

**UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty made on June 10, 2015

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:

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO (the "University")

- AND -

C [REDACTED] D [REDACTED] (the "Student")

REASONS FOR DECISION

Hearing Date: February 29, 2016

Panel Members:

Ms. Roslyn M. Tsao, Lawyer, Chair

Professor Richard B. Day, UTM Political Science, Faculty Panel Member

Mr. Jeffery Couse, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

Ms. Tina Lie, Assistant Discipline Counsel for University, Paliare Roland Barristers

Dr. Kristi Gourlay, Manager, Office of Student Academic Integrity

Mr. Ralph Tassone, Instructor for RSM323: Auditing I, University of Toronto, Rotman Commerce

Ms. Lesley Mak, Associate Director – Academic Program Services at Rotman Commerce

In Attendance:

Ms. Krista Osbourne, Administrative Assistant, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances

Not in Attendance:

Mr. C [REDACTED] D [REDACTED], Student

1. The Trial Division of the Tribunal heard this matter on February 29, 2016. The Student was charged on June 10, 2015 with various offences related to a number of discreet acts of alleged misconduct, in 4 courses, during a period from February 28, 2014 to April 14, 2015. The nature of the Charges are summarized as follows:
 - (a) forging of a Verification of Student Illness or Injury Form ("Medical Note") dated February 25, 2014 and submitting same on or about February 28, 2014 to obtain academic accommodation in RSM222 contrary to section B.I.1(a) of the Code;
 - (b) forging of a Medical Note dated October 14, 2014 and submitting same on or about October 15, 2014 to obtain academic accommodation in RSM324 and RSM221 contrary to section B.I.1(a) of the Code;
 - (c) forging of a Medical Note dated February 24, 2015 and submitting same on or about February 25, 2015 to obtain academic accommodation in RSM323 contrary to section B.I.1(a) of the Code;
 - (d) engaging in academic dishonesty, fraud or misrepresentation to obtain academic advantage by representing that he had written and received a grade for two (2) quizzes in RSM323, when he had not, contrary to Section B.I.3(b) of the Code; and
 - (e) engaging in academic dishonesty, fraud or misrepresentation to obtain academic advantage by representing that he had submitted two (2) answer booklets in the final examination in RSM323, when he had not, contrary to Section B.I.3(b) of the Code.

Hearing to Proceed in Absence of Student

2. The Student did not attend at the Hearing. The Tribunal waited until after the scheduled commencement of the Hearing to allow for the Student to appear.
3. The University presented evidence to the Tribunal confirming the Student's ROSI Record, which set out his email address and mailing address for service purposes.

4. On or about June 10, 2015, the University served the Student with the formal Charges dated June 10, 2015 by e-mail.
5. Counsel for the University also emailed the Student on June 26, 2015 advising of her role as prosecutor and inviting a response from the Student or his counsel.
6. Neither of the above-noted emails indicated any non-delivery or "bounce back". The Student did not respond to either email.
7. On or about January 5, 2016, counsel for the University served its requisite disclosure and summaries of Anticipated Evidence of witnesses by both email and by courier to the Student's ROSI mailing address. Again, there was no "bounce back" of the email and the courier package was delivered to the Student's address and was not returned.
8. On or about January 18, 2016, the University served the Student by email with the Notice of Hearing dated January 18, 2016 confirming the February 29, 2016 hearing date.
9. On or about February 9, 2016, counsel for the University served the Student by email with a copy of an Affidavit intended to be relied upon at the hearing and an updated Anticipated Witness list and evidence.
10. As service of the Charges and Notice of Hearing was effected in accordance with Paragraph 9(c) of the *Rules of Practice and Procedure*, the Panel proceeded with the Hearing in the absence of the Student.

Facts

11. As sometimes occurs in cases, the investigation into an alleged incident of misconduct results in the discovery of other misconduct which is more historical in nature.

Evidence of Ralph Tassone, Instructor of RSM323

12. Mr. Tassone is a sessional lecturer at Rotman's Commerce. He is a CPA and has been teaching at Rotman's for 4 years. Mr. Tassone's full-time occupation is teaching and over the past 4 years, he has taught 35 courses. In the current term, he is teaching 7 courses.

