

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty filed on July 31, 2017,

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:

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

A [REDACTED] A [REDACTED]

REASONS FOR DECISION

Hearing Date: May 25, 2018

Members of the Panel:

Ms. Johanna Braden, Barrister and Solicitor, Chair
Professor Michael Evans, Faculty Panel Member
Ms. Sherice Robertson, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

Ms. Lily Harmer, Assistant Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland, Barristers
Professor Luc De Nil, Vice-Dean, Students, School of Graduate Studies, University of Toronto
Mr. Philip Norton, Counsel to the Student, Norton Barristers
Mr. A [REDACTED] A [REDACTED], the Student

In Attendance:

Ms. Tracey Gameiro, Associate Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances
Mr. Brian Alexic, Technology Assistant, Office of the Governing Council

1. The Trial Division of the University Tribunal was convened on May 25, 2018, to consider charges brought by the University of Toronto (the “University”) against Mr. A [REDACTED] A [REDACTED] (the “Student”) under the *University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*, 1995 (the “Code”).

The Charges

2. The Charges alleged against the Student are as follows.

Charges

1. You knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified an academic record, and/or uttered, circulated or made use of such forged, altered or falsified record, namely, a document which purported to be your Preliminary Grade Report from the University of Toronto dated January 6, 2015, which you made available to and submitted to prospective employers, contrary to section B.I.3(a) of the *Code*.

2. You knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified an academic record, and/or uttered, circulated or made use of such forged, altered or falsified record, namely, a document which purported to be your Preliminary Grade Report from the University of Toronto dated September 7, 2015, which you made available to and submitted to prospective employers, contrary to section B.I.3(a) of the *Code*.

3. You knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified an academic record, and/or uttered, circulated or made use of such forged, altered or falsified record, namely, a document which purported to be your Preliminary Grade Report from the University of Toronto dated March 11, 2016, which you made available to and submitted to prospective employers, contrary to section B.I.3(a) of the *Code*.

4. You knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified an academic record, and/or uttered, circulated or made use of such forged, altered or falsified record, namely, a document which purported to be your Preliminary Grade Report from the University of Toronto dated May 12, 2016, which you made available to and submitted to prospective employers, contrary to section B.I.3(a) of the *Code*.

5. You knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified an academic record, and/or uttered, circulated or made use of such forged, altered or falsified record, namely, a document which purported to be your Academic History from the University of Toronto dated September 6, 2015, which you made available to and submitted to prospective employers, contrary to section B.I.3(a) of the *Code*.

6. You knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified an academic record, and/or uttered, circulated or made use of such forged, altered or falsified record, namely, a document which purported to be your Academic History from the University of Toronto dated March 23, 2016, which you made available to and submitted to prospective employers, contrary to section B.I.3(a) of the *Code*.

7. You knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified an academic record, and/or uttered, circulated or made use of such forged, altered or falsified record, namely, an email from Rotman School of Management sent to MBA students on June 10, 2016, identifying the Full-Time MBA- Class of 2016 Dean's List and Bregman Scholar, which you submitted to prospective employers, contrary to section B.I.3(a) of the *Code*.

8. In the alternative to paragraph 7 you knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified a document or evidence required by the University, or uttered, circulated or made use of any such forged, altered or falsified document, namely, an email from Rotman School of Management sent to MBA students on June 10, 2016, identifying the Full-Time MBA- Class of 2016 Dean's List and Bregman Scholar, contrary to section B.I.1(a) of the *Code*.

9. You knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified an academic record, and/or uttered, circulated or made use of such forged, altered or falsified record, namely, a resumé which you submitted as part of your job application postings to the Rotman School of Management Career Centre and to prospective employers beginning in or about October 2014 through to at least June 2016, contrary to section B.I.3(a) of the *Code*.

10. In the alternative to paragraph 9 you knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified a document or evidence required by the University, or uttered, circulated or made use of any such forged, altered or falsified document, namely, a resumé which you submitted as part of your job application postings to the Rotman School of Management

Career Centre and to prospective employers beginning in or about October 2014 through to at least June 2016, contrary to section B.I.1(a) of the *Code*.

11. In or about February 2017, you knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified a document or evidence required by the University, or uttered, circulated or made use of any such forged, altered or falsified document, namely, a LinkedIn profile stating you were a member of the Dean's Honours List at the University of Toronto, contrary to section B.I.1(a) of the *Code*.

