

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL  
TRIAL DIVISION**

**IN THE MATTER OF** charges of academic dishonesty filed on February 6, 2013,

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995,

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the University of Toronto Act, 1971, S.O. 1971, c. 56 as amended S.O. 1978, c. 88

**B E T W E E N:**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**– AND –**

**S [REDACTED] P [REDACTED]**

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

**Hearing Date:** Wednesday, March 20, 2013

**Members of the Panel:**

Ms. Sarah Kraicer, Barrister and Solicitor, Chair  
Professor Ernest Lam, Faculty of Dentistry, Faculty Panel Member  
Mr. Adam Found, Student Panel Member

**Appearances:**

Mr. Robert Centa, Assistant Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland Barristers

**In Attendance:**

Dr. Kristi Gourlay, Manager, Office of Student Academic Integrity, Faculty of Arts and Sciences  
Ms. Natalie Ramtahal, Coordinator, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances

**Not in Attendance:**

Ms. S [REDACTED] P [REDACTED], the Student

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

1. The Trial Division of the University Tribunal was convened on March 20, 2013, to consider charges brought by the University of Toronto (the "University") against Ms. S [REDACTED] P [REDACTED] (the "Student") under the *University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995* (the "Code").

### **Preliminary Matters**

2. The Student did not attend the hearing. The Student signed a Consent dated March 5, 2013 which was included in the Joint Book of Documents filed in this proceeding acknowledging that she received reasonable notice of the hearing, requesting that the University Tribunal proceed in her absence, and waiving her right to any further notice of these proceedings. The Student signed an Agreed Statement of Facts and a Joint Submission on Penalty, and indicated that she did not wish to attend or participate further in these proceedings. She acknowledged that, in her absence, the University Tribunal may find that she committed acts of academic misconduct, and may impose sanctions on her as set out in the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters.
3. The Tribunal was satisfied on reading the Consent and on hearing submissions from Discipline Counsel that the Student had received proper Notice and that it would be appropriate for the hearing to proceed in the Student's absence.

### **The Charges**

4. The Charges against the Student are as follows:

- (a) In or around August or September 2009, you knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified documents or evidence required by the University of Toronto, or uttered, circulated or made use of any such forged, altered or falsified documents, namely two letters and a personal statement, which you submitted in support of your request for academic accommodations or relief in SPA100Y, contrary to Section B.I.1(a) of the Code.
- (b) In or around August 2011, you knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified documents or evidence required by the University of Toronto, or uttered, circulated or made use of any such forged, altered or falsified documents, namely a letter and a University of Toronto Student Medical Certificate, which you submitted in support of your request for academic accommodations in EAS102Y, contrary to Section B.I.1(a) of the Code.
- (c) In January 2012, you knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified documents or evidence required by the University of Toronto, or uttered, circulated or made use of any such forged, altered or falsified documents, namely a letter, a University of Toronto Student Medical Certificate and a personal statement, which you submitted in support of your request for academic accommodations in EAS102Y, contrary to Section B.I.1(a) of the Code.
- (d) In February 2012, you knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified documents or evidence required by the University of Toronto, or uttered, circulated or made use of any such forged, altered or falsified documents, namely a letter and a personal statement, which you submitted in support of your request for academic accommodations in EAS102Y, contrary to Section B.I.1(a) of the Code.
- (e) In November 2012, you knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified documents or evidence required by the University of Toronto, or uttered, circulated or made use of any such forged, altered or falsified documents, namely a letter and a University of Toronto

Student Medical Certificate, which you submitted in support of your request for academic accommodations or relief in SOC102H, contrary to Section B.I.1(a) of the Code.

- (f) In the alternative to each of the charges above, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation not otherwise described in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind by submitting falsified or forged documents to the University of Toronto in support of various forms of academic accommodation or relief, contrary to Section B.I.3(b) of the Code.

