

## **DISCIPLINE REPORT 2020-2021**

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 *RRR* for more details.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Students found responsible (Primary Infractions)</b>	<b>Infractions Committed (Total Infractions)</b>
Academic	66	71
Alcohol	19	39
Assault	2	2
Dishonesty/Fraud	9	12
Disorderly Conduct	16	22
Drugs	1	5
Harassment/Respect for Others	1	1
Hazing	22	23
Health and Safety	432	434
Information Technology	0	0
Property Damage & Vandalism	0	1
Theft	11	11
Total	<hr/> 579	<hr/> 621

#### Academic

Dean's Warning	1
Reprimand	5
Disciplinary Probation	37
Suspension - one semester	21
Suspension - one semester, with censure	0
Suspension - one year	1
Expulsion	1
Total	<hr/> 66

This year 66 students were found responsible for 71 academic violations. Most of these students were found responsible for plagiarism and/or an attempt to gain an unfair advantage, i.e., the use of any outside source without proper acknowledgment in any work submitted for academic credit. The outside sources in question included prose and computer code written by other students, scholarly articles available in print or online, and internet sources, such as online encyclopedias or papers made available online.

Penalties for these violations ranged from reprimands to expulsion. The reprimand penalty was used for more minor 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 a

student made misrepresentations in order to gain more time for an assignment, where a student attempted to gain an unfair advantage but did not use the information in the exam, and for a violation of the tutoring policy.

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. 21 students were in this category. One student was issued a two-semester suspension where the violations occurred on two academic submissions and were numerous in frequency. 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.

One student was expelled for a second egregious incident of plagiarism, copying a paper from an online source without attribution.

### Alcohol

Dean's Warning	6
Reprimand	1
Disciplinary Probation	11
Campus Service	1
	<hr/>
Total	19

Of the 19 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. Students with a previous disciplinary history were also placed on disciplinary probation and assigned campus service hours.

### Assault

Dean's Warning	0
Disciplinary Probation	2
	<hr/>
Total	2

The two students found responsible for assault struck each other and received varying terms of disciplinary probation.

### Dishonesty/Fraud

Dean's Warning	3
Reprimand	2
Disciplinary Probation	4
	9
Total	

Acts of dishonesty or fraud, including misuse or unauthorized lending/borrowing of University identification, possession of fraudulent identification, and dishonesty with University officials, were met with warnings, reprimands, or short terms of disciplinary probation. A number of students failed to respond to a University officials when contacted multiple times regarding Covid-19 protocols or were dishonest in interviews with a University investigator.

Disorderly Conduct

Dean's Warning	13
Reprimand	1
Disciplinary Probation	2
	16
Total	

Disorderly conduct is a broad category which covers a range of infractions. Dean's warnings were issued following minor violations by students with no previous disciplinary history; such violations included unauthorized entry into private or secure spaces, accessing restricted areas without permission and the creation of public disturbances.

Drugs

Dean's Warning	1
Disciplinary Probation	0
	1
Total	

A student consumed a marijuana edible and would have received disciplinary probation, but the penalty was mitigated due to a call for help. Three other students were also found responsible for possession or use of cannabis or drug paraphernalia, although the accompanying social contract violation was the primary infraction.

Harassment/Respect for Others

Dean's Warning	1
Disciplinary Probation	0
	1
Total	

There was one case of a breach of a no communication/no contact order, but the penalty was mitigated due to the particular circumstances of the case.

Hazing (Formerly Included with Harassment/Respect for Others)

Dean's Warning	19
Reprimand	1
Disciplinary Probation	2
	<hr/>
Total	22

A number of students participated in assigning, completing or performing a pledge task that was deemed to be hazing. Most students received a Dean's Warning, unless they were previously on disciplinary probation. In issuing Dean's Warnings instead of disciplinary probation, the board considered the nature of the tasks and certain other circumstances.

Health and Safety

Dean's Warning	60
Reprimand	26
Disciplinary Probation	346
	<hr/>
Total	432

In the fall of 2020, in order to contain and mitigate community spread of the COVID-19 virus, all students who were residing on campus or who were residing locally off-campus but had been granted access to certain campus facilities, were required to sign and abide by the Social Contract. In the spring semester 2021, all students choosing to reside on campus or choosing to live locally off-campus were required to sign and abide by the Social Contract unless they applied for and were granted an exemption.

Approximately half of the violations involved students who did not submit two Covid tests per week, per the University testing protocol. Violations involving failure to comply with testing protocols ranged from a reprimand to 24 months of probation and being barred from campus depending upon the number of times and degree to which the student failed to follow the protocols. The remainder of the violations were either hosting or attending a gathering, either in a dormitory room/suite or at an off-campus residence where the number of guests in attendance exceeded the permitted number and/or involved an off-campus guest in a dormitory. Normally, hosts were assigned a term of disciplinary probation up to 24 months (unless there were also other violations, in which case periods of probation were added for the additional violations) and had on-campus housing revoked or were barred from access to the campus for the remainder of the semester. Guests were normally assigned a shorter term of probation. In some cases, the term of probation was increased for other associated violations (e.g. alcohol, fire safety, etc.) or because the student had a previous violation. Other violations included failure to abide by quarantine guidelines or travel policies.

Reprimands and short terms of disciplinary probation were also assigned to students with no previous disciplinary history following minor health and safety violations, such as being on fire escapes, rooftops, and other elevated surfaces, or using a university grill without proper authorization.

### Information Technology

Disciplinary Probation	0
Total	<u>0</u>

There were no primary information technology violations in the 2020-2021 Academic Year.

### Property Damage/Vandalism

Reprimand	0
Disciplinary Probation	0
Total	<u>0</u>

There were no primary property damage/vandalism violations in the 2020-2021 Academic Year. There was one incident where a student damaged property, but the accompanying assault violation was the primary infraction.

### 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	8
Disciplinary Probation	3
Total	<u>11</u>

8 of the 11 students found responsible for theft were given Dean's warnings for illegally downloading/sharing 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.