12. In the alternative to paragraphs 1 through 11 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, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the *Code*, in connection with:

- (a) a document that purported to be your Preliminary Grade Report dated January 6, 2015;
- (b) a document that purported to be your Preliminary Grade Report dated September 7, 2015;
- (c) a document that purported to be your Preliminary Grade Report dated March 11, 2016;
- (d) a document that purported to be your Preliminary Grade Report dated May 12, 2016;
- (e) a document that purported to be your Academic History from the University of Toronto dated September 6, 2015;
- (f) a document that purported to be your Academic History from the University of Toronto dated March 23, 2016;
- (g) an email from Rotman School of Management sent to MBA students on June 10, 2016, identifying the Full-Time MBA- Class of 2016 Dean's List and Bregman Scholar,
- (h) a resumé which you submitted as part of your job application postings to the Rotman School of Management Career Centre and to prospective employers beginning in or about October 2014 through to at least June 2016,
- (i) a Linked In profile stating you were a member of the Dean's Honours List at the University of Toronto, in or about February 2017.

The Student's Plea

3. The Student was present and represented by counsel. The Student admitted all charges. These admissions were reflected in a written Agreed Statement of Facts, which had been signed by the Student.

The Evidence

4. The evidence before the Tribunal was presented by an Agreed Statement of Facts and Joint Book of Documents ("JBD"). The key portions are reproduced here without the documents referred to therein.

1. The Student first registered at the University of Toronto in the Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering in Fall 2008. He received his Bachelor of Applied Science in June 2013, with a cumulative grade point average ("CGPA") of 3.26 ("Engineering Degree").

2. In Fall 2014 the Student enrolled at the Rotman School of Management ("Rotman") in the Master of Business Administration ("MBA") program. He received an MBA degree in June, 2016, with a CGPA of 3.56 ("MBA Degree"). The Student's academic record at the University of Toronto as of September 15, 2017 ("ROSI") is included in the JBD at Tab 3.

Rotman Career Centre

3. Rotman maintains a Career Centre which assists its students to access job opportunities, offering career coaches, workshops and skill-building sessions. The Career Centre maintains a robust electronic job application system for employers to post job openings and for Rotman students to apply for job opportunities and to post their profiles, career preferences, resumés, grade reports, and official academic histories ("RCareer"). A description of the Rotman Career Centre from the Rotman website is included in the JBD at Tab 4.

4. Students create a profile, and can upload multiple documents to RCareer, including resumés, cover letters, writing samples, and transcripts of their marks and academic history. The Additional Document Manager, Resumé Manager and Cover Letter Manager in RCareer are used by students to upload, store and delete various versions of

their cover letters, transcripts and resumés. Students must choose one resumé as their default resumé, but can have numerous versions of the various documents stored in the system. They can also include their employment preferences regarding career aspirations.

5. Employers can access and search RCareer at any time for students by their listed preferences and, if a student has elected to include their resumé, will have access to the default resumé selected by the student.

6. Employers provide information to Rotman about specific job opportunities which are posted on RCareer with an application deadline. Students choose which jobs to apply for, and what information and documentation to include in their applications. Most employers ask that students also submit their application to the employer's website, and sometimes also by email, but the students' application materials are provided through the RCareer in most cases.

7. Once a job application deadline has passed, employers will either automatically receive the students' job applications from RCareer, or the Career Centre will immediately package and forward all of the relevant applications to the employer electronically. Any job application materials posted by a student for a posted job that existed in RCareer at the deadline date will be forwarded by Rotman to the employer.

Ingram Micro Job Application

8. On or around January 24, 2017, Morgan Fine at Ingram Micro telephoned Simone Richard, Student & Corporate Liaison at Rotman, to request verification of information provided to Ingram Micro by the Student in a job application. In particular Mr. Fine asked for verification that the Student had been on the Dean's List at Rotman, that he had been an Andrew Alexander Kinghorn Fellowship recipient, and that he was a Bregman scholar. Mr. Fine asked Ms. Richard to confirm that the Student had received these three awards.