### **Agreed Statement of Facts and Plea**

- 5. Discipline Counsel advised the Tribunal at the outset of the hearing that the University had entered into an Agreed Statement of Facts with the Student, which is attached as Appendix “A” to these Reasons for Decision. The Tribunal also received into evidence a Joint Book of Documents, on consent, containing documents referred to in the Agreed Statement of Facts.
- 6. Pursuant to the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Student pleaded guilty to all 6 charges filed by the Provost. The University agreed that if the Tribunal convicts the Student on any one of the Charges, the Provost will withdraw Charge 6.
- 7. The facts underlying the charges are set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts and the Joint Book of Authorities. As set out in more detail in the Agreed Statement of Facts, the circumstances giving rise to the charges involve multiple occasions in which the Student filed petitions to the Committee on Standing at the University of Toronto Faculty of Arts and Science (“Committee”) with supporting documentation that included false

information, and forged and falsified letters and medical certificates. The facts are summarized below:

8. On September 3, 2009, the Student submitted a petition to request late withdrawal without academic penalty from the course SPA100Y1Y. She admitted that she filed the petition knowing it contained false information and that she knowingly forged and falsified letters purportedly from a church pastor and a hospital-based "Counselling Associate" to support the request. The University accepted the documentation, but did not grant the late withdrawal.
9. On August 30, 2011, the Student filed a petition to the Committee seeking to write a deferred final examination in EAS 102Y1Y. The Student admits that she filed this petition knowing it contained false information about a purported illness, and that she knowingly forged and falsified a medical certificate and letter both purportedly signed by a physician in support of the petition. She admits that the physician did not prepare or sign these documents. The University granted the deferral.
10. On January 2, 2012, the Student filed a petition to the Committee to request a further deferral of the examination in EAS 102Y1Y. The Student admits that she filed her petition knowing that it contained false information about a purported illness, and that she knowingly forged and falsified a medical certificate and letter purportedly signed by a different physician in support of the petition. She admits that the physician did not prepare or sign these documents. The University granted the further deferral.
11. On February 27, 2012, the Student filed a petition to the Committee to request a third deferral of the examination in EAS 102Y1Y. The Student admits that she filed this petition knowing that it contained false

information including the assertion that her father suffered a heart attack, and that she knowingly forged and falsified a physician letter that purported to document her father's illness. The Student admits that the physician did not prepare or sign this document. The University granted the further deferral.

12. On November 27, 2012, the Student filed a petition to the Committee seeking late withdrawal without penalty from SOC 102H1F. The Student admits that she knowingly forged and falsified a medical certificate and physician letter submitted in support of the petition. The student admits that the physician did not prepare or sign these documents.
13. The Student further admits that she was employed by Humber River Regional Hospital and that she used her position there to permit her to forge the documents she submitted to the University.
14. With respect to all of the false information, forged or falsified documents that the Student provided to the University, the Student admits that she knowingly sent this false information in order to obtain an academic advantage, to mislead the Committee and others at the University, and expecting that the Committee would rely on this information to its detriment and would provide her with an academic advantage.
15. On January 30, 2013, the Student met with the Dean's Designate for Academic Integrity to discuss allegations that she had violated the *Code of Behaviour*. During this meeting, the Student admitted that she had committed the academic offences described in the Agreed Statement of Facts.

## **Decision on Charges**

16. After reviewing the facts contained in the Agreed Statement of Facts and Book of Documents, the Tribunal deliberated and determined that the facts demonstrated that the Charges 1-5 to which the Student had entered a plea of guilty were proven. The Tribunal accepted the guilty pleas in respect of those charges, and found that Student guilty of five counts of forgery, contrary to section B.I.1(a) of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, in respect of Charges 1-5.
17. The remaining charge 6 was therefore withdrawn by the University. The Tribunal therefore makes no finding with respect to charge 6 or the guilty plea entered with respect to that charge.