13. Mr. Tassone was the instructor for RSM323, Auditing I, in the Winter 2015 term in question. He had first taught this course in the Fall 2014 term. RSM323 was taught by Mr. Tassone and another instructor in concurrent sections in the term but Mr. Tassone marked all assignments/examinations for all of the students in this course. The Student was enrolled in RSM323 in Winter 2015 in Mr. Tassone's section.
14. Mr. Tassone did not use any Teaching Assistants in the course. RSM323 was a 2 hour weekly course with evaluations comprising several quizzes (which could be used by a student to reduce the weighting of the midterm or final examination), a midterm test and a final examination.
15. The course outline for RSM323 confirmed the course requirement, and clear descriptions of behaviour constituting academic dishonesty, including: "Falsifying or altering any documentation required by the University, including (but not limited to), medical notes."
16. Mr. Tassone's first communication from the Student was an email on March 25, 2015 which read:

Dear Prof,

My marks for quizzes haven't been published on portal for weeks.

At first, I though [sic] there maybe [sic] some problems for the system or the strike of TAs, but I checked with my friends recently, and they said their marks were out online.

I wonder what's happened. Could you please let TA check. Thank you.

I can give you the quiz paper if you need that,

The mark I got here for Quiz 1 is 5/9 Quiz 2 is 14/15 and Quiz 3 as 8.5/10.

Thank you.

Bests, [sic]

17. Mr. Tassone was initially struck with the reference to TAs since any student who had attended class would have been aware that there were no TAs in the course.
18. Mr. Tassone then checked on Blackboard (the online student portal). The Student had written only Quiz 1 and received 5/9 (as cited by the Student) but there were no scores

for Quizzes 2 or 3. Prudently, Mr. Tassone also scanned the scores for the other students in the course for Quizzes 2 and 3 to see whether the cited scores might have been given to another student/s. There were no like results in quizzes 2 and 3 for other students.

19. As such, Mr. Tassone replied by email to the Student within 30 minutes and advised that the Student was to come to see him "with all papers". In the email, Mr. Tassone also noted that there was no midterm mark for the Student and asked whether he had written it.
20. The Student replied by email that he had been sick for the midterm and filed documentation to waive writing the midterm such that the final examination would be weighted more. The Student also advised that he was in Rochester and asked if he could scan the "quiz paper" (singular) to Mr. Tassone.
21. Mr. Tassone replied by email that he would have to see the actual quizzes and not scans. Mr. Tassone asked the Student to come see him with the quizzes as he wanted to investigate any purported breakdown in his marking controls.
22. The Student replied that he understood and would contact Mr. Tassone "asap". The emails were exchanged within 45 minutes from start to end.
23. Mr. Tassone was a very frank and credible witness. It was fitting, given that the course in question was on auditing, that Mr. Tassone had very strict marking controls and procedure in place for his quizzes, midterm and examination.
24. For quizzes, for example, Mr. Tassone or his fellow instructor invigilate the quizzes, handing out the tests and collecting them personally. Mr. Tassone marks all quizzes himself. He marks by class, alphabetically, and is scrupulous about recording the correct mark for the correct student. He crosschecks the number of students who did or did not write the quiz to ensure that it corresponds to the number of quizzes he has marked. The quizzes are handed back the following week during the lecture. Hence, Mr. Tassone was concerned from the Student's email about the possibility of a breakdown in his controls.

25. The Student did not contact Mr. Tassone "asap" after March 25th and on April 9th, 2015, Mr. Tassone emailed the Student to follow up and ask again that the quizzes be dropped off to him. There was no response from the Student.
26. The final examination for RSM323 was on April 14, 2015. Mr. Tassone personally attended at the examination to invigilate and retained another individual to assist. There was one other invigilator from Arts and Science. The examination was a "restricted exam", an examination which could be used again. As such, Mr. Tassone had very strict policies of how to deal with the examination question booklet, including the booklet being printed on yellow paper, having all students seated before distribution of the exam booklet and collection of all booklets (question and answer) at the end of the examination.
27. When Mr. Tassone had arrived, the students had signed a sign-in sheet and were seated. Mr. Tassone specifically asked the other invigilator to identify the Student as he intended to speak to the Student about the quizzes after the examination.
28. At the end of the examination, the students were told to place all their answer booklets (used or not) and examination booklet inside each other into 1 package. There were 81 examinations written corresponding to the sign-in sheet and there were 81 packages collected. Each of the invigilators collected 2 or 3 rows of students' packages. Mr. Tassone specifically collected the Student's package and asked the Student to please see him regarding the quizzes afterward to which the Student had responded affirmatively.
29. However, the Student did not stay afterward but rather left. Mr. Tassone took all the examination packages himself and went immediately back to his office. As the Student did not stay to speak with him, Mr. Tassone had an understandable unease and "sensed" that he should immediately go through the answer packages to review the Student's package.
30. Mr. Tassone found only one (1) answer booklet for the Student marked "Book No. 2" of "Total Number of Books used 2" plus a small fragment of paper, which appeared to be

from a lined page of an answer booklet, inserted inside the one booklet that the Student handed in.

