directives to which to adhere. This student was subsequently accused of not following the directives of a University official. The student was found responsible and suspended for one quarter.

The **Law School** convened one disciplinary hearing involving one student.

A student was alleged to have plagiarized a paper. The student was found responsible and given a four-quarter suspension. Additionally, the student was assigned a grade of F for the course and asked to write a substantial research paper on plagiarism.

The **Social Sciences Division** convened one disciplinary hearing involving one student.

A doctoral student was accused of violating the University's policy on protests and demonstrations. The student was alleged to be one of nine protestors who entered a University building and proceeded to disable building elevators, barricade the main entrance of an administrative office and use metal locks to prevent entry to and exit from the building. The student was found responsible and issued a warning.

**Table 1. Student cases referred to area disciplinary committees, AY 2006-07 – AY 2015-16**

Year	College/ Academic Matter	College/ Other Matter	Graduate/ Academic Matter	Graduate/ Other Matter	Total
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
2015-16	19	16	28	4	67

## 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 alleged violations of the University Policy on Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Misconduct.

In 2015-16, the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee (UWSDC) was convened on five occasions to consider allegations brought against five students. Two of the students involved in these matters (both complainants) requested a review of UWSDC decisions.

- A College student was brought before the UWSDC to respond to allegations that they had sexually assaulted another College student. Using the preponderance of evidence standard, the committee concluded that the student was responsible for engaging in non-consensual sexual touching with another student who was deemed incapacitated. The committee imposed several sanctions, including a no-contact directive, priority registration for the complainant, and for the respondent, restricted access to certain parts of the campus, barring from convocation ceremonies, ineligibility to participate in College Study Abroad programs and required participation in educational sessions.
- A doctoral student in the Humanities Division was referred to the UWSDC regarding an allegation of sexual assault against a student in the College. Using the preponderance of evidence standard, the committee concluded that the student was not responsible for sexual assault. The complainant asked for a review of the outcome on the grounds that proper procedures were not followed and that new and material information had become available that could have affected the outcome of the matter in the complainant's favor. The review board determined there were no procedural errors and that the new material had no relevance to the outcome. The committee's decision was upheld.

- A College student was referred to the UWSDC to consider an allegation that the student had sexually assaulted another College student. Using the preponderance of evidence standard, the committee concluded the student was not responsible for sexual assault.
- A College student was referred to the UWSDC for alleged sexual harassment and sexual misconduct directed toward a high school student. It was alleged that the College student kissed and sexually touched the high school student during an RSO event. It was further alleged that during the course of the investigation, the College student lied to two University officials. Using the preponderance of evidence standard, the committee concluded that the College student was responsible for conduct unbecoming of a College student and for presenting false information to a University official. The committee asked the student to attend a series of educational sessions, placed the student on probation for the remainder of the student’s College career and prescribed the student’s removal from the RSO.
- A College student was referred to the UWSDC for alleged sexual assault of another College student. Using the preponderance of evidence standard, the committee concluded the respondent was responsible for engaging in nonconsensual contact with and penetration of a fellow student. The committee determined that the complainant consented to sexual activity only if certain conditions were met and that the respondent may have briefly and/or unwittingly not adhered to those conditions. Based on these factors, the committee issued the respondent a two-quarter suspension. The complainant requested a review of the outcome, citing the availability of new information that was not available at the time of the hearing, which could have affected the outcome. The review board requested that the UWSDC examine this new material. The committee considered the new information and upheld its original decision.

**Table 2. Student cases<sup>1</sup> referred to the University-wide Student Disciplinary Committee, AY 2014-15 through AY 2015-16**

Year	College	Graduate Schools and Divisions	Total
2014-15	2	2	4
2015-16	4	1	5

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