

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty made on April 9, 2018

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 am. S.O.*

B E T W E E N:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

I ■■■■ R ■■■■

REASONS FOR DECISION

Hearing Dates: August 16, 2018 and January 28, 2019

Members of the Panel:

Mr. R.S.M. Woods, Chair

Professor Dionne Aleman, Faculty Panel Member

Ms. Natasha Brien, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

Ms. Tina Lie, Assistant Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP

Mr. Hatim Kheir, Representative for the Student, Downtown Legal Services (August 16, 2018 only)

Hearing Secretary:

Ms. Tracey Gameiro, Associate Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances

Not in Attendance:

Mr. I ■■■■ R ■■■■, the Student

THE CHARGES

1. On April 9, 2018, the University of Toronto (the “**University**”) charged I [REDACTED] R [REDACTED] (the “**Student**”) with the following offences under the *University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995* (the “**Code**”):

1. On or about October 26, 2016, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in an essay that you submitted in RLG312H5 (Method and Theory in the History of Religions) (“**RLG312**”), contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the *Code*.

2. In the alternative, on or about October 26, 2016, you knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with an essay that you submitted in RLG312, contrary to section B.i.1(b) of the *Code*.

3. In the further alternative, on or about October 26, 2016, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation not otherwise described in the *Code* in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in connection with an essay that you submitted in RLG312, contrary to section B.i.3(b) of the *Code*.

4. On or about December 2, 2016, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in a response (for November 18, 2016) that you submitted in RLG314H5 (Religion and Gender) (“**RLG314**”), contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the *Code*.

5. In the alternative, on or about December 2, 2016, you knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with a response (for November 18, 2016) that you submitted in RLG314, contrary to section B.i.1(b) of the *Code*.

6. In the further alternative, on or about December 2, 2016, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation not otherwise described in the *Code* in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in connection with a response (for November 18, 2016) that you submitted in RLG314, contrary to section B.i.3(b) of the *Code*.

7. On or about December 2, 2016, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in a response (for November 25, 2016) that you submitted in RLG314, contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the *Code*.

8. In the alternative, on or about December 2, 2016, you knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with a response (for November 25, 2016) that you submitted in RLG314, contrary to section B.i.1(b) of the *Code*.

9. In the further alternative, on or about December 2, 2016, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation not otherwise described in the *Code* in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in connection with a response (for November 25, 2016) that you submitted in RLG314, contrary to section B.i.3(b) of the *Code*.

10. On or about December 9, 2016, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in a paper that you submitted in RLG314, contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the *Code*.

11. In the alternative, on or about December 9, 2016, you knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with a paper that you submitted in RLG314, contrary to section B.i.1(b) of the *Code*.

12. In the further alternative, on or about December 9, 2016, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation not otherwise described in the *Code* in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in connection with paper that you submitted in RLG314, contrary to section B.i.3(b) of the *Code*.

13. On or about March 31, 2017, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in a paper that you submitted in RLG450H5 (Ritual, Material Practice, and the Senses in South Asian Islam) (“**RLG450**”), contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the *Code*.

14. In the alternative, on or about March 31, 2017, you knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with a paper that you submitted in RLG450, contrary to section B.i.1(b) of the *Code*.

15. In the further alternative, on or about March 31, 2017, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation not otherwise described in the *Code* in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in connection with paper that you submitted in RLG450, contrary to section B.i.3(b) of the *Code*.

THE HEARING

2. The Tribunal heard this matter over the course of two days, August 16, 2018 and January 28, 2019.

3. The first day of hearings, August 16, 2018, was scheduled with the consent of the Student’s representative from Downtown Legal Services (“**DLS**”). At the Student’s request, he was to attend the hearing via Skype.

4. The Student's representative attended the hearing, but the Student did not. The Student's representative advised the Tribunal that he had been able to speak with the Student over Skype previously, but the Tribunal was unable to reach him on the day of the hearing. After a number of unsuccessful attempts to reach the Student via Skype, the Tribunal proceeded without him, although in the presence of his representative from DLS. It accepted into evidence an agreed statement of facts (the "**Agreed Statement of Facts**") signed by the Student and was provided with a Joint Book of Authorities by counsel for the University and the Student's representative. A copy of the Agreed Statement of Facts is attached as Schedule A to these reasons.

5. Based on the Agreed Statement of Facts and the admissions of guilt in it, the Tribunal concluded that the student was guilty of some of the charges that the University had made against him. Given that the Student was not present in person or via Skype at the hearing, the Tribunal adjourned the sanctions hearing to October 29, 2018. To ensure that the sanctions hearing proceeded on that date, the Tribunal ordered that the hearing was peremptory on the Student.

6. Unfortunately, as a result of the illness of a Tribunal member, the hearing could not proceed on October 29, 2018. By that point, DLS had withdrawn as the Student's representative on the basis that it had been unable to contact him since August 16, 2018.