31. Mr. Tassone immediately looked through all the other answer packages to see whether there was a booklet with a fragment torn out. There was none.
32. Given a reasonable suspicion of some academic misconduct, Mr. Tassone went to speak to someone in the department (this would have been within 30 minutes of the end of the examination) about the Student's missing quizzes and examination submission.
33. Just after midnight on April 15, 2015, Mr. Tassone sent an email with a comprehensive summary of the foregoing regarding the Student to Dr. Kristi Gourlay and Lesley Mak. The subject line was "Academic Integrity RSM323 Auditing I". The contents of this email conform with Mr. Tassone's evidence at the hearing.
34. Mr. Tassone also emailed the Student on April 16, 2015 requesting a mandatory meeting the following week to review quizzes 2 and 3 and to discuss his final examination submission. Mr. Tassone warned that if the Student did not attend for a meeting, he would forward the matter to the Office of Academic Integrity.
35. The Student emailed back immediately as follows:

Hello Prof,

Sorry for forgot replying your message. I did get the email, but things got quite messy these days, so I forgot.

With the quizzes, I did not contact you after the first time I talked to you about the quizzes issues, because after I got home from Rochester, I could not find my quiz paper after my girlfriend cleaned the room.

At first I was quite nervous about the mark, but after thinking about it. Due to the TA strike issues, U of T announces that CR/NCR options. Based on the marks and expectations for this course, I can not get higher GPA for this course than my current GPA, so I will CR/NCR it.

So, I thought if I can do well on Final, then there won't be any issues for not passing. Which means I will CR/NCR this course, so as long as I am above 50, I am good.

That's why I didn't keep contacting you about quiz issue and forgot to write you back about this.

I wonder what do you mean by the submission of my final exam?

I can definitely meet with you. Since my last final is on next Friday, I prefer to talk to you on next Tuesday as well. I can meet you at anytime you want, hopefully around noon.

Please give me a time and your office room#. See you on next Tuesday.

Thank you.

Bests,

36. Mr. Tassone responded with a meeting date of April 21st at 1 pm at his office which the Student confirmed. The meeting occurred and the events of such meeting are privileged.
37. Thereafter, the matter was directed to a meeting with the Dean's Designate.
38. Mr. Tassone was unequivocal that he has never failed to record a mark or lost any part of a student's examination. Mr. Tassone also confirmed that there were no other anomalies in the grades raised by any of the other students for RSM323 that term.

The Student's Examination Booklet and Paper Fragment

39. Some time is warranted to describe the Student's one answer booklet and the fragment of an answer booklet that was submitted with the Student's examination package. Firstly, it is noted that the full answer book had answers to certain questions as follows, in the following order:
 - "Question 10 Continued": [with two short paragraphs, the second paragraph reading "So, in conclusion, ...However, due to the three factors I mentioned above. I should NOT take the request]
 - "Question 6 (Extra addition)": [responding to both Part A and Part B of the question. For Part B, the paragraph begins "On the last booklet I have already mentioned the A.P needs to be more focused on the completeness assertion because the auditors need to make sure the actual transaction is done"]
 - "Question 5 (ADDITIONAL)": [setting out a "P.S." reading "Please combine the additional answers here with the answers on the other booklet. Sorry for the inconvenience. Thank you"]
40. There were no answers provided to Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 9 of the 10 examination questions in the answer "Booklet 2".

41. The fragment of paper was about 2" x 2.5" and had writing which would appear to be part of answers filling the lines from the larger page. The fragment was inside the other answer booklet. It was not found loose among the other packages by Mr. Tassone.