## **Penalty**

18. The University and the Student submitted a Joint Submission on Penalty to the Tribunal, which is attached to this Reasons for Decision as Appendix "B". The Joint Submission proposed :
  - a. a final grade of zero be assigned for each of SPA 100Y, EAS 102, and SOC 102H;
  - b. The Student be immediately suspended from the University for a period of five years from the date of the hearing;
  - c. that a corresponding notation be placed on her academic record and transcript until the earlier of her graduation from the University or seven years; and

d. that the Tribunal should report this case to the Provost who may publish a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanctions imposed, with the student's name withheld.

19. In oral submissions, Discipline Counsel emphasized the seriousness of the Student's misconduct, that it involved repeated acts of dishonesty and on multiple occasions over a substantial period of time and that the penalty should reflect the strong need for general deterrence. The petition system relies on students to provide the University with honest and accurate information about their circumstances. The Student abused the trust of the University, and its petition system, which seeks to accommodate the genuine and bona fide reasons and circumstances of students that may warrant special consideration with respect to such matters as deferrals and extensions. Discipline Counsel also noted that the Student additionally breached her former employer's trust. Discipline Counsel acknowledged that on the other hand, the Student had no prior discipline history, admitted guilt, and cooperated fully with the University including agreeing to the Agreed Statement of Facts and Joint Submission on Penalty. Discipline Counsel submitted that this level of cooperation indicated that the Student had some insight into her actions, and some prospect of rehabilitation. Discipline counsel also brought to the Tribunal's attention a number of recent cases in which students had received similar penalties to those proposed in the Joint Submission for similar multiple acts of submitting false or forged information to the University, including *P.P* (Case 642; June 10, 2011), and *Q.W.* (Case 633; March 22, 2012).

20. The Tribunal is mindful that a high threshold must be met for the Tribunal to reject a joint submission on penalty. Only where the Tribunal is of the view that accepting the joint submission would bring the administration of justice into disrepute should the Tribunal reject it. With this threshold in mind, the Tribunal considered the factors set out in the decision of



*University of Toronto v. C.* (File 1976/77-3; November 5, 1976) and previous case law of this Tribunal in assessing the appropriateness of the proposed penalty.

21. The nature of the offence in this case and the extenuating circumstances surrounding the offence – the submission of forged and false information in order to obtain an academic advantage – are very serious. In our view, where the forged information is medical documentation, the misconduct is even more serious, as it implicates the integrity of third party health professionals and undermines the ability of the University to rely on the bona fides of medical certificates and documentation in a petition process that depends on self-reporting by students. We agree with the observation of the *K.C.Y.* (Case 646; February 20, 2013) panel that the medical verification and accommodation process is integral to the University's obligations under the *Human Rights Code* and to its petition process, and that presenting forged medical certificates and physician letters attacks the integrity of that process. This conduct must be met with a very serious sanction in order to meet the goal of general deterrence.
22. Regarding the likelihood of a repetition of the offence and the Student's character, the Student submitted 5 different sets of false information on 5 occasions from September 2009 to November 2012. The multiplicity of occasions of similar misconduct, over a prolonged period of time, suggests that there is a likelihood that she will repeat the misconduct. On the other hand, she had no prior discipline history, and no history of persisting in misconduct after receiving a warning. The Student has also fully cooperated with the University in these proceedings. As she has chosen, as is her right, not to appear at the hearing, we have limited information, outside of the admissions she has made and the extent of her cooperation, of any mitigating factors to explain her conduct or in regard to

her character.