7. The Tribunal Chair asked both the Student and counsel for the University for written submissions on whether any new date should also be made peremptory on the student. Counsel for the University provided submissions pointing out the Student's failure to explain his absence on the original hearing date and failure to respond in a timely fashion to the University's attempts to reach him, as well as the University's interest in imposing a sanction without further delay. The Student did not provide any submissions, although he had responded to earlier emails. In those emails he had stated that he had planned to attend the sanctions hearing on October 29, 2018 in person, and asked that any future communications with him be via email and no other means of contact.

8. Based on its availability, the Tribunal scheduled the resumed hearing for January 28, 2019. Notice of the new hearing date was provided to both counsel for the University and by email to the Student. In the circumstances, the Tribunal Chair decided that he would not make the sanctions hearing peremptory on the Student.

9. The Student did not attend the hearing on January 28, 2019 either in person or via Skype. As with the first day of the hearing, the Tribunal made multiple attempts to contact the Student by Skype, but was unable to do so.

10. Counsel for the University provided the Tribunal with affidavits from Janice Patterson, an assistant at her law firm, as well as from Tracey Gameiro, Associate Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances, Office of the Governing Council of the University detailing the notice of the hearing provided to the Student. Based on that evidence, the Tribunal was satisfied that the Student had had notice of the resumed hearing and determined that it would proceed with the sanctions portion of the hearing. After hearing submissions on sanction from counsel for the University, the Tribunal imposed the sanction set out below.

MERITS OF THE CHARGES

Facts

11. Based on the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Tribunal makes the following findings of fact.

RLG312

12. In Fall 2016, the Student enrolled in RLG312 (Method and Theory in the History of Religions) which was taught by Professor Barton Scott.

Statement Regarding Academic Integrity

13. The syllabus for RLG312 provided to students who took that course contained a statement stressing the importance of academic integrity. That statement read in part:

University Statement on Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is essential to the pursuit of learning and scholarship in a university, and to ensuring that a degree from the University of Toronto is a strong signal of each student's individual academic achievement. As a result, the University treats cases of cheating and plagiarism very seriously. The University of Toronto's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm) outlines the behaviours that constitute academic dishonesty and the process for addressing academic offences. Potential offences include, but are not limited to:

In papers and assignments:

1. Using someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement.
2. Submitting your own work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor.
3. Making up sources and facts.
4. Obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on any assignment.

The RLG 312 Essay

14. Students in RLG312 were required to submit three essays, each worth 20% of their final grade. To help guard against plagiarism, students were required to submit their essays to Turnitin, an online database of publications, other student submissions and internet sources.

15. On October 26, 2016, the Student submitted his second essay entitled "Ludwig Feuerbach's theory of Religion" (the "**RLG312 Essay**") to Turnitin. The Turnitin report returned a 48% similarity index with internet sources. In particular, the Turnitin report found that the RLG312 Essay contained passages taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from an article by Kile Jones entitled "A Critique of Ludwig Feuerbach's Philosophy of Religion" which was available online. That article was not cited in the text or bibliography of the RLG312 Essay.

Meeting with Professor Scott to Discuss Misconduct Allegation

16. The Student met with Professor Scott to discuss the allegation of academic misconduct involving the RLG312 Essay on November 9, 2016.

RLG314

17. In Fall 2016, the Student was also enrolled in RLG314H5 (Religion and Gender) which was taught by Dr. H. Ganapathy-Coleman.

Statement Regarding Academic Integrity

18. Students in RLG314 were given information about the University's expectations regarding academic integrity. The course syllabus for RLG314 included language stressing the importance of academic integrity similar to that in the course syllabus for RLG312.

Course Requirements

19. Students in RLG314 were required to submit four response papers, each worth 6.66%, as well as two papers, each worth 25% of their final grades.

The November 18 and 25 Response Papers

20. During the term, the Student informed Dr. H. Ganapathy-Coleman of some difficulties that he was having after missing several classes. As a result, Dr. H. Ganapathy-Coleman gave the Student permission to submit his outstanding work at the end of the term.

21. On December 2, 2016, the last day of classes in RLG314, the Student submitted two response papers (the "**November 18 Response**" and the "**November 25 Response**"). On review, Dr. H. Ganapathy-Coleman determined that the responses contained passages that were taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from online sources that were not cited.

22. In particular, the Student's November 18 Response contained passages that were taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from a review (the "**November 18 Source**") by Nicki Waugh of *Goddesses and the divine feminine: a western religious history* available online (at <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2005/2005-12-16.html>). The November 18 Source was not cited in the November 18 Response.

23. The November 25 Response contained passages that were taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from two sources (collectively the "**November 25 Sources**"), a a summary of *Is the Goddess a Feminist? The Politics of South Asian Goddesses* from the Amazon.com website (at <https://www.amazon.com/Goddess-Feminist-Politics-South-Goddesses/dp/081473619X>) and an article by Karen G. Ruffle entitled "May Fatimah Gather our Tears: The Mystical and Intercessory Powers of Fatimah al-Zahra in Indo-Persian, Shi-i Devotional Literature and Performance".