9. On or about January 26, 2017, Zania Mauricette, Lead, Career Coaching Team at Rotman, sent an email to Morgan Fine at Ingram Micro advising him that the Student was not on the Dean's list for the Rotman MBA class of 2016. She directed Mr. Fine to the degree verification website to submit a request for information. A copy of the email sent by Ms. Mauricette to Mr. Fine on January 26, 2017 is included in the JBD at Tab 5.

10. On or about February 1, 2017, John Lundy at Ingram Micro emailed Patrick McEnroe, Assistant Director, Academic Services, at Rotman to ask for confirmation of three attached documents. This email included a copy of an email from the Student dated January 31, 2017, in which the Student indicated he was following up on Mr. Lundy's request to confirm the Student's awards, and attaching three documents which he described as follows :

- (a) List of 2016 Bregman Scholars at Rotman ("Student's Dean's List");
- (b) Leadership Award Certificate from Rotman; and
- (c) 2012 award email confirming that he was the recipient of the 2012 Chalmers Award for the best undergraduate these [sic] in his department.

11. A copy of this email chain with Ingram Micro and the attached documents are included in the JBD at Tab 6.

Dean's List

12. Each June, Rotman MBA issues a list to announce various awards, including the first and second year Dean's Lists for the Full-Time MBA program, which acknowledges the top 20% of students in each of the two classes based on their CGPA. Of these top 20%, the top 10% of the first year class also earn the designation of Andrew Alexander Kinghorn Fellowship, and the top 10% of the graduating class earn the additional designation of Bregman Scholar.

13. On June 19, 2015, when the Student was finishing his first year at Rotman, Jan Mahrt-Smith, the Academic Director, Full Time MBA Program, Associate Professor Finance at Rotman, sent an email to students announcing the First Year Dean's List & Andrew Alexander Kinghorn Fellowship recipients for the Full-Time MBA program ("Official First Year Dean's List"). The Student's name was not on the Dean's List, as his grades did not place him in the top 20% of students in his class. A copy of the June 19, 2015 email announcing the Dean's List is included in the JBD at Tab 7.

14. On June 10, 2016, when the Student was in the Rotman MBA graduating class, Professor Mahrt-Smith sent an email to the Rotman community announcing the Dean's Lists for that year, including for the Student's graduating class ("Official Graduating Year Dean's List"). Again, the Student's name was not on the Dean's List as he was not in the

top 20% of his graduating class. A copy of the June 10, 2016 email and the attached Dean's lists are included in the JBD at Tab 8.

15. John Lundy's email of February 1, 2017 and the attached documents were brought to the attention of Professor Mahrt-Smith. Professor Mahrt-Smith reviewed the Official Graduating Year Dean's List and determined that the Student was not on the Dean's List.

16. Professor Mahrt-Smith then reviewed and compared the Student's Dean's List to the Official Graduating Year Dean's List. He noted that the second name on the Official Graduating Year Dean's List in the "Dean's List and Bregman Scholar" category was missing altogether from the Student's Dean's List, and in its place the Student's name appeared.

A.T. Kearney Job Application

17. Professor Mahrt-Smith asked Erin Miller, Director, Careers (Full-Time MBA Program) to pull documentation submitted by the Student to RCareer in support of job applications. Ms. Miller provided a cover letter dated September 10, 2015, a resumé ("September 2015 Resumé"), and Preliminary Grade Report ("PGR") dated September 7, 2015 ("September 7, 2015 PGR") that the Student had posted on RCareer to respond to a job posting for A.T. Kearney (September 2015 A.T. Kearney Application"). A copy of the September 2015 A.T. Kearney Application documents is included in the JBD at Tab 9.

18. A comparison of the Student's ROSI to the documents included in his September 2015 A.T. Kearney Application revealed the following:

- (a) The September 2015 Resumé showed:
 - (i) The Student's MBA GPA to be 3.81/4.0, when the grades listed in ROSI result in a GPA of 3.22; and
 - (ii) his Engineering Degree GPA to be 3.88/4.0, when ROSI shows it to have been 3.26.
- (b) 10 of the 16 grades listed in the September 7, 2015 PGR were inflated to show higher grades from those shown in ROSI.

First Dean's Meeting

19. On February 21, 2017, Professor Luc De Nil, Dean's Designate, sent a letter to the Student to advise him that he had received a report alleging that he had committed an academic offence by falsifying his September 7, 2015 PGR, and the Student's Dean's List. Professor De Nil asked the Student to attend a Dean's meeting to discuss the allegations. A copy of the letter from Professor De Nil to the Student dated February 21, 2017, is included in the JBD at Tab 10.

