

Provost's Annual Report on Cases of Academic Discipline

Appendix B: Summary of University Tribunal Cases 2010-2011

Table 1: Overview of Open Cases

Year July 1-June 30	Cases Carried Forward charges laid before July 1	New Cases charges laid	Total Open Cases	Cases Resolved	Cases Carried Forward
2006-07	25	24	49	19	28
2007-08	28	21	49	23	26
2008-09	26	38	64	25	39
2009-10	39	38	77	51*	26
2010-11	26	35	61	33*	28**

*These include cases that were returned to the decanal level/settled.

** The cases carried forward are not all active as some were closed after June 30, 2011.

Table 2: Number of Cases by Final Outcome

Outcome	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Acquittal	0	0	0	1	0
Degree Recall	0	4	1	0	0
Expulsion from University	6	4	3	13	10
Suspension	4	8	13	23	14
Returned to Decanal Level / Minutes of Settlement	9	7	8	14	9

Table 3: Number of Cases Appealed

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Total	2	1	0	0	1*

* Some cases were appealed during this period but they will be recorded in the year the decision is issued.

Table 4: Number of Offences by Type

Charge Code	Charge Text	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11*
B.i.1(a)	Forgery (documents, not transcripts)	5	8	17	22	29
B.i.1(b)	Unauthorized aid	6	24	7	18	13
B.i.1(c)	Personation	0	1	3	0	7
B.i.1(d)	Plagiarism	16	35	19	25	19
B.i.1(e)	Re-submission of work	0	4	0	0	0
B.i.1(f)	Concoction	3	8	5	5	6
B.i.3(a)	Forgery (academic records)	5	8	7	23	21
B.i.3(b)	Cheating for academic advantage	6	22	2	7	7

*These include offences that went back to the decanal level. For the Tribunal level we do not choose the primary offence, but rather, count all offences for which the Tribunal found an individual guilty.

Table 5: Number of Offenders by Division

Division	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11*
Applied Science & Engineering	0	1	1	0	2
Arts & Science	9	12	12	24	14
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate Studies	1	2	0	3	2
Law	0	1	0	1	0
Medicine	0	0	0	0	0
Music	0	0	0	0	0
Nursing	0	0	0	0	0
OISE / UT	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacy	0	0	0	0	0
Physical Education & Health	0	0	0	0	0
U of T Mississauga	6	3	7	18	11
U of T Scarborough	3	4	5	5	4

* These include offenders whose cases went back to decanal level for resolution/settled.

Table 6a: Timeliness between Charges Laid and Order Issued

Year July 1-June 30	Time between Charges Laid and Order Issued*		
	Within 6 months	Within 9 months	Total
2009-10	24%	24%	48% **
2010-11	77%	9%	86% ***

* This does not include offenders whose cases went back to decanal level for resolution/settled.

** This year was a hybrid of the old, pre-Order system and new process, and therefore difficult to obtain accurate percentages. For example, 50% of cases did not receive an order at all.

*** There were two cases that were removed from the total for purpose of timeliness because charges had been laid more than nine months before the new structure had begun. Therefore they would not accurately reflect the impact of adding Orders to the process.

Table 6b: Timeliness between Charges Laid and Decision Issued

Year July 1-June 30	Time between Charges Laid and Decision Issued*		
	Within 6 months	Within 9 months	Total
2008-09	19%	13%	32%
2009-10	26%	23%	49% **
2010-11	45%	32%	77% ***

* This does not include offenders whose cases went back to decanal level for resolution/settled.