The Second Paper

24. On December 9, 2016 (the deadline for the second paper), the Student submitted his second paper in RLG314 entitled “The Status of Women in the Societies of World Religion” (the “**RLG314 Paper**”) to Turnitin. The Turnitin report returned a 53% similarity index to sources in the Turnitin database. The Student’s RLG314 Paper contained passages that were taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from an article (the “**RLG314 Source**”) by Kamila Klingorova and Tomas Havlicek, “Religion and gender inequality: The status of women in the societies of world religions” that was available online (at <https://content.sciendo.com/view/journals/mgr/23/2/article-p2.xml>) (the “RLG314 Source”). The RLG314 Source was not cited in the RLG314 Paper.

Meeting with Professor Ganapathy-Coleman to Discuss Misconduct Allegations

25. The Student met with Dr. H. Ganapathy-Coleman to discuss the allegations of academic misconduct with respect to his assignments in RLG314 on December 16, 2016.

RLG450

26. In Winter 2017, the Student enrolled in RLG450H5 (Ritual, Material Practice, and the Senses in South Asian Islam) (“**RLG450**”), which was taught by Professor Karen Ruffle.

Statement Regarding Academic Integrity

27. Professor Ruffle’s syllabus for RLG450 included a detailed statement on the importance of academic integrity which reads, in part, as follows:

Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is fundamental to learning and scholarship at the University of Toronto and beyond. Participating honestly, respectfully, responsibly, and fairly in this academic community ensures that the U of T degree that you earn will be valued as a true indication of your individual academic achievement, and will continue to receive the respect and recognition it deserves. I am sympathetic to the many challenges today’s students face. Reasonable late penalties are given for assignments submitted after deadline in order to help you manage conflicting deadlines. Should you feel pressured to seek unauthorized assistance or plagiarize on work because of challenges you are facing, please speak to me or your College Registrar for guidance. I will grant extensions on deadlines for documented illnesses.

Students are expected to know what constitutes AI: Familiarize yourself with the University of Toronto's *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* (www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm). It is the rule-book for academic behaviour at the U of T. You can also find out more about academic integrity here: <https://www.utm.utoronto.ca/academic-integrity/students>. Potential offences include, but are not limited to

In papers and assignments:

- Using someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement.
- Copying material word-for-word from a source (including lecture and study group notes) and not placing the words within quotation marks.
- Submitting your own work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor.
- Making up sources and facts.
- Including references to sources that you did not use.
- Obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on any assignment including:
 - Working in groups on assignments that are supposed to be individual work;
 - Having someone rewrite or add material to your work while "editing;"
 - "Crowdsourcing" ideas and text via a Facebook/online study group without attribution.
- Lending your work to a classmate who submits it as his/her own without your permission.
- For guidance on how *not* to plagiarize, please visit the Writing Centre and refer to Margaret Proctor's tip sheet on "Now Not to Plagiarize" (Appendix A). For more information: <http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/advice/using-sources/how-not-to-plagiarize>

The RLG450 Paper

28. Students in RLG450 were required to give a final presentation worth 15% and submit a final paper worth 25% of their final grades. Due to illness, the Student did not attend the class in which he was supposed to give his presentation. Professor Ruffle agreed to reallocate the weighting so that his final paper would be worth 40% of his final grade.

29. On March 31, 2017, the Student submitted his final paper entitled “The Taj Mahal in India” (the “**RLG450 Paper**”) to Turnitin. Although the Turnitin report returned only a 9% similarity index to other sources, Professor Ruffle suspected that the Student may have made unauthorized use of sources. Professor Ruffle determined that the RLG450 Paper contained passages that appeared to have been taken from online sources without appropriate attribution, in particular, two articles (the “**RLG Sources**”): an article entitled “Taj Mahal” from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) website (at <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/252>) and, an article entitled “The Taj Mahal is so special – let us tell you why” from the Imagine Travel website (at <http://blog.imaginetravel.com/taj-mahal-definitely-bucket-list/>). The Student’s RLG450 Paper contained ideas that were taken from the RLG450 Sources, which were not cited in the RLG450 Paper.

30. On March 31, 2017, Professor Ruffle sent the Student an email advising him that she had received his paper and asking him to meet with her. On April 1, 2017, the Student responded:

Oh I definitely would’ve but I’ll be in states. One of my relative is unfortunately not well at all so I’ll have to be there but what’s it about maybe we can facetime or something?

Also, I was about to email you actually I realized one of the references from the paper is missing. It’s this one

Centre, UNESCO World Heritage. “Taj Mahal.” *UNESCO World Heritage Centre*. Web. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/252>

I really apologize for this inconvenience there was a confusion. Sparavigna should’ve been replaced with the above reference in the second paragraph. But I used some of Sparavigna’s ideas in the essay too so it’s cited.

Let me know what it’s about if we can maybe reschedule it or talk on email whichever way I convenient for you.

The Meeting with Professor Ruffle to Discuss the Misconduct Allegations

31. The Student met with Professor Ruffle to discuss the allegation of academic misconduct on April 17, 2017.

The Dean's Designate Meeting

32. On July 17, 2017, the Student met Professor Michael Georges, Dean's Designate, to discuss the alleged offences in RLG312, RLG314 and RLG450. Professor Georges gave the Student the warning that was required to be given under the *Code*.