20. The Student attended a meeting with the Dean's Designate on April 3, 2017. He admits that this meeting took place in a manner consistent with the requirements of the *Code*. At that meeting the Student was asked to comment on the allegations concerning documents submitted in job applications:

- (a) an altered September 7, 2015 PGR in the September 2015 A.T. Kearney Application;
- (b) a falsified Dean's List to Ingram Micro; and
- (c) a falsified MBA GPA in the September 2015 A.T. Kearney Application.

21. At the meeting the Student admitted that he altered the Dean's list he provided to Ingram Micro in January, 2017, and that he falsified 10 grades in the September 7, 2015 PGR and his MBA GPA. He claimed that he had been under extreme pressure to get the best opportunity he could to support his family. He apologized and expressed remorse. A copy of a letter from Professor De Nil to the Student dated May 19, 2017 summarizing their April 3, 2017 meeting is included in the JBD at Tab 11.

Further Investigations

22. After the Student's admissions at the April 3, 2017 Dean's meeting, Rotman conducted further investigations aimed at improving its systems and processes to avoid future cases of misrepresentation. During these further investigations Rotman uncovered numerous additional job applications and related documents posted to RCareer by the Student which also misrepresented his academic record in respect of both his MBA program and his undergraduate Engineering Degree.

23. RCareer was reviewed for existing records of all job postings to which the Student had applied, as follows:

- (a) RCareer Job Applications Log showed that the Student had applied to 30 employers using RCareer during the period November 2014 to June 2016. A copy of the Job Applications Log is included in the JBD at Tab 12;
- (b) RCareer Additional Document Manager showed that the Student had uploaded different versions of PGRs and academic histories on 8 different occasions during the period September 9, 2015 to March 29, 2016. A copy of the Additional Document Manager printout and related uploads is included in the JBD at Tab 13;
- (c) RCareer Resumé Manager showed that the Student had uploaded different versions of his resumé on five different occasions during the period March 29, 2016 to June 14, 2016. A copy of the Resumé Manager printout and related uploads is included in the JBD at Tab 14.

24. Copies of the 30 job applications referred to in the Job Application Log were pulled. Of these, all but the earliest one dated December 7, 2014 (when the Student was still in his first term in his MBA program) raised similar concerns to those which had been identified in respect of the Student's A.T. Kearney application. The job applications included additional versions of the Student's resumé, PGR and academic history. In each of the 29 job applications in issue some or all of the falsified information was made available to the prospective employers, including:

- (a) four different versions of falsified PGRs, dated January 6, 2015, September 7, 2015, March 11, 2016 and May 12, 2016, respectively. Each of these PGRs listed MBA courses and grades, many of which were inflated;
- (b) two different versions of a falsified academic history dated September 6, 2015 and March 23, 2016, respectively. Both of these academic histories listed courses and grades for both the MBA and Engineering Degree, many of which were inflated; and
- (c) 15 different versions of a falsified resumé containing altered GPAs over that time period.

Second Dean's Meeting

25. On June 1, 2017, Professor Luc De Nil, Dean's Designate, sent a letter to the Student to advise him that additional information had been obtained regarding further

allegations under the *Code*. Professor De Nil asked the Student to attend a further follow-up Dean's meeting on June 5, 2017 to discuss the additional allegations. A copy of the letter from Professor De Nil to the Student dated June 1, 2017, is included in the JBD at Tab 15.

26. The Student attended a second meeting with the Dean's Designate on June 5, 2017 to discuss the additional information which had come to light since his first Dean's meeting on April 3, 2017. He admits that this meeting took place in a manner consistent with the requirements of the *Code*. At that meeting the Student chose not to respond to any of the questions asked of him. A copy of a letter from Professor De Nil to the Student dated June 5, 2017 summarizing both Dean's meetings is included in the JBD at Tab 16.

Further Investigations

27. In May, 2018, when preparing for the hearing of the charges against the Student, Ms. Richard found 14 additional job applications posted by the Student in a section of RCareer where job applications had been moved from the Job Applications Log to the section of RCareer listing job postings for which interviews were scheduled. Twelve of these additional job applications were submitted by the Student to potential employers in RCareer.