Evidence of Ms. Lesley Mak, Associate Director Academic Program Services at Rotman Commerce

42. Ms. Mak's role at Rotman's is to oversee its students and assist them with academic situations.
43. In particular, where a student requires accommodation for a medical matter, there is a Request for Accommodation form to be submitted with the Verification of Student Illness or Injury Form ("Medical Note") completed by a licensed medical practitioner.
44. Ms. Mak explained that there are approximately 120 such requests per semester. The Requests are reviewed by the Program Advisor, Kevin Mak, to match up the deadline for the deliverable (test, assignment, etc) and the date of the medical appointment, as well as checking whether a medical professional has apparently executed the Medical Note. If these basic requirements are satisfied, the request is usually granted.
45. When Mr. Tassone notified Ms. Mak and her office about his academic integrity concerns relating to the Student, Ms. Mak looked into the Student's petition history (i.e., Requests for Accommodation). This is standard when there is a questionable situation relating to a student's academic integrity.
46. Ms. Mak found that over the past 2-3 years, there were several petitions submitted with Medical Notes which were signed by the same physician. In particular, the Student submitted Medical Notes, signed by Dr. Erica Fischer of the University of Toronto Health Service, for Requests for Accommodation on the following dates:
- February 25, 2014 for midterm in RSM222
 - October 14, 2014 for midterms in RSM324 and RSM221
 - February 24, 2015 for midterm in RSM323

47. Mr. Mak contacted the University of Toronto Health Service seeking confirmation of the Student's appointments on the above dates. Health Services advised that the Student had not attended on any of these dates.

Affidavit of Dr. Erica Fischer Sworn February 9, 2016

48. The University tendered the Affidavit of Dr. Fischer, the physician who purportedly signed the three Medical Notes.
49. Dr. Fischer's Affidavit stated:
- (a) She saw the Student on November 27, 2013 and provided him with a Medical Note for that visit;
 - (b) The Medical Notes dated February 25, 2014, October 14, 2014 and February 24, 2015 do not correspond to any actual visits by the Student with her;
 - (c) The handwriting under Parts 1 and 2 of the Medical Notes is not hers;
 - (d) The handwriting under Part 3 (name and CPSO number), as well as the signature, appear to be identical and are hers;
 - (e) The stamp on the right under Part 3 appears to be hers;
 - (f) The handwriting on the right under Part 3 (date) is not hers; and
 - (g) She did not complete these three Medical Notes.

Evidence of Dr. Kristi Gourlay, Manager, Office of Student Academic Integrity

50. Dr. Kristi Gourlay attended in her role at the Dean's Designate meeting on May 5, 2015 with Professor Britton (one of the Dean's Designates), Mr. Tassone and the Student. The Dean's warning was read to the Student and the potential sanctions available to the Dean's Designate were discussed.

51. The Student immediately admitted to submitting the forged Medical Notes. The Student stated that he had attended at another hospital but his condition was not serious enough so he made up the Medical Notes.
52. With respect to the quizzes and the final examination in RSM323, the Student maintained that he had written quizzes 2 and 3 and had submitted two booklets for the final examination.
53. The Student believed that Mr. Tassone had lost the 2 quizzes and the second examination booklet.
54. The Student was asked where the missing quiz papers were since the Student had offered to provide them (by email scan) to Mr. Tassone while he was in Rochester. The Student again advised that his girlfriend had thrown them away. When questioned about why his girlfriend would have done this, the Student alluded to the "Chinese way" that as soon as you get a quiz back, you throw it out.
55. The Student was also questioned about his attendance at class since he would know that there was no TA in the course if he had attended. He acknowledged that he did not really go to class. Mr. Tassone asked the Student some questions about the course material which the Student could not answer and demonstrated that he had not attended classes.
56. With respect to the second examination booklet having only partial answers to some questions, the Student maintained that the other booklet had 7 pages of bulleted notes and then he started to write full answers but ran out of room in the first booklet.

Decision of the Tribunal

57. The onus is on the University to demonstrate that there is clear and compelling evidence that the Student forged the Medical Notes and that the Student attempted to mislead Mr. Tassone about (1) two quizzes that he purportedly wrote and received back with a grade and (2) having submitted a second answer booklet in the final examination, all relating to RSM323.

58. As counsel correctly advised, the Panel does not need to know exactly what happened to the alleged quizzes that the Student maintains that he had nor does the Panel need to exactly know how the fragment from a second answer booklet found its way into the Student's first answer booklet with the rest of the booklet nowhere to be found to reach a finding of guilt.
59. The Panel needs only to find that offences occurred on a balance of probabilities.

