

DISCIPLINE REPORT 2022-2023

At the end of each academic year, information on disciplinary proceedings involving undergraduate students who violated University policy during the preceding 12 months is published by the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Students (ODUS) in a Discipline Report. Please see below for more detailed information regarding such disciplinary proceedings.

Note: On occasion, a student may be found responsible for more than one violation in the context of a single incident. For purposes of this report, such a student is counted only once. That student is listed under the category that corresponds with the violation judged to be of primary significance in the case.

OVERVIEW

Allegations of misconduct by undergraduate students which are not covered by the Honor System fall under the jurisdiction of the Faculty-Student Committee on Discipline.¹ The Committee on Discipline maintains transparent, consistently-applied procedures, set forth in *Rights, Rules, Responsibilities*. Please see *RRR* section 2.5 for details. Students are neither found responsible nor given a sanction absent a thorough adjudication—premised on complete notice, information, and the opportunity to be heard—and a formal finding that clear and persuasive evidence supports the charge(s). The same is true of the Residential College Disciplinary Board, to which the Committee on Discipline delegates authority for non-academic offenses for which separation is not a possible outcome.

BY CATEGORY

The categories below refer to University policies as described in *Rights, Rules, Responsibilities*; they do not refer to crimes. The data in this section refer to violations of University policy for which undergraduate students were formally found responsible by the appropriate authority. For these and other reasons, it should not be expected that the data in this report align with the data provided by the Department of Public Safety for reported crimes.

By category, numbers are provided both for “students found responsible” and for “infractions committed.” These numbers are distinct because in any given case, a student may be charged with more than one type of infraction, or with multiple incidents of the same type of infraction. In each case involving more than one infraction, ODUS determines which infraction was the most significant, and designates that infraction the primary infraction for that case. Thus, the column labeled “students found responsible” refers to the number of students for whom a violation in that particular category was the primary violation. The column labeled “infractions

¹ Until the fall of 2014, sexual misconduct allegations were heard by its Subcommittee on Sexual Misconduct. These cases are now under the jurisdiction of the Vice Provost for Institutional Equity and Diversity, who serves as the Title IX Coordinator. This office is responsible for communicating with all members of the University community regarding Title IX. Please see section 1.3 of the 2020 edition of *Rights, Rules, Responsibilities* for more details.

committed” refers to the number of times violations under that category were committed across all cases.

Category	Students found responsible² (Primary Infractions)	Infractions Committed (Total Infractions)
Academic	50	63
Alcohol	55	118
Assault	4	6
Dishonesty/Fraud	24	45
Disorderly Conduct	26	59
Drugs	4	8
Harassment/Respect for Others	3	4
Hazing	90	110
Health and Safety	32	48
Information Technology	0	0
Property (unauthorized entry/occupancy)	11	13
Property Damage & Vandalism	5	8
Theft	32	33
Total	<u>336</u>	<u>515</u>

Academic

Dean's Warning	2
Reprimand	1
Disciplinary Probation	17
Suspension - one semester	25
Suspension - one year	3
Suspension – 18 months	1
Post-Degree Sanction	1
	—
Total	50

Students were given Dean's Warnings for failures to properly cite when the amount was minimal, and outside sources were allowed. The reprimand penalty was used for more minor

² If a student was found responsible in more than one case, the student would be counted once for each case. Therefore, the number does not reflect the number of unique students.

violations, such as where there was a very limited amount of plagiarism (likely due to a careless error) or a source was consulted contrary to course policy for a homework assignment but text was not copied. Disciplinary probation was applied instead of a one-semester suspension where infractions were committed, but where consideration was given to the potential confusion that may have resulted from collaboration policies or the manner in which course policies were communicated. Disciplinary probation was also issued where there was a very limited amount of plagiarism, reflecting carelessness rather than an intent to misrepresent authorship, where it was plausible that students may have misunderstood a collaboration policy (and were transparent about working with others), where the assignments were worth a small portion of the overall course grade, where a student made misrepresentations in order to gain more time for an assignment, where they failed to fully cite some passages due to carelessness and disorganized notetaking, or where they aided plagiarism by sharing code when prohibited by course policy. One student was assigned a post-degree sanction (the equivalent of disciplinary probation), as they came forward after graduating to admit a violation.

In accordance with *Rights, Rules, Responsibilities*, where the Committee on Discipline was persuaded that a student ought reasonably to have understood that they were committing an academic infraction, the student was suspended for one semester. Students were suspended for plagiarism (copying from online or outside sources without attribution on take-home exams or papers) and for plagiarizing on coding assignments (copying from online code or from other students). Students were suspended for two semesters when they were dishonest (fabricated evidence, for example), or were found responsible for plagiarism on multiple assignments in the same semester. One student was issued an 18-month suspension where the violations occurred on the senior thesis, and contained many careless citation errors, and pages of verbatim or near verbatim texts improperly cited. Several cases involved the use of generative AI (e.g., ChatGPT) on take-home exams or papers without citation.