33. The Student attended the meeting with a representative from DLS. During the meeting, the Student read from a prepared statement in which he admitted to the offences alleged. In his statement, he also described the difficulties that he was experiencing in Fall 2016 and Winter 2017, including the illness of his grandfather (who subsequently passed away) and his own health challenges (for which he sought accommodations from the University). He claimed that the incidents of plagiarism were unintentional and were mistakes. He also relied on the fact that he had emailed Professor Ruffle with the omitted citation when he became aware of it

34. At the meeting, the Student signed Admission of Guilt forms for the alleged offences in RLG312, RLG314 and RLG450.

Admissions of Guilt

35. In the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Student made a series of admissions with respect to the charges against him.

36. In respect of the RLG312 Essay, in the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Student admitted that he knowingly:

- (a) included verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas in the RLG312 Essay that were taken from the RLG312 Source;
- (b) failed to attribute the verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas appropriately using citations, references or other appropriate means;
- (c) represented in the RLG312 Essay the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, or the work of another person as his own; and
- (d) committed plagiarism, contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the *Code*.

37. In respect of the RLG314 Paper, in the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Student admitted that he:

- (a) included verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas in the RLG314 Paper that were taken from the RLG314 Source;
- (b) failed to attribute the verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas appropriately using citations, references or other appropriate means;
- (c) represented in the RLG314 Paper the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, or the work of another person as his own; and
- (d) committed plagiarism in the RLG314 Paper, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.

38. In respect of the November 18 and November 25 Responses, in the Agreed Statement of Facts the Student admitted that he knowingly:

- (a) included verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas in the November 18 Response that were taken from the November 18 Source;
- (b) failed to attribute the verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas appropriately using citations, references or other appropriate means in the November 18 Response;
- (c) represented in the November 18 Response the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, or the work of another person as his own;
- (d) included verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas in the November 25 Response that were taken from the November 25 Sources;
- (e) failed to attribute the verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas appropriately using citations, references or other appropriate means in the November 25 Response;
- (f) represented in the November 25 Response the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, or the work of another person as his own; and

- (g) committed plagiarism, contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the *Code* in respect of both the November 18 Response and the November 25 Response.

39. With respect to the RLG450 Paper, in the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Student admitted that he knowingly:

- (a) included verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas in the RLG450 Paper that were taken from the RLG450 Sources;
- (b) failed to attribute the verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas appropriately using citations, references or other appropriate means;
- (c) represented in the RLG450 Paper the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, or the work of another person as his own; and
- (d) committed plagiarism, contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the *Code*.

Decision on the Merits of the Charges

40. Having reviewed the evidence and the very clear admissions of guilt made by the Student, we conclude that the Student is guilty of knowingly representing as his own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the *Code* in respect of the RLG312 Essay, the RLG314 Paper, the November 18 Response, the November 25 Response and the RLG450 Paper.

41. As a result, the Tribunal finds the Student guilty of the following five charges:

- (a) that on or about October 26, 2016, the Student knowingly represented as his own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in an essay that he submitted in RLG312, contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the *Code*.
- (b) that on or about December 2, 2016, the Student knowingly represented as his own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in a response (for November 18, 2016) that he submitted in RLG314, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*;

- (c) that on or about December 2, 2016, the Student knowingly represented as his own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in a response (for November 25, 2016) that he submitted in RLG314, contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the Code;
- (d) that on or about December 9, 2016, the Student knowingly represented as his own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in a paper that he submitted in RLG314, contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the Code; and
- (e) that on or about March 31, 2017, the Student knowingly represented as his own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in a paper that he submitted in RLG450, contrary to section B.i.1(d) of the Code.

42. In accordance with the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Provost has withdrawn all of the remaining charges.

PENALTY

Facts

43. Although we adjourned the original hearing to permit the Student to lead evidence relating to the issue of penalty, the Student did not attend the penalty phase hearing either in person or by Skype. As a result, the only evidence we had before us in respect of penalty was the Agreed Statement of Facts.

Submissions

44. Counsel for the University submitted that the Tribunal should make an order:
- (a) recording a grade of zero in each of RLG312 (Fall 2016), RLG314 (Fall 2016) and RLG450 (Winter 2017);
 - (b) suspending the Student starting the date of our order and continuing until December 31, 2022;
 - (c) permanently recording the sanction on the Student's academic record; and

(d) allowing the decision to be published, with the Student's name withheld.

45. Counsel for the University submitted that the Student had committed a number of offences involving serious plagiarism and that therefore a suspension of almost four years and a permanent notation on the Student's academic record was appropriate in the circumstances.

46. Counsel for the University noted that the fact that the student had acknowledged his guilt at the meeting with the Dean's designate, demonstrated some degree of remorse, and that he had agreed to the Agreed Statement of Facts, were all factors in his favour. Also in his favour was the fact that this series of offences were the first time the Student had been found guilty of academic misconduct. In this regard, counsel advised us that the University was treating the five offences as one concurrent first offence by the Student.