23. We agree that the proposed penalty in the Joint Submission is consistent with previous decisions of the Tribunal dealing with similar cases of multiple forged documents submitted to obtain an academic advantage. We note that in the *P.P.* (Case 642; June 10, 2011) decision, the student submitted falsified documents in support of petitions for deferrals for four courses on four distinct occasions over a two year period. The student cooperated with the University, and did not attend the hearing. There was an agreed statement of fact, and the Tribunal accepted a joint submission of penalty, consisting of a final grade of zero in the affected courses, a five year suspension, and a five year notation of the sanction. In the *Q.W.*, (Case 633; March 22, 2012) decision, the student submitted falsified information in 6 petitions over four years. The student cooperated with the University and expressed remorse and promised to conduct herself ethically in the future. The Tribunal accepted the penalty recommended in the joint submission, consisting of a grade of zero in the affected courses, a five year suspension, and recording of the sanction for seven years. In the *K.C.Y.* (Case 646; February 20, 2013) decision, the student was found guilty of submitting false and forged information, including petitions and medical certificates, with respect to 6 courses over a one year period. Unlike in the present case, the student did not fully cooperate with the University process, and was found to have continued to attempt to mislead the Tribunal. The Tribunal also found that an aggravating factor was that the student had purchased the false medical certificates from a commercial enterprise. The Tribunal recommended expulsion, together with a final grade of zero in all affected courses.
24. The Tribunal in this case has considered the relevant factors and the case law and has concluded that it accepts the recommendation for the

sanctions set out in the Joint Submission on Penalty. In our view, the sanctions set out in the Joint Submission on Penalty are reasonable in the circumstances of this case, and accepting the recommended penalty does not bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

25. The Tribunal does wish to signal, however, that absent the Joint Submission, it would have given serious consideration to increasing the period of time that the sanction is to be recorded on the Student's academic record and transcript. The Joint Submission proposes the period to be from the date of the Order to the earlier of the date the Student graduates or seven years. The Student has only earned 4.5 credits. If she continues her studies at the University after her suspension has concluded, it will likely take her at least another 3 years (8 years from the date of the Order) to conclude the requirements for an undergraduate degree. However, the recording of the sanction period could end seven years from the date of the Order. The Tribunal would have considered extending the period so that the sanction would continue to be recorded on the Student's academic record and transcript, at a minimum, for the entire period of time that she would likely be enrolled at the University should she resume her studies after the expiry of the suspension. However, notwithstanding these comments, we confirm that we accept the Joint Submission on Penalty, including the seven year period of recording of the sanction, as the recommended sanctions are reasonable and do not bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

26. The Tribunal issued the following Order on March 20, 2013:

- 1) **THAT** the hearing may proceed in Ms. P■■■■'s absence;
- 2) **THAT** Ms. P■■■■ is guilty of 5 counts of forgery, contrary to section B.I.1(a) of the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*;

- 3) **THAT** Ms. P■■ shall receive a final grade of zero in each of the following courses:
- (a) SPA 100Y;
  - (b) EAS 102Y; and
  - (c) SOC 102H.
- 4) **THAT** Ms. P■■ be suspended from the University from the date of this order until March 19, 2018;
- 5) **THAT** the sanction shall be recorded on Ms. P■■'s academic record and transcript from the date of this order until the earlier of the date Ms. P■■ graduates or seven years; and
- 6) **THAT** this case shall be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanction or sanction imposed, with the name of the student withheld.

Dated at Toronto, this 15<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sarah T. Kraicer, Co-Chair

## APPENDIX A

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**IN THE MATTER OF** charges of academic dishonesty made on February 6, 2013,

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the University of Toronto *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*, 1995,

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the *University of Toronto Act*, 1971, S.O. 1971, c. 56 as amended  
S.O. 1978, c. 88

**BETWEEN:**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

- and -

S [REDACTED] P [REDACTED]

**AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS**

1. This hearing arises out of charges of academic misconduct filed by the Provost of the University of Toronto (the "Provost") under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* ("Code"). For the purposes of this hearing, the Provost and S [REDACTED] P [REDACTED] ("Ms. P [REDACTED]") have prepared this Agreed Statement of Facts ("ASF") and a joint book of documents ("JBD"). The Provost and Ms. P [REDACTED] agree that:

- (a) each document contained in the JBD may be admitted into evidence at the Tribunal for all purposes, including to prove the truth of the document's contents, without further need to prove the document; and
- (b) if a document indicates that it was sent or received by someone, that is *prima facie* proof that the document was sent and received as indicated.