Alcohol

Dean’s Warning	21
Reprimand	12
Disciplinary Probation	21
Other/Reiteration	1
Total	<hr/> 55

Of the students who received penalties for violating the alcohol policy, those with no previous disciplinary history whose actions posed a relatively low risk to the health, safety, and wellbeing of the community and its members received Dean’s Warnings. Such lower-risk violations included the possession of an open container of alcohol in a common space and the hosting of gatherings at which low-proof (less than 30) alcohol was made available in an amount appropriate to the number of persons present. Violations that involved the presence of hard alcohol, drinking games, or other factors indicating a higher risk to health, safety, or wellbeing, were met with varying terms of disciplinary probation, depending on the severity of the conduct

at issue, whether other violations of University policy occurred and whether the student had a previous disciplinary history.

Assault

Disciplinary Probation	3
Suspension- one semester	1
Total	<u>4</u>

Students received terms of probation for pushing and slapping one another and throwing urine at another student. One student injured another by applying pressure to their head, causing them to need medical attention. One student who had prior violations was suspended for one semester for striking and kicking a Department of Public Safety (DPS) officer as they attempted to bring the student to medical care, being verbally belligerent to DPS and to medical staff, and threatening to shoot them with a gun.

Dishonesty/Fraud

Dean’s Warning	7
Reprimand	3
Disciplinary Probation	12
Suspension – one semester	1
Total	<u>23</u>

Several students received Dean’s Warnings or reprimands for violations of the University’s policy on honesty and cooperation in University matters for loaning their Tigercard to another student or for using another student’s Tigercard. Some students received reprimands for being in possession of fake IDs. Other students received varying terms of disciplinary probation for being dishonest to administrators or providing misleading information to DPS officers during a criminal investigation. One student used a cell phone on a placement test that was not submitted for class credit and was issued nine months of probation. Another student was suspended for submitting a falsified transcript to their residential college dean in order to fulfill a requirement of course completion for reinstatement at the University.

Disorderly Conduct

Dean’s Warning	2
Reprimand	8
Disciplinary Probation	16
Other/Reiteration	1
Total	<u>27</u>

Disorderly conduct is a broad category which covers a range of infractions. Dean’s Warnings, reprimands, and short terms of disciplinary probation were issued following minor violations by students with no previous disciplinary history, such as taping their door open, using vacant spaces or rooms not assigned to a student to hold gatherings, and the creation of public disturbances. Students received reprimands or terms of disciplinary probation for leaving University Health Services (UHS) without authorization or being uncooperative with DPS or UHS staff. Students received varying terms of probation for repeated violations of parking on campus without a permit or for other parking violations.

Drugs

Dean’s Warning	3
Reprimand	1
	<hr/>
Total	4

Three students were found responsible for consuming marijuana edibles and had their penalties mitigated to Dean’s Warnings when their friends or bystanders called for help because the students were experiencing adverse effects. One student set off a fire alarm by smoking marijuana and received a reprimand.

Harassment/Respect for Others

Disciplinary Probation	3
	<hr/>
Total	3

One student committed several violations of no-communication and no-contact orders, resulting in progressively increased terms of disciplinary probation.

Hazing (Formerly Included with Harassment/Respect for Others)

Reprimand	23
Disciplinary Probation	47
Suspension – one semester	5
Suspension – one semester w/censure	5
Suspension – one year	2
Suspension – one year w/censure	2
Suspension – 18 months	1
Suspension – 2 years	1
Withheld Degree	4
	<hr/>

Twenty-two (22) students were found responsible for violating the University's hazing policy for participating in or helping facilitate a student organization initiation process, during which students were falsely told they were participating in a "second tryout," resulting in new members being criticized, intimidated, or demeaned during the initiation process. Seventeen (17) of the 22 students were members of the student organization who helped in the initiation process and received a reprimand. Four (4) students who were officers helped organize the initiations and were also held responsible for a violation of the alcohol policy for serving alcohol to minors; they received disciplinary probation. One (1) student was held responsible as a member who helped with the initiation process and had an unrelated alcohol policy violation.

