

May 31, 1977

REGISTERED MAIL
PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. K.

Mississauga, Ontario

Dear Mr. K.

At its Hearing on Monday, May 30, 1977, the Local Branch of the Trial Division of the University Tribunal considered the following charge against you:

That in the winter term, 1977 as a student in HIS 101, you submitted a term paper which you represented as your own work but which was the work of another with intent to deceive within the meaning of Section E.1(a)(11) of the Academic Code of Behaviour.

In accordance with Section 65 of the Rules of Procedure of the University of Toronto Disciplinary Structure, I am writing to formally advise you of the decision of the University Tribunal with respect to this charge.

The jury found you to be guilty of the charge.

In imposing its sanction the jury decided that you should receive a zero grade in HIS 101 and that a notation should be placed on your transcript indicating the reason for this sanction, the notation to be removed at the end of eighteen months provided that no further academic sanctions are imposed in that period.

The jury gave the following reasons for the sanctions imposed:

We have chosen this sanction because we have found the defendant guilty of intent to deceive and we have asked that a notation be placed on his record for eighteen months rather than a longer period in order that the reason might be removed from the transcript if he seeks to use the transcript to obtain employment in the second half of what might be his graduating year.

.../2

May 31, 1977

- 2 -

Also in accordance with Section 65 of the Rules of Procedure, I am enclosing pertinent information regarding the rights of appeal and the time limit within which appeals must be made.

Yours sincerely,

PATRICK S. PHILLIPS
Secretary, Academic Tribunal

PSP/co
Encl.