**A. Notice of hearing**

2. Ms. P█ admits that she received reasonable notice of the hearing. The notice of hearing is included in the JBD at Tab 1.

**B. Charges and guilty plea**

3. Ms. P█ admits that she received a copy of the charges filed by the Provost on February 6, 2013, which are found at JBD Tab 2. Ms. P█ waives the reading of the charges filed against her, and pleads guilty to all 6 charges filed by the Provost.

4. If the Tribunal convicts Ms. P█ on any one of the charges, the Provost will withdraw charge 6.

5. A copy of Ms. P█'s academic record, dated March 6, 2013, is found in the JBD at Tab 3. At all material times, Ms. P█ was a student member of the University of Toronto, within the meaning of the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*. Ms. P█ acknowledges that the University Tribunal has jurisdiction over her and that the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* applies to her conduct.

**C. Petition filed in September 2009**

6. On September 3, 2009, Ms. P█ filed a petition to the Committee on Standing at the University of Toronto Faculty of Arts and Science ("Committee"). A copy of the petition file is included in the JBD at Tab 4.

7. By filing her petition, Ms. P█ affirmed that she had provided accurate and complete information with the petition.

8. Ms. P█ filed the petition to request late withdrawal without academic penalty from the course SPA100Y1Y. In her personal statement in support of the petition, Ms. P█ wrote:

Due to unforeseen circumstances that I faced during the months of July and August 2009, commencing from the 2nd half of the term, I was unable to keep up with my course load. My bestfriend's mother, who had been a neighbor and like a

2nd mother to me passed away during this time. It was very sudden and unexpected. For I have not had someone so close to me pass away in my life before, I didn't know how to manage with this change. I tried to keep living my life as I had before, but I was unable to run away from this loss as it followed me wherever I went. I wanted to keep at it and fight to try my best in my regular endeavors, but failed at managing my emotions and mental distress. After much battling, I sought professional help from my counseling pastor from Hope Multicultural Church and counselor from Humber River Regional Hospital. With this letter, I have attached supporting documentation in regards to this tough time of adjustment.

9. The University accepted the supporting documents provided by Ms. P■■ without confirming their authenticity, but did not grant Ms. P■■'s petition.

10. Ms. P■■ admits that she filed her petition knowing that it contained false information, including, but not limited to the assertions relating to the impact that her best friend's mother's death had on her.

11. Ms. P■■ admits that she knowingly forged and falsified letters allegedly from Anna Kim (who does not exist) and Maryann Qizelbash that purported to document the counselling that she received and circulated those documents to support her request for an academic advantage.

**D. Petition filed in August 2011**

12. On August 30, 2011, Ms. P■■ submitted a petition to the Committee seeking permission to write a deferred final examination in EAS 102Y1Y. A copy of the petition file is included in the JBD at Tab 5. By filing her petition, Ms. P■■ affirmed that she had provided accurate and complete information with her petition.

13. Ms. P■■ stated in the personal statement accompanying her petition that:

I was unable to write EAS102Y1Y exam on August 17th, 2011 because I was very ill. I have enjoyed this class and Professor John Stowe's profound teachings, but unfortunately, fell very ill upon the coming of the final exam. I feel very regretful for this and hope that I can be given a chance at carrying this course to completion.



14. In support of this petition, Ms. P ■ submitted a University of Toronto Student Medical Certificate and a letter, both of which were purportedly signed by Dr. Patricia Mason on August 17, 2011.

15. The University accepted the documents provided by Ms. P ■ without confirming their authenticity. On September 15, 2011, the Committee granted Ms. P ■'s request and permitted her to write a special deferred examination during the December examination period.

16. Ms. P ■ admits that she filed her petition knowing that it contained false information, and that she knowingly forged and falsified both the medical certificate and the letter, and circulated those documents to obtain an academic advantage. She admits that Dr. Mason did not prepare or sign these documents.