47. Counsel noted that the number of incidents and failure to attend the hearing, and his suggestion to the Dean's designate that the plagiarism was unintentional, counted against the Student. The Student's plagiarism was extensive. It was not just a matter of some missing citations, but rather whole paragraphs. The degree of plagiarism in the RLG314 Paper was particularly bad. That paper was entirely plagiarized. The one article from which the Student appeared to have taken the entire paper was not even cited. The RLG 450 Paper was taken entirely from two uncited on-line sources. The Student raised the missing citation for one of those sources only after Professor Ruffle raised it with him.

48. There were no extenuating circumstances. There was some suggestion that the Student had been ill, but no evidence was before the Tribunal to support that suggestion.

49. Counsel for the University submitted that while the Student had no past history of academic offences, he had committed five offences between the end of October 2016 and March of 2017, most of them in the six weeks between the end of October and the middle of December 2016. The chronology of events was nevertheless troubling because some of the offences were committed after the Student had met with his instructor to discuss allegations of plagiarism, demonstrating that the meetings had not deterred him.

50. The University submitted that the requested penalty was in line with the decisions of the Tribunal in other similar cases.

Decision on Penalty

51. As this Tribunal has stated repeatedly, plagiarism is a serious breach of the University's standards of ethical behaviour which undermines both the relationship of trust between the University and its students, and the relationship between students themselves by undermining their trust in one another, and the integrity of the degrees for which they are studying.

52. The easy access to multiple sources afforded by the internet has only exacerbated the problem by providing students with a wide array of source materials from which to choose, along with the possibility that precisely because there are so many sources one might be able to use one without discovery.

53. The task for the Tribunal hearing a plagiarism case is to determine the appropriate penalty for the individual offender, while taking into consideration the seriousness of the offence and the need to deter others from it in the future.

54. This Tribunal has set out the factors to be considered in imposing sanctions on students in plagiarism cases. One such case is *The University of Toronto v N.A (Case No.: 661, February 29, 2012)* where the Tribunal described the factors this way:

31 The Factors to be considered when determining penalty are well established:

- (i) the character of the person charged;
- (ii) the likelihood of a repetition of the offence;
- (iii) the nature of the offence committed;
- (iv) any extenuating circumstances surrounding commission of the offence;
- (v) the detriment to the University occasioned by the offence;
- (vi) the need to deter others from committing a similar offence.

32 The Tribunal, in determining the appropriate penalty, should consider various factors in order to find a fit sentence for this offender, for this offence in this community. In doing so, fairness, balance and proportion must be balanced.

33 There should be some measure of uniformity or proportionality so that there should be similar sentences imposed for offences committed in similar

circumstances. The sentencing should preserve and ensure fairness by avoiding disproportionate sentences among similar sentencing processes so that there are not wide swings or inconsistencies between like offences and like offenders, recognizing that there is never a like offence or like offender.

- 34 There should be a range of sentences for offences such as plagiarism with sentences within that range moving up or down within that range depending on aggravating or mitigating circumstances.

55. Reviewing each of these factors in turn, and starting with the Student's character, the Tribunal agrees with the University that the Student's admission of guilt and cooperation in preparing and submitting the Agreed Statement of Facts are both positive factors, as is his cooperation in meeting with the Dean's representative. Both the admission of the guilt and the agreement to the Agreed Statement of Facts demonstrate the Student's acknowledgment that his acts were wrong and go some way towards facilitating the resolution of the charges. Another factor in the Student's favour is the fact that this series of plagiarized papers amounted to a first offence under the Code. Against this, however, must be weighed the fact that the Student failed to attend in person at either session of the Hearing.

56. Addressing the second factor, based on his past conduct, there is good reason to expect that the Student will reoffend unless he is given a significant penalty. Despite meeting with Professor Scott on November 9, 2016 to discuss the plagiarism in the RLG312 Essay, the Student submitted the November 18 and November 25 Responses on December 2, 2016, and the RLG314 Paper on December 9, 2016, all of which were heavily plagiarized. He met with Dr. H. Ganapathy-Coleman to discuss the plagiarized papers on December 16, 2016, and yet submitted another plagiarized paper, the RLG450 Paper in March 2017. Clearly, despite having been caught and spoken to by his professors, the Student was not prepared to cease his academic misconduct when warned about it and given the opportunity to continue his studies.

57. In terms of the nature of the offence, as set out above, plagiarism is a serious academic offence. The plagiarism in this particular case was significant. As counsel for the University pointed out, this was not a case of missing citations, this was a case of whole paragraphs, even more or less whole articles, written by others being presented as the Student's own work. Possibly worse, instead of stopping after he was caught the first or even the second time, the Student persisted in portraying the work of others as his own.

58. The Tribunal finds no extenuating circumstances based on the evidence before it. We might have considered illness as an extenuating circumstance, but no evidence substantiating an illness was provided to us.