28. In May, 2018, Ms. Richard exported data from RCareer which showed that all known currently existing records in RCareer reflect that the Student applied to a total of 41 job postings during the period December 7, 2014 to June 14, 2016 through RCareer, in addition to the September 2015 A.T. Kearney Application. The applications were pulled from three different sections of RCareer, as follows:

- (a) 29 job postings under the Activity Tab "JOB – Applied to Posting"; and
- (b) 12 job postings found under the "Schedule Interview" section.

29. A copy of the spreadsheets setting out the exported data from RCareer is included in the JBD at Tab 17. Copies of these job applications submitted by the Student in response to the job postings are included in the JBD at Tab 18.

30. Charts illustrating the altered information in the various documents are included in the JBD as follows:

- (a) Table of all job applications in relation to the charges (Tab 19);
 - (b) Table comparing all versions of MBA PGRs and Academic Histories to ROSI (Tab 20); and
 - (c) Table comparing both versions of Engineering academic histories (September 6, 2015 and March 23, 2016) to ROSI (Tab 21).
31. The Student admits that:
- (a) he submitted 42 job applications to numerous employers in which he significantly inflated his academic record, in different ways at different times, which overstated his academic achievements at the University;
 - (b) he did so in order to enhance his chances of obtaining employment, and that in doing so he was disadvantaging other applicants for those positions;
 - (c) he told two employers, Ingram Micro, and RBC Capital Markets, that he had earned a spot on the MBA Dean's List and that he was a Bregman Scholar, when he was not; and
 - (d) he removed a classmate's name and replaced it with his own on the Student's Dean's List and list of Bregman Scholars when asked by Ingram Micro to verify those awards.
32. The Student admits that, for the purpose of applying to potential employers to obtain employment, contrary to section B.1.3(a) (or alternatively section B.1.1(a)) of the *Code*, he knowingly:
- (a) forged, altered and falsified four versions of his PGR which purported to be his PGR from the University of Toronto (charges 1, 2, 3, 4);
 - (b) forged, altered and falsified two versions of his academic history which purported to be his Academic History from the University of Toronto (charges 5, 6);
 - (c) forged, altered and falsified the Dean's List he provided to Ingram Micro which purported to be the Dean's List from the University of Toronto (charge 7); and
 - (d) falsified the information contained in his resumé (charge 9).

Decision of the Tribunal on the Charges

5. The onus is on the University to establish on the balance of probabilities, using clear and convincing evidence, that one or more of the academic offences charged has been committed by the Student.

6. In this case, the Student admitted the Charges. The Tribunal was satisfied that the Student's admissions were voluntary, informed and unequivocal. Further, the evidence contained in the Agreed Statement of Facts and accompanying documents clearly and thoroughly proved that the Student committed multiple acts of academic misconduct, deliberately and repeatedly misrepresenting his academic achievements in order to gain advantage over other job-seekers.

7. Some of the Student's misconduct occurred after he had graduated from the MBA program at the University in June of 2016. The Tribunal asked counsel for the parties as to whether this Tribunal had jurisdiction to make findings of misconduct against a former Student regarding conduct that occurred *after* the former Student had graduated. After conferring, both counsel replied that this Tribunal likely did not have jurisdiction to make findings of misconduct in respect of matters occurring after June of 2016. Further, the University sought to withdraw duplicative and alternative charges. Accordingly, the Tribunal found the Student was guilty of Charges 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9. Charges 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12 were withdrawn by the University.

Submissions on Penalty

8. There was a joint submission on penalty, in which both parties requested that the Tribunal make an order including the following sanctions:

- (a) that the Tribunal recommend to the President that he recommend to Governing Council that:

- (i) it cancel and recall the Masters of Business Administration degree conferred by the University on the Student in June 2016;
 - (ii) it suspend the Bachelor of Applied Science degree conferred by the University on the Student in June 2012 for a period of five years, from the date of the hearing on May 25, 2018 to May 24, 2023;
- (b) that a permanent notation of the sanctions imposed be placed on the Student's academic record and transcript; and
- (c) that this case be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanction or sanctions imposed, with the Student's name withheld.

9. Because the Student had already graduated from the University with two degrees, the sanctions that were available were more limited than they would be if the Student was still enrolled with the University. Practically speaking, the options for the Tribunal in cases involving former students are to cancel academic standing or academic credits obtained by former students, or to recommend to the Governing Council that previously conferred degrees or diplomas be cancelled, recalled, or suspended.