***E. Petition filed in January 2012***

17. On January 5, 2012, Ms. P ■ filed a petition to the Committee seeking a further deferral examination in EAS 102Y1Y, which she was to have written in the December examination period. A copy of the petition file is included in the JBD at Tab 6. By filing her petition, Ms. P ■ affirmed that she had provided accurate and complete information on the form and with her petition.

18. In her personal statement in support of the petition Ms. P ■ wrote:

Dear Petitions Committee,

First and foremost, I'm very sorry for the immense inconvenience I have brought to you and U of T for missing my past exam. I thought I was merely experiencing the onset of flu-like symptoms only to find out that I was diagnosed with strep throat upon the day of the exam. I had tried to fight this "flu" with basic over-the-counter medication only leading to having a high fever on the day of the exam leading to me being taken to the ER. With this past exam, having being one granted from a deferral in the past summer, I truly wanted to make every effort not to miss this chance. I wish I had been able to fight off this infection and I regretfully beg you for one more chance at writing the EAS102 final exam.

19. In support of this petition, Ms. P ■ submitted a University of Toronto Student Medical Certificate and a letter, both of which were dated January 5, 2012, and which were purportedly prepared and signed by Dr. Jai Jayaraman.

20. The University accepted the documents provided by Ms. P ■ without confirming their authenticity. On January 19, 2012, the Committee granted Ms. P ■'s petition and permitted her to write a special redeferral examination during reading week in February 2012.

21. Ms. P ■ admits that she filed her petition knowing that it contained false information, and that she knowingly forged and falsified the supporting documents and circulated those documents to obtain an academic advantage. Ms. P ■ admits that Dr. Jayaraman did not prepare or sign these documents.

**F. February 2012 Petition**

22. On February 27, 2012, Ms. P ■ filed a petition to the Committee to request a further deferral of the exam in EAS 102Y1Y. A copy of the petition file is included in the JBD at Tab 7.

23. In filing the petition, Ms. P ■ affirmed that she had provided accurate and complete information on the form and with her petition.

24. In her personal statement in support of the petition Ms. P ■ wrote:

Dear Petitions Committee at the University of Toronto,

I write to you in hopes of being granted another chance at writing the final exam for EAS102Y1Y.

One of the most unimaginable catastrophes has occurred in a student's career by me missing the graciously granted redeferred exam! From the bottom of my heart, I'm very sorry for the immense inconvenience I've brought to the Petition's Committee and to the University of Toronto. I'm sorry for disturbing its respectable and honorable name.

As I had been preparing for this final exam and was greatly thankful for being given this opportunity, I was certain that nothing could stand in the way of me giving it my very best on this final. To my shock, as my father was getting ready to kindly drive me to my exam, he underwent cardiac arrest. Because my day

had become unbelievably inundated with this ordeal, it was impossible for me to write my exam. Thankfully, my father survived this daunting episode and is well on his way to recovery. Attached is a medical letter written by my father's physician-in-charge. I hope this documentation will suffice, if not, please contact me at s[REDACTED].p[REDACTED]@utoronto.ca or (416) 473-2947 and let me know what else you may require.

Words cannot express the contrition I feel for this third request to write the EAS102Y1Y final examination. I beg you for one last chance at writing this exam – one last chance at doing U of T proud and one last chance at contributing to the dignity this incredible institution deserves. I give you whatever is left on the weight of my word, that I will not disappoint U of T if I am granted one final attempt at writing the EAS102Y1Y final examination.

25. In support of this petition, Ms. P[REDACTED] submitted a letter which was purportedly prepared and signed by Dr. Jai Jayaraman on February 24, 2012.

26. The University accepted the document provided by Ms. P[REDACTED] without confirming its authenticity. On March 1, 2012, the Committee granted Ms. P[REDACTED]'s petition and granted her a special redeferral examination during the April 2012 examination period.

27. Ms. P[REDACTED] admits that she filed the petition knowing that it contained false information, including but not limited to the assertion that her father suffered a heart attack, that she knowingly forged and falsified the letter that purported to document her father's illness, and that she circulated that document to obtain an academic advantage. Ms. P[REDACTED] admits that Dr. Jayaraman did not prepare or sign this document.