59. Dealing with the last two factors, the Student's actions reflect very poorly on the University. There is no issue that other students need to be deterred from such behaviour, a goal that only a serious penalty will achieve.

60. The cases provided to us by counsel for the University indicate that a finding of guilt in a plagiarism case involving a paper in a course at the University warrant a penalty of a grade of zero in the course for which the student has submitted the plagiarized paper, a suspension of between three and five years, and a notation on the student's academic record for a range of time between the same time as the suspension or up to two years more than that period, or graduation. The most serious sanctions have been imposed on students charged with multiple instances of plagiarism who have already previously been found guilty of submitting plagiarized work, and who did not agree to an agreed statement of facts and a joint submission on penalty.

61. At the low end of the scale is *University of Toronto v. H.M.E (Case No.: 941, February 16, 2018)*. In that case, the student had submitted two papers, both of which were virtual copies of other papers, one a paper submitted by another student in the same course, the other a paper available on-line from a paper sharing site. The student had also lied about turning in a third paper in another course. The student had no prior record of academic misconduct and had cooperated with the investigation. The hearing had proceeded on the basis of an agreed statement of facts and a joint submission on penalty. The Tribunal noted the serious and deliberate nature of the offences and the detriment to the University, as well as the student's admission of guilt and cooperation in the investigation, and lack of any prior record. Ultimately, the Tribunal accepted the joint submission on penalty and imposed a sanction consisting of a grade of zero in the three courses, a four-year suspension and a six year notation on the student's academic record.

62. At the high end of the scale is *The University of Toronto v. N.A. (Case No.: 661, February 29, 2012)*. In that case, the student was found to have submitted an essay for a second-year English course which contained words and phrases lifted directly from various websites. This was the fourth incident in which the student had plagiarised the work of others. She had received penalties

of increasing severity for the previous offences, culminating in a twelve-month suspension. The offence before the Tribunal had taken place in the year following the period of the student's suspension. Bearing in mind the number of prior offences, the student's apparent lack of remorse, and failure to cooperate with the disciplinary process, the Tribunal imposed a final grade of zero in the course for which the plagiarized work had been submitted, a five year suspension and a notation on the student's academic record of just under seven years.

63. Taking into consideration all of the circumstances, we agree with the University that a grade of zero in all three of the courses in which the Student submitted plagiarized work and a suspension of just under four years is appropriate.

64. We do not, however, believe that a permanent notation of the sanction on the Student's academic record and transcript is appropriate. None of the cases cited to us, including ones where the conduct was much more egregious, have imposed such a sanction. Should the student return to the University and complete his studies, we believe that he should be able to move forward after graduation without a notation of our sanction on his academic record. We therefore order that the notation be from the date of our order up to the date of the Student's graduation.

65. The Tribunal therefore imposes the following penalty on the Student:

- (a) a final grade of zero in the course RLG312 in Fall 2016;
- (b) a final grade of zero in the course RLG314 in Fall 2016;
- (c) a final grade of zero in the course RLG450 in Winter 2017;
- (d) a suspension from the University from January 28, 2019, the date of the Tribunal's original order, until December 31, 2022; and
- (e) a notation of the sanction on the Student's academic record and transcript from the day the Tribunal makes its order until the Student's graduation.

66. The Tribunal further orders that this case be reported to the Provost of the University for publication of a notice of the Tribunal's decision and the sanction imposed with the name of the Student withheld.

Dated at Toronto this 29th day of April, 2019.



R. Seumas M. Woods, Co-Chair

Schedule "A"

THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty made on April 9, 2018,

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

- and -

I ■■■ R ■■■■ ■■■■■■

AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. This matter arises out of charges of academic misconduct filed on April 9, 2018 by the Provost of the University of Toronto (the "Provost") under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* ("Code"). The Provost and I ■■■ R ■■■■ (the "Student") have prepared this Agreed Statement of Facts ("ASF") and a Joint Book of Documents ("JBD"). The Provost and the Student agree that:

- (a) each document contained in the JBD may be admitted into evidence for all purposes, including for 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.

2. The Student admits that he received a copy of the charges filed by the Provost. The charges are included in the JBD at **Tab 1**.

3. The Student admits that he received a copy of the notice of hearing in this matter and that he has received reasonable notice of this hearing. A copy of the notice of hearing is included in the JBD at **Tab 2**.

4. The Student waives the reading of the charges filed against him, and pleads guilty to all charges. The Provost agrees that if the Tribunal convicts the Student on charges #1, #4, #7, #10 and #13, the Provost will withdraw charges #2, #3, #5, #6, #8, #9, #11, #12, #14, and #15.

5. At all material times, the Student was a student at the University of Toronto Mississauga. A copy of the Student's current academic record is included in the JBD at **Tab 3**.

A. RLG312

6. In Fall 2016, the Student enrolled in RLG312H5 (Method and Theory in the History of Religions) ("RLG312"), which was taught by Professor Barton Scott. A copy of the course syllabus for RLG312 is included in the JBD at **Tab 4**.