Decision of the Tribunal on Penalty

10. The Tribunal is aware of the value in respecting and deferring to joint submissions. While the Tribunal retains the discretion to reject joint submissions in appropriate cases, the fact that adversarial parties have been able to agree on the appropriate sanction is a good indication in and of itself that the appropriate balancing of interests has occurred. The Tribunal should only depart from joint submissions where it feels that the proposed sanction is so far outside the range of appropriate outcomes that it would bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

11. The Tribunal considered the factors and principles relevant to sanction set out by this Tribunal in *University of Toronto and Mr. C* (Case No. 1976/77-3, November 5, 1976). The most significant factors for the Tribunal were as follows.

- (a) The character of the Student: the Student attended the hearing and admitted his wrong-doing. He made a personal statement apologizing and taking responsibility for his actions. He admitted that he knew his conduct was wrong when he did it. The Tribunal recognizes that by admitting his guilt, the Student has shown some insight and remorse. The Tribunal also recognizes that the Student legitimately earned two degrees at the University and had a clean discipline record until now. However, balanced against these mitigating factors, the Tribunal also recognizes that the Student tried to steal employment opportunities from others by lying about his academic achievements.
- (b) The likelihood of a repetition of the offence: the Tribunal was very concerned about the repeated nature of this misconduct. The Student submitted 42 job applications to numerous employers in which he significantly inflated his academic record, in different ways and at different times. He fabricated documents to misrepresent his accomplishments. The Student now says that he has learned his lesson and will never engage in this kind of dishonesty again. We hope this is true. However, in light of the planned, deliberate and repeated nature of the Student's dishonesty, a significant penalty is required to ensure specific deterrence for this Student.
- (c) The nature of the offence committed: one of the goals of the University is to prepare students for the working world. People attend the University because a degree is a meaningful accomplishment that signifies their ability to thrive in their chosen profession. When students misrepresent their academic achievements to prospective employers, the integrity of the University's grading and award-granting processes is undermined. Other students are prejudiced.

- (d) Any extenuating circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence: the Student told the Tribunal that he had experienced tremendous anxiety and pressure to get a job. No doubt this is true. However, he would not have been the only one feeling this pressure. When he lied about his qualifications, the Student would have increased the pressure on others, who may have looked like poorer prospects in comparison to the Student's inflated application.
- (d) The need to deter others from committing similar offences: deliberate, repeated dishonesty must always be denounced and deterred in order to protect the academic integrity of the University. In today's online world, it is all too easy for students to misrepresent their grades and other achievements. Current and former students must understand that this kind of misconduct will have serious repercussions.

12. In addition to the factors from the *C. case, supra*, the Tribunal considered other cases of this Tribunal in similar circumstances. The University submitted a Book of Authorities including more than 30 cases from this Tribunal of offences involving falsified academic qualifications. No two cases are identical, and the Tribunal is not bound by past decisions. However, the Tribunal strives to develop a consistent body of case law so that students are treated fairly and equitably.

13. The joint submission in this case was squarely within the range of sanctions imposed in similar cases. It does not bring the administration of justice into disrepute and is not otherwise contrary to the public interest. It strikes a fair balance between the mitigating and aggravating factors.

14. The joint submission was tailored to reflect that the Student had properly earned his credits. Cancellation of his MBA degree and suspension of his Bachelor's degree will not affect his earned credits. However, it will limit the Student's professional opportunities significantly. It is a harsh but fair sanction.

15. In all of the circumstances, the Tribunal is satisfied that the following Order is appropriate:

1. That the Student is guilty of seven counts of knowingly forging, altering, or falsifying an academic record, or uttering, circulating, or making use of such academic record, contrary to section B.I.3(a) of the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*;
2. The Tribunal recommends to the President of the University that he recommend to the Governing Council that:
 - (a) it cancel and recall the Masters of Business Administration degree conferred by the University on the Student in June 2016; and
 - (b) it suspend the Bachelor of Applied Science degree conferred by the University on the Student in June 2012 for a period of five years, from the date of the hearing on May 25, 2018 to May 24, 2023.
3. That a permanent notation of the sanctions imposed shall be placed on the Student's academic record and transcript; and
4. That this case shall be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanction or sanctions imposed, with the name of the student withheld.

Dated at Toronto this 30th day of August, 2018



Johanna Braden