Forgery of Medical Notes

60. In addition to the Student's admission of guilt related to the forging of the three (3) Medical Notes, the Affidavit of Dr. Fischer, the evidence of Ms. Mak and the plain and obvious observations from the Medical Notes themselves, support a finding of guilt of the charges set out in Paragraph 1(a), (b) and (c) above.
61. As to the charges set out in Paragraph 1(d) and (e) above, we note that counsel for the University also, appropriately, confirmed that it was not relying on the admissions of guilt to forgery as any similar fact evidence or evidence of character of the Student in prosecuting these two other offences.
62. The Panel has weighed the evidence relating to the two quizzes and the second examination booklet independently of the evidence relating to the forgery offences.

Two Missing Quizzes

63. With respect to the two alleged missing quiz grades, we find that the Student's March 25, 2015 email exchange with Mr. Tassone is suspicious in nature. The email refers to a TA (there was none) and claims that three quiz scores were missing and that he had the "quiz paper" (singular) if Mr. Tassone required it. The Student's first quiz score was 5/9 and was written by the Student as Mr. Tassone acknowledged. In the second exchange, the Student offers to scan the "quiz paper" (singular) to Mr. Tassone as he was in Rochester. When Mr. Tassone indicates that he must view the original quizzes and asks the Student to arrange a meeting the following week, the Student indicates that he understands and will contact him asap. However, the Student does not contact Mr. Tassone upon his return, ignores Mr. Tassone's follow up email of April 9th, ignores Mr. Tassone's request

to stay behind after the examination to speak and only advises days after the examination that he forgot to answer Mr. Tassone's earlier email.

64. In the Student's April 16th email to Mr. Tassone, he states that "after he got home from Rochester", he could not find his "quiz paper" (singular) after his girlfriend cleaned his room. This explanation is problematic as it implies that the Student either had the quizzes in Rochester when he sent the March 25th email but his girlfriend threw them out after his return to Toronto or he emailed Mr. Tassone without the quiz papers, which were presumably in Toronto, but had the marks noted and was not actually offering to email scans to Mr. Tassone until his return to Toronto. Neither of these explanations is particularly elegant.
65. The failure to respond to Mr. Tassone, to meet with Mr. Tassone with his quizzes or to ensure that his quiz paper was not discarded after his email exchange of March 25th (knowing that Mr. Tassone would require them to record the marks) causes the Panel to have significant doubt about the existence of the two quiz papers.
66. Even apart from the skepticism arising from the "dog ate my homework"-like excuse proffered by the Student, the Panel relies upon the clear and convincing evidence regarding Mr. Tassone's marking protocols and his steps taken (once alerted to a possible breakdown in his marking controls) to satisfy himself that he did not misplace two quizzes of this Student. Mr. Tassone is a seasoned instructor, an instructor in Auditing practices in the Chartered Accounting context no less. The likelihood that Mr. Tassone misplaced one, let alone two, quiz papers of one student on two different quiz dates is remote. In order to return a finding of "not guilty", the Panel would have to reject Mr. Tassone's uncontradicted evidence and we are not prepared to do that.
67. The Panel, therefore, finds it more likely than not that the Student attempted to mislead Mr. Tassone about two fictitious quiz results. This constitutes an offence pursuant to Section B.I.3(e) of the Code.

Missing Examination Booklet

68. Based on the review of the answer booklet described above, the Panel formed a strong impression that this answer booklet marked "2 of 2" by the Student was framed in a way to imply that there was a Booklet "1 of 2". The references to "additional", "continued", "in conclusion" as well as the convenient "P.S." reference to the "other booklet" appear to have been orchestrated to set the stage for the Student to again claim that Mr. Tassone misplaced an entire booklet.
69. The fragment from the supposed "other booklet" which was tucked tightly into the intact booklet seems too convenient to simply have been an unfortunate accident. Mr. Tassone personally oversaw the collection of the examination packages. All students were asked to submit all answer booklets. Mr. Tassone collected and took the 81 answer packages directly to his office. No other students' packages were lost, compromised or torn.
70. In order to reject Mr. Tassone's evidence regarding this offence, the Panel would have to find that the Student's first Answer booklet was somehow torn in transit, that the corner fragment tucked itself into the Student's other booklet after having been torn and that the rest of the first booklet disappeared. Again, we are not prepared to reject Mr. Tassone's evidence regarding his protocols and diligence in invigilating the examination.
71. We are also troubled as to why the Student did not remain at the examination as requested by Mr. Tassone during the examination to discuss the quizzes. This is, in our view, an indicia of consciousness of guilt as staying behind could well have compromised any missing booklet scenario.
72. The Panel, therefore, finds it more likely than not that the Student has attempted to mislead Mr. Tassone about a missing examination booklet that was purportedly submitted. This constitutes an offence pursuant to Section B.I.3(e) of the Code.
73. The University advised that it would withdraw three alternative charges to the three forgery counts if there were findings of guilt.