7. Students in RLG312 were given information about the University's expectations regarding academic integrity. The course syllabus included the following with respect to academic integrity (at page 5):

University Statement on Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is essential to the pursuit of learning and scholarship in a university, and to ensuring that a degree from the University of Toronto is a strong signal of each student's individual academic achievement. As a result, the University treats cases of cheating and plagiarism very seriously. The University of Toronto's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm) outlines the behaviours that constitute academic dishonesty and the process for addressing academic offences. Potential offences include, but are not limited to:

In papers and assignments:

1. Using someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement.
2. Submitting your own work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor.
3. Making up sources and facts.

4. Obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on any assignment.

[...]

All suspected cases of academic dishonesty will be investigated following the procedures outlined in the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. If you have questions or concerns about what constitutes appropriate academic behaviour or appropriate research and citation methods, you are expected to seek out additional information on academic integrity from your instructor or from other institutional resources (see <http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/academic-integrity/resources/students>).

For further information, see <http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/advice/using-sources/how-not-to-plagiarize>.

8. Students in RLG312 were required to submit three essays, each worth 20% of their final grade. They were required to submit their essays to Turnitin, which is an online database of publications, other student submissions and internet sources, for the purposes of detecting plagiarism.

9. On October 26, 2016, the Student submitted his second essay entitled "Ludwig Feuerbach's theory of Religion" (the "RLG312 Essay") to Turnitin. A copy of the Turnitin report for the RLG312 Essay is included in the JBD at **Tab 5**. The Turnitin report returned a 48% similarity index with internet sources.

10. A highlighted copy of the Student's RLG312 Essay is included in the JBD at **Tab 6**. A highlighted copy of an article entitled "A Critique of Ludwig Feuerbach's Philosophy of Religion" by Kile Jones that was available online (at http://www.meta-religion.com/Philosophy/Articles/Philosophy_of_religion/critique_of_ludwig.htm) (the "RLG312 Source") is included in the JBD at **Tab 6A**. The highlighted text at Tab 6 corresponds to the same highlighted text at Tab 6A.

11. The Student's RLG312 Essay contained passages that were taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from the RLG312 Source, which was not cited in the text or in the bibliography of the RLG312 Essay.

12. On November 9, 2016, the Student met with Professor Scott to discuss the allegation of academic misconduct involving the Student's RLG312 Essay.

B. RLG314

13. In Fall 2016, the Student also enrolled in RLG314H5 (Religion and Gender) ("RLG314"), which was taught by Dr. H. Ganapathy-Coleman. A copy of the course syllabus for RLG314 is included in the JBD at **Tab 7**.

14. Students in RLG314 were given information about the University's expectations regarding academic integrity. The course syllabus for RLG314 included the following (at page 6):

ACADEMIC CONDUCT

As a student in this course, you have certain rights and responsibilities, some of which are outlined in the following statement of academic integrity written by the University of Toronto's Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation:

"Academic integrity is essential to the pursuit of learning and scholarship in a university, and to ensuring that a degree from the University of Toronto is a strong signal of each student's individual academic achievement. As a result, the University treats cases of cheating and plagiarism very seriously. The University of Toronto's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm) outlines the behaviours that constitute academic dishonesty and the processes for addressing academic offences. Potential offences include, but are not limited to

In papers and assignments:

- Using someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement.
- Submitting your own work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor.
- Making up sources and facts.
- Obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on any assignment.

[...]

All suspected cases of academic dishonesty will be investigated following the procedures outlined in the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. If you have questions or concerns about what constitutes appropriate academic behaviour or appropriate research and citation methods, you are expected to seek out additional information on academic integrity from your instructor or from other institutional resources (see <http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/academic-integrity/resources/students>).

15. Students in RLG314 were required to submit four response papers, each worth 6.66%, as well as two papers, each worth 25% of their final grades.

1. Response Papers

16. During the term, Mr. R [REDACTED] informed Dr. Ganapathy-Coleman of some difficulties that he was having after missing several classes. As a result, Dr. Ganapathy-Coleman gave Mr. R [REDACTED] permission to submit his outstanding work at the end of the term.

17. On December 2, 2016, the last day of class, Mr. R [REDACTED] submitted a response paper for November 18, 2016 (the "November 18 Response") and a response paper for November 25, 2016 (the "November 25 Response"). On review, Dr. Ganapathy-Coleman determined that the responses contained passages that were taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from online sources that were not cited.

18. A highlighted copy of the November 18 Response is included in the JBD at **Tab 8**. A highlighted copy of a review by Nicki Waugh of *Godesses and the divine feminine: a western religious history* available online (at <http://bmcr.brynmawr/2005/2005-12-16.html>) (the "November 18 Source") is included in the JBD at **Tab 8A**. The highlighted text at Tab 8 corresponds to the same highlighted text at Tab 8A.

19. The Student's November 18 Response contained passages that were taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from the November 18 Source, which was not cited in the November 18 Response.