Twenty-six (26) students associated with a fraternity were found responsible for violations of the hazing policy. Three (3) students organized events as pledges/new members or as members. In these events, new members (including minors) were encouraged to consume foods, liquids, and alcoholic beverages in a manner that risked physical and emotional harm and were made to participate in physically and emotionally demeaning and/or dangerous conduct that placed the new members at a substantial risk of physical injury and other harms, and which resulted in physical injury to some new members. Twenty-four (24) students attended events as a member or a new member/pledge. In these events, new members were encouraged to consume foods, liquids, and alcoholic beverages in a manner that risked physical and emotional harm and participated in physically and emotionally demeaning and/or dangerous conduct that carried a substantial risk of physical injury and other harms. Ten (10) of those students also attended similar events as members where pledges experienced similar conduct once they were members. Fifteen (15) of those students were part of a deliberate and systemic effort to withhold information from investigators and provide incomplete and inaccurate information. Two (2) of those students failed to cooperate with the investigation. The penalties issued in connection with this case ranged from a withheld degree for two years (two students); suspension for two years (one student); suspension for one year (four students) to three semesters (one student); suspension for one semester (10 students); withheld degree for one semester (two students); 48 months of disciplinary probation (two students); 24 months of disciplinary probation (one student); 15 months of disciplinary probation (one student); 12 months of disciplinary probation (two students); and nine months of disciplinary probation (one student). Seven (7) students who were suspended had censure added to their penalty for their dishonesty or failure to get help or to underscore the seriousness of their conduct. Factors considered in issuing penalties included their role in organizing fraternity events, whether the students participated in hazing as both a pledge/new member and as a member, whether they were dishonest and their level of dishonesty, whether they had additional charges for failure to get help or non-cooperation, whether they were particularly cooperative with the investigation, and the seriousness of their conduct.

Twenty-eight (28) students were found responsible for a violation of the University's hazing policy for participating in or helping facilitate a varsity athletics team organization initiation process, during which new members removed shirts/pants, were blindfolded, and had their mouths/hands taped. Ten (10) of the 28 students helped organize the event and told new members to bring duct tape/zip ties, and to play a drinking game, where the penalty was

drinking. Three (3) of the 28 students were dishonest with university investigators. The penalties issued in connection with this disciplinary case included 36 months of disciplinary probation (one student); 28 months of disciplinary probation (one student), 23 months of disciplinary probation (one student); 22 months of disciplinary probation (one student); 20 months of disciplinary probation (one student); 19 months of disciplinary probation (one student); 13 months of disciplinary probation (three students); nine months of disciplinary probation (one student); six months of disciplinary probation (nine students); five months of disciplinary probation (one student); four months of disciplinary probation (six students); reprimand (one student, who provided substantial information to help the investigation). The outcome varied depending on how many violations the student had, the nature of the violations, and the student's prior disciplinary record.

Health and Safety

Dean's Warning	8
Reprimand	15
Disciplinary Probation	9
Total	<u>32</u>

Students received Dean's Warnings for maintaining fire hazards (such as having candles in their room) and lighting firecrackers outdoors. Reprimands were assigned to students who smoked/vaped in their rooms, had an unauthorized air conditioner or microwave in their room, hosted a dog overnight without authorization, or burned incense. Students who activated the fire alarm by smoking and/or tampered with the smoke detector or with previous disciplinary history received periods of probation.

Information Technology

	0
Total	<u>0</u>

There were no primary information technology violations in the 2022-2023 Academic Year.

Property

Dean's Warning	9
Reprimand	1
Disciplinary probation	1
Total	<u>11</u>

Students received Dean's Warnings for sleeping in University buildings after hours or for using a room not assigned to them to study and listen to music. One student received a reprimand for

practicing on a basketball court in Jadwin Gym on multiple occasions without permission when the building was closed. Another student received four months of probation for using a vacant room that did not belong to them and for an unrelated violation. One student received a lengthy term of probation for occupying a restricted electrical room.

Property Damage/Vandalism

Disciplinary Probation	5
Total	<u>5</u>

Students received short terms of disciplinary probation for minor damage to their dorm rooms. One student received a lengthy term of disciplinary probation for hosting a gathering that resulted in damage to the hallway valued at approximately \$700.

Sexual Misconduct

As of September 2014, cases implicating Title IX (i.e., cases implicating the Title IX Sexual Harassment policy or University Sexual Misconduct policy) are investigated, adjudicated, and reported by the Office of the Vice Provost for Institutional Equity and Diversity. Thus, the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Students does not include these statistics in our annual discipline report.

Theft

Dean’s Warning	9
Reprimand	2
Disciplinary Probation	20
Withheld Degree	1
Total	<u>32</u>

Students received Dean’s Warnings for illegally downloading/sharing copyright-protected digital media files, such as music or movies. Students also received varying terms of probation for the theft or misappropriation of University or personal property, shoplifting items from the University Store, or cashing checks issued to others. Students received varying terms of probation for removing a couch from a common room and moving it to their suite for personal use. One student with a previous disciplinary record had their degree withheld for shoplifting items valued at over \$2,000 on over 80 occasions over the course of a year.