#### **G. November 2012 Petition**

28. On November 27, 2012, Ms. P[REDACTED] filed a petition to the Committee seeking late withdrawal without penalty from SOC 102H1F. A copy of the petition file is included in the JBD at Tab 8. In filing her petition, Ms. P[REDACTED] affirmed that the supporting documentation she had provided to the University was complete and accurate.

29. In support of the petition, Ms. P[REDACTED] submitted a University of Toronto Student Medical Certificate and a letter, both of which were dated November 27, 2012, and which were purportedly prepared and/or signed by Dr. Jeffrey Ashley.

30. Ms. P ■ admits that she knowingly forged and falsified the documents that she submitted and circulated those documents to obtain the academic advantage she sought. Ms. P ■ admits that Dr. Ashley did not prepare or sign these documents.

#### **H. General Admissions**

31. Ms. P ■ admits that, at all material times, she was employed by Humber River Regional Hospital and that she used her position there to permit her to forge the documents she submitted to the University.

32. With respect to all of the false information, forged or falsified documents that Ms. P ■ provided to the University, Ms. P ■ admits that she knowingly sent this false information:

- (a) in order to obtain an academic advantage;
- (b) to mislead the Committee and others at the University; and
- (c) expecting that the Committee would rely on this information to its detriment and would provide her with an academic advantage.

33. On January 30, 2013, Ms. P ■ met with Professor John Britton, Dean's Designate for Academic Integrity, to discuss the allegations that she had violated the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*. During this meeting, Ms. P ■ admitted that she had committed the academic offences described above.

34. Ms. P ■ acknowledges that she is signing this ASF freely and voluntarily, knowing of the potential consequences she faces. Ms. P ■ acknowledges that the Provost has provided her with no assurances regarding what sanction he may request the Tribunal to impose in this case.

Signed on March 5, 2013.

■  
S ■ P ■

Signed on March 5, 2013.



Robert A. Centa  
Assistant Discipline Counsel  
University of Toronto

NO. 1

THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

MS. [REDACTED]

This Exhibit is produced by  
the UNIVERSITY  
this 20 day of MARCH, 2013.

*[Handwritten signature]*

## **APPENDIX B**

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**IN THE MATTER OF** charges of academic dishonesty made on February 6, 2013,

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the University of Toronto *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*, 1995,

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the *University of Toronto Act*, 1971, S.O. 1971, c. 56 as amended S.O. 1978, c. 88

**B E T W E E N:**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

- and -

S [REDACTED] P [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**JOINT SUBMISSION ON PENALTY**

1. The University of Toronto and S [REDACTED] P [REDACTED] submit to the Tribunal that the appropriate penalty in all the circumstances of this case is that:
  - a. a final grade of zero be assigned for each of SPA 100Y, EAS 102, and SOC 102H;
  - b. Ms. P [REDACTED] be immediately suspended from the University for a period of five years from the date of the hearing; and
  - c. that a corresponding notation be placed on her academic record and transcript until the earlier of her graduation from the University or seven years.


2. The University of Toronto and Ms. P [REDACTED] submit that the Tribunal should report this case to the Provost who may publish a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanctions imposed, with the student's name withheld.

3. Ms. P [REDACTED] acknowledges that the University of Toronto has advised her to obtain independent legal advice before signing this Joint Submission on Penalty and that she has done so or that she has deliberately waived her right to do so.

Signed in Toronto on March 5, 2013.

[REDACTED]  
S [REDACTED] P [REDACTED]

Signed in Toronto on March 5, 2013.

  
Robert A. Centa  
Assistant Discipline Counsel  
University of Toronto

859483\_1.DOC

NO. 3

THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

ms. [REDACTED]  
This Exhibit is produced by  
the UNIVERSITY  
this 20 day of MARCH, 2013.