20. A highlighted copy of the November 25 Response is included in the JBD at **Tab 9**. A highlighted copy of:

- (a) a summary of *Is the Goddess a Feminist? The Politics of South Asian Goddesses* from the Amazon.com website (at <https://www.amazon.com/Goddess-Feminist-Politics-South-Goddesses/dp/081473619X>) is included in the JBD at **Tab 9A**; and
- (b) an article by Karen G. Ruffle, "May Fatimah Gather our Tears: The Mystical and Intercessory Powers of Fatimah al-Zahra in Indo-Persian,

Shi-I Devotional Literature and Performance” is included in the JBD at **Tab 9B**

(collectively, the “November 25 Sources”). The highlighted text at Tab 9 corresponds to the highlighted text at Tabs 9A and 9B.

21. The Student’s November 25 Response contained passages that were taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from the November 25 Sources, which were not cited in the November 25 Response.

2. Second Paper

22. On December 9, 2016 (the deadline for the second paper), Mr. R [REDACTED] submitted his second paper in RLG314 entitled “The Status of Women in the Societies of World Religion” (the “RLG314 Paper”) to Turnitin. The Turnitin report returned a 53% similarity index to sources in the Turnitin database.

23. A highlighted copy of the Student’s RLG314 Paper is included in the JBD at **Tab 10**. A highlighted copy of an article by Kamila Klingorova and Thomas Havlicek, “Religion and gender inequality: The status of women in the societies of world religions” that was available online (at <https://content.sciendo.com/view/journals/mgr/23/2/article-p2.xml>) (the “RLG314 Source”) is included in the JBD at **Tab 10A**. The highlighted text at Tab 10 corresponds to the highlighted text at Tab 10A.

24. The Student’s RLG314 Paper contained passages that were taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from the RLG314 Source, which was not cited in the RLG314 Paper.

25. On December 16, 2016, Dr. Ganapathy-Coleman met with Mr. R [REDACTED] to discuss the allegations of academic misconduct in the above assignments in RLG314.

C. RLG450

26. In Winter 2017, the Student enrolled in RLG450H5 (Ritual, Material Practice, and the Senses in South Asian Islam) ("RLG450"), which was taught by Professor Karen Ruffle. A copy of the course syllabus for RLG450 is included in the JBD at **Tab 11**.

27. Students in RLG450 were given information about the University's expectations regarding academic integrity. The course syllabus for RLG450 included the following (at pages 8 to 9):

Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is fundamental to learning and scholarship at the University of Toronto and beyond. Participating honestly, respectfully, responsibly, and fairly in this academic community ensures that the U of T degree that you earn will be valued as a true indication of your individual academic achievement, and will continue to receive the respect and recognition it deserves. I am sympathetic to the many challenges today's students face. Reasonable late penalties are given for assignments submitted after deadline in order to help you manage conflicting deadlines. Should you feel pressured to seek unauthorized assistance or plagiarize on work because of challenges you are facing, please speak to me or your College Registrar for guidance. I will grant extensions on deadlines for documented illnesses.

Students are expected to know what constitutes AI: Familiarize yourself with the University of Toronto's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm). It is the rule-book for academic behaviour at the U of T. You can also find out more about academic integrity here: <http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/academic-integrity/students>. Potential offences include, but are not limited to

In papers and assignments:

- Using someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement.
- Copying material word-for-word from a source (including lecture and study group notes) and not placing the words within quotation marks.
- Submitting your own work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor.
- Making up sources and facts.
- Including references to sources that you did not use.
- Obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on any assignment including:
 - Working in groups on assignments that are supposed to be individual work;
 - Having someone rewrite or add material to your work while "editing;"
 - "Crowdsourcing" ideas and text via a Facebook/online study group without attribution.
- Lending your work to a classmate who submits it as his/her own without your permission.
- For guidance on how *not* to plagiarize, please visit the Writing Centre and refer to Margaret Proctor's tip sheet on "Now Not to Plagiarize" (Appendix A). For more

information: <http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/advice/using-sources/how-not-to-plagiarize>

[...]

The University of Toronto treats cases of academic misconduct very seriously. All suspected cases of academic dishonesty will be investigated following the procedures outlined in the *Code*. The consequences for academic misconduct can be severe, including a failure in the course and a notation on your transcript.

You can find help for your assigned work by seeing me in office hours, speaking with your TA, or visiting the many [resources](#) available on campus. If you have any questions about what is or is not permitted in this course, please do not hesitate to contact me.

28. Students in RLG450 were required to give a final presentation worth 15% and submit a final paper worth 25% of their final grades. Due to illness, the Student did not attend the class in which he was supposed to give his presentation. Professor Ruffle agreed to reallocate the weighting so that his final paper would be worth 40% of his final grade.

29. On March 31, 2017, the Student submitted his final paper entitled "The Taj Mahal in India" (the "RLG450 Paper") to Turnitin. Although the Turnitin report returned only a 9% similarity index to other sources, Professor Ruffle suspected that Mr. R [REDACTED] may have made unauthorized use of sources. On review, she determined that the RLG450 Paper contained passages that appeared to have been taken from online sources without appropriate attribution.

30. A highlighted copy of the RLG450 Paper is included in the JBD at **Tab 12**. A highlighted copy of:

- (a) "