

DISCIPLINE REPORT 2021-2022

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

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 2021 edition of *RRR* for more details.

Category	Students found responsible (Primary Infractions)	Infractions Committed (Total Infractions)
Academic	50	67
Alcohol	157	164
Assault	0	0
Dishonesty/Fraud	5	9
Disorderly Conduct	28	35
Drugs	11	11
Harassment/Respect for Others	7	7
Hazing	0	0
Health and Safety	730	742
Information Technology	1	1
Property	2	2
Property Damage and Vandalism	3	3
Theft	29	31
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	1,023	1,072

Academic

Dean's Warning	3
Reprimand	7
Disciplinary Probation	13
Suspension - one semester	23
Suspension - one semester, with censure	2
Suspension - one year	2
Expulsion	0
	<hr/>
Total	50

This year 50 students were found responsible for 67 academic violations. Most of these students were found responsible for plagiarism (the use of any outside source without proper acknowledgment in any work submitted for academic credit), an attempt to gain an unfair advantage or a violation of examination procedures. The outside sources in question included prose and computer code written by other students, scholarly articles available in print or online, and online/internet sources, such as papers made available online.

Penalties for these violations ranged from Dean's Warnings to one-year suspensions. Dean's Warnings were given for minor violations where, for example, students provided help that went beyond the course collaboration policy (which permitted collaboration) on a homework assignment; where a student used a calculator to complete an answer on a homework assignment when calculators were prohibited but wrote a note to the instructor that they did not know how to calculate the value; or where a student received input from a family member on a paper without noting it in the Acknowledgments section. The reprimand penalty was also used for more minor violations, such as where students received help that went beyond

the course collaboration policy (which permitted collaboration) on a homework assignment or where students failed to follow assignment instructions to complete lab reports individually and submitted lab reports very similar to a partner's lab reports because they discussed the reports extensively as they were writing. Disciplinary probation was issued where there was a very limited amount of plagiarism, reflecting carelessness rather than an intent to misrepresent authorship, where student used online sources without proper citation on homework assignments, or where a student consulted the internet during an exam when it was not permitted but there was no clear and persuasive evidence that they used the information they consulted. Disciplinary probation was also issued when students aided plagiarism by sharing code (without an intention for the other student to plagiarize) where the other student ultimately copied their work.

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. 27 students were in this category. One student was given a two-semester suspension for a second egregious incident of plagiarism, posting final exam questions on Chegg and using the Chegg solutions in answering the final exam questions without citation in violation of exam policies and transcription or publication of course-related material and tutoring policies. An additional student was given a two-semester suspension due to being found responsible in a second academic violation after being found responsible for an Honor Code violation.

Students were also suspended for one semester for plagiarizing online coding assignments, for collaborating during take-home exams when collaboration was not permitted, for copying from online sources without attribution, and for copying from online or outside sources during an exam where collaboration was not permitted. Two students were issued suspensions with censure where they had a prior academic violation. Two students were suspended for two semesters where they were already on disciplinary probation for a prior academic violation.

Alcohol

Dean's Warning	129
Reprimand	12
Disciplinary Probation	15
Reiterated Probation	1
	<hr/>
Total	157

Of the 157 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. Reprimands were given when the penalty would have been a Dean's warning but the student already had a Dean's warning or when the violation was accompanied by another Dean's warning-level violation. 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 contrary to University policy. This year's number of alcohol violations was significantly higher due to a 109-person case at an off-campus location. Generally, 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. Students with a previous disciplinary history were also placed on disciplinary probation and assigned campus service hours.

Assault

Dean's Warning	0
Disciplinary Probation	0
	—
Total	0

There were no students found responsible of assault.

Dishonesty/Fraud

Dean's Warning	0
Reprimand	0
Disciplinary Probation	4
Suspension – one semester	1
	—
Total	5

Acts of dishonesty or fraud, including possessing a fraudulent driver's license, submitting a fraudulent receipt after using a University credit card to make a personal purchase, and being dishonest to instructors regarding the need for an extension on a paper or regarding the rescheduling of an exam were met with varying terms of disciplinary probation. One student who improperly accepted funding from multiple departments when policies prohibited accepting funding for other full-time positions and who used funds designated for a summer course for purposes for which they were not approved was suspended for one semester.

Disorderly Conduct

Dean's Warning	9
Reprimand	1
Disciplinary Probation	18
	—
Total	28

Disorderly conduct is a broad category which covers a range of infractions. Dean's warnings and a reprimand were issued following minor violations by students with no previous disciplinary history; such violations included violating quiet hours by playing loud music, being noncompliant with the COVID testing protocol and playing lawn golf in close proximity to people and campus buildings. Varying terms of disciplinary probation were issued for disorderly conduct such as non-cooperation with DPS officers, UHS staff or Penn Medicine staff, pouring beer on another student at an eating club, driving a University vehicle when not authorized to do so, repeatedly parking on campus without a permit or without registering a vehicle, unauthorized entry into a student's room, and disrupting a lecture by playing a prank.

Drugs

Dean's Warning	4
Reprimand	4
Disciplinary Probation	3
	—

Total 11

Dean's Warnings were issued where students admitted to consuming a marijuana edible but the violation was discovered as a result of a call for help for an adverse reaction, in which case the board mitigates the penalty. Reprimands were issued to students who used or smoked marijuana. A short term of disciplinary probation was given to students who smoked marijuana but also committed another violation such as disorderly conduct or a violation of the alcohol policy.

Harassment/Respect for Others

Reprimand	1
Disciplinary Probation	5
Campus Service	1
Total	<u>7</u>

Varying terms of disciplinary probation were given to students who violated DNCO orders. One student was issued probation for making threats against other students and possessing an unauthorized salt gun on campus.

Hazing

Dean's Warning	0
Reprimand	0
Disciplinary Probation	0
Total	<u>0</u>

There were no students found responsible for hazing.

Health and Safety

Dean's Warning	14
Reprimand	578
Disciplinary Probation	138
Total	<u>730</u>

The vast majority of the health and safety violations were regarding noncompliance with COVID and public health policies. Reprimands were issued when students were noncompliant with the COVID testing policies after receiving a warning or for other health and safety violations such as accessing the roof of certain buildings or possessing an unauthorized appliance, grill or other equipment. Periods of disciplinary probation were given where a student had multiple incidents of COVID testing noncompliance or where they failed to comply with other public health policies, such as quarantine directives.

Information Technology

Dean's Warning	1
----------------	---

Total	— 1
-------	--------

There was one dean's warning issued for using a software program that shared the University wifi signal.

Property

Dean's Warnings	2
-----------------	---

Total	— 2
-------	--------

There were two instances where students stayed overnight in University spaces without authorization.

Property Damage/Vandalism

Dean's Warning	2
----------------	---

Disciplinary Probation	1
------------------------	---

Total	— 3
-------	--------

There were three instances of property damage/vandalism (using chalk on University walls and breaking a dorm window) that resulted in Dean's Warnings or a period of disciplinary probation.

Sexual Misconduct

As of September 2014, cases implicating Title IX (i.e., cases implicating the University's policy on Sex Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct) 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 no longer includes these statistics in our annual discipline report.

Theft

Dean's Warning	17
----------------	----

Reprimand	2
-----------	---

Disciplinary Probation	10
------------------------	----

Total	— 29
-------	---------

16 of the 29 students found responsible for theft were given Dean's warnings for the illegal downloading and/or sharing of copyright-protected digital media files, such as music or movies. One student received disciplinary probation for a second such violation. Short terms of disciplinary probation were also assigned for acts such as the attempted theft or misappropriation of university or personal property.