Penalty

74. The University sought the following penalty:
- (a) a zero in RSM222H1;
 - (b) a zero in RSM324H1
 - (c) a zero in RSM221H1;
 - (d) a zero in RSM323H1;
 - (e) an immediate suspension from the University of up to 5 years from the date of the order or until Governing Council makes its decision on expulsion, whichever comes first, and that a corresponding notation be placed on the Student's academic record and transcript; and
 - (f) a recommendation to the President of the University that he recommend to Governing Council that Mr. D ■■■ be expelled from the University.
75. The Student has no prior record of academic misconduct. The University tendered no other evidence on penalty.
76. The Panel has no difficulty imposing sanctions (a) through (e) above given the nature of the offences, the number of offences in question and range of sanctions imposed in other decisions of this Tribunal in similar circumstances.
77. In considering whether to recommend expulsion, the Panel makes the following observations about this case.
78. Although the Student ostensibly accepted guilt to the three (3) forgeries of medical notes at the Dean's Designate meeting, he also admitted that he forged the medical notes because he was told by another medical provider that he was not ill enough to warrant a medical note. The Student was fully aware that he was engaging in dishonest/fraudulent conduct at the time of committing the forgeries on the three separate occasions.

79. Furthermore, the Student has failed to engage or respond to Mr. Tassone, the University or counsel in the face of the charges. The Student did not attend the hearing to provide any defence, explanation or submissions of extenuating circumstances.
80. More importantly, the circumstances relating to the offences about the missing quizzes and the final examination in RSM323 are symptomatic of calculated behaviour and misconduct. As the Student chose not to attend the hearing to provide his own evidence about the missing quizzes and the missing examination booklet, nor subject himself to cross-examination, the Panel has drawn its conclusions based on Mr. Tassone's uncontradicted evidence and a review of the other documentary evidence.
81. Firstly, the email exchanges, avoiding of meetings, express indications of possessing the missing quizzes followed by a weak excuse as to their non-production as well as the Student's reasoning as to why he dropped his request to have the quiz scores entered (availing of the TA strike which permitted CR/NCR grading) are indications of a continuing charade with the hope that Mr. Tassone would either relent or forget about his initial ruse.
82. Secondly, as the Panel is not prepared to conclude that there was a second answer "Booklet 1 of 2" submitted, we have concluded that the Student took deliberate steps to give the impression that there was another booklet gone missing --- culminating with a torn fragment with writing ---- to presumably anchor a request for at least a 50% grade if Mr. Tassone was to acknowledge the possibility that he lost the other booklet. This type of calculated deception elevates this misconduct to the more serious end of the spectrum.
83. Lastly, in considering the C [REDACTED] (Case 1975/76-4) factors, the Panel is most concerned about the likelihood of repetition and the detriment to the University occasioned by the offences.
84. The Student has not participated in the hearing process and shows no indication of remorse that would provide any comfort that the Student would not repeat academic misconduct. The offences span multiple occasions and over a year in time. The Student was a 3rd year student and was well aware of the elements of academic dishonesty.

85. The forging of medical notes, in and of itself, is cause for grave concern to the integrity of the University, particularly where the Student seeks to graduate with a stated "Specialist" designation on his transcript of "Financial Reporting and Control". The accommodation process for all students in the University is compromised by forged medical notes which undermine legitimate requests. Recommendation for expulsion has been made in similar cases.
86. With the additional deception outlined above, involving the quiz scores and the examination booklet, the Panel is compelled to recommend expulsion.
87. An Order was signed by the Panel at the Hearing with all sanctions recommended by the University as set out in above paragraph 74.
88. The Tribunal is to report this decision to the Provost for publication of a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanctions imposed in the University's newspapers, with the name of the Student withheld.

Dated at Toronto, this

7th

day of April, 2016



Roslyn Tsao, Chair