

University Disciplinary Actions: 2010-11

Presented to Council of the Faculty Senate on April 24, 2012

Kimberly Goff-Crews

Vice President for Campus Life and Dean of Students in the University

Campus and Student Life has been asked by the Council of the University Senate to report each year on matters pertaining to the University disciplinary legislation enacted by the council on May 23, 1970, and amended on June 8, 1976.

For another year, the All-University Disciplinary Committee did not meet during the 2010-11 academic year.

Campus and Student Life also reports to the council on disciplinary matters that have occurred in the academic units during the year. In 2010-11, Area Disciplinary Committees were convened on thirteen occasions to consider allegations brought against twelve students.

In the College, seven disciplinary hearings were convened involving seven students. None of the students requested a review of the disciplinary decision.

- A student was brought before a disciplinary committee for an allegation of assaulting a fellow student. The student did not contest the allegation and in fact came forward to the Dean of Students before a disciplinary hearing was convened. The disciplinary committee placed the student on probation until graduation. The student on own accord sought therapeutic treatment. Student was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder. Student is a former marine who served a tour of duty in Iraq.
- A second student appeared before a disciplinary committee charged with vandalizing College property and failing to follow the instructions of a University official. Likewise, the disciplinary committee was asked to consider a pattern of alleged abusive behavior that led to an administrative decision to remove this student from the House System. This student also did not contest the allegation. The disciplinary committee suspended the student for four quarters and requested that the Dean of Students use the power of her office to encourage that the student follow a treatment plan while on suspension and get medical clearance before returning to campus.
- A third student was called before a disciplinary committee charged with plagiarism. The result of the hearing was a three quarter suspension and a recommendation that the student seek counseling. The recommendation for counseling was determined because the disciplinary committee felt that the student had difficulty in understanding integrity and taking personal responsibility.
- In the fourth case of a disciplinary hearing, a student was brought before a committee for sending a vindictive letter to a law school attempting to sabotage the application of another student. The student was found responsible and suspended for a quarter.

- In the fifth instance, a disciplinary committee hearing was held for a student accused of academic dishonesty. Specifically, the student was accused and found responsible for utilizing a former TA's cnet ID and password to steal answer keys to complete assignments. The student was given a five quarter suspension.
- A sixth student was brought to a disciplinary committee for an accusation of academic dishonesty in relation to the case aforementioned. This student was the TA who admitted to sharing personal password with the previous student to access the answer keys. This student was given a four quarter suspension.
- The last case in the College involved a student accused of plagiarism. This student twice violated University rules by committing plagiarism in papers. A four quarter suspension was imposed.

In the Graduate Divisions and Professional Schools, six hearings were convened involving five students. Two graduate students requested a review of the disciplinary committee's decisions and in each case the original decision was upheld.

One graduate student was seen by two separate disciplinary committees in the Social Sciences Division. As the underlying cause for complaint in each of the cases involving said student had an element of allegation of sexual violence, specifically sexual harassment and stalking, procedural elements were promptly adopted to reflect the "Dear Colleague Letter" issued in April 2011, by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR). This letter is a guidance document clarifying universities' responsibilities under Title IX with regard to addressing sexual violence and sexual harassment. The letter states that universities are to adhere to a three-part protocol, one of which is to take the steps necessary to find a "prompt and *equitable* resolution" of complaints (the other two parts are distribution of notice of non-discrimination to students, employees and guests on campuses and designating a Title IX coordinator to oversee complaints).

The Chicago Booth School of Business held one disciplinary hearing.

- A student was accused of misrepresenting the need as to why the student necessitated extended time to complete a take home examination. The student was placed on probation for the remainder of the student's tenure with Chicago Booth.

The Biological Sciences Division convened one disciplinary hearing.

- A student accused of physical and verbal abuse, threatening the safety of others in the laboratory was brought before a disciplinary committee. The student was placed on probation until the termination of the program and lost privileges for one quarter—not granted access to research laboratories.

The Harris School of Public Policy convened one disciplinary hearing.

- A student was before a disciplinary committee accused of plagiarizing the work of fellow students on at least two occasions. The committee recommended to the faculty that the student redo the problem sets and treat the problems sets submitted as having not completed the passage.

The Social Sciences Division convened two disciplinary hearings involving the same accused student.

- A student asked by the Dean of Students not to have contact with a fellow student was accused of not following a directive of a university official. The committee found that the evidence did not sustain the allegation.
- Same student as aforementioned was accused of allegations of sexual harassment, stalking, unlawful harassment and domestic abuse. Another disciplinary committee was convened to consider these allegations. The committee determined that the evidence did not sustain the allegations. The committee followed new prescribed measures based on the guidelines of the “Dear Colleague Letter”, allowing the complainant to have equal access to the hearing, the evidence and the outcome of the hearing. The complainant, having the right to request a review under prescribed measures did so. Complainant asked for a review of the case based on new evidence not available at the time of the hearing. The Review Committee upheld the original finding.

Students sent before disciplinary committees, AY 2001– AY 2011

Year	College/ Academic	College/ Other	Graduate/ Academic	Graduate/ Other	Total
01-02	5	5	8	9	27
02-03	4	2	6	3	15
03-04	4	0	16	4	24
04-05	1	4	6	1	12
05-06	3	6	8	3	20
06-07	7	6	3	2	18
07-08	3	6	9	2	20
08-09	1	5	12	2	19
09-10	2	4	8	2	16
10-11	4	3	3	3	13
<i>Average</i>	<i>3.4</i>	<i>4.1</i>	<i>7.9</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>18.4</i>