



University of Toronto TORONTO ONTARIO M5S 1A1

University Tribunal

May 1st, 1989

REGISTERED MAIL

CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. S.

Toronto, Ontario

Dear Mr. S.

At its hearing on Thursday, April 27th, 1989 the University Tribunal considered the following charges against you:

- (1) Being a student enrolled in GSC 120F in or about the fall of 1988 you did forge or falsify an academic record of the University contrary to Section E.1.(c) of the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters.

In particular, you wrote and signed a medical certificate purportedly from a physician and submitted it to the University through Professor J. Patterson as an excuse for term work required in GSC 120F.

- (2) In or about the fall of 1988 you did make use of a forged or falsified academic record of the University contrary to Section E.1.(c) of the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters.

In particular, you submitted to the University through Professor J. Patterson a false medical certificate containing the signature of a non-existent physician in an attempt to be excused from term work required in GSC 120F.

The jury accepted your plea of guilty to the charges and imposed the following sanctions:

- a grade of zero in the course GSC 120F;
- suspension from the University from May 1st, 1989 to April 30th, 1991;
- that the suspension and the reason for it be recorded on your academic record and transcript from May 1st, 1989 to April 30th, 1994; and

- that the decision and sanctions imposed be reported to the Vice-President and Provost for publication (name withheld) in the university newspapers.

The jury gave the following reasons for their decision:

"We felt that a somewhat more lenient penalty, than what the University had requested in terms of length of suspension, was in order because we felt that there were several extenuating circumstances. First of all, while it in no way excuses the offence, we took into consideration that Mr. S. believed himself to be on probation when, in fact, he was not. This may have placed additional pressure on him and his judgement may have been somewhat affected by that belief. We also felt that when the Dean confronted him with the offence, the fact that he admitted his guilt was something that should be taken into consideration. In other words, it appears that he has admitted his guilt all along and therefore we felt that perhaps it would justify being a little more lenient. However, it was very hard for us to consider what any other extenuating circumstances were because he chose not to comment on the reasons behind his actions. The reason why we feel that the penalty is in order is that this is a serious academic offence. Had he gotten away with the submission of this document, it might very well have benefitted him academically in the course. We feel that the verdict should be published by the Provost without mention of his name. This is very necessary for deterrence".

Information concerning rights of appeal may be found in Section L of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. The deadline for filing an appeal by you or by the University is May 23rd, 1989.

Yours Truly,

Dominique Petersen
Secretary
University Tribunal

DP*np

cc: J. Minor
K. Feldman
J. Foley
D. Cook
G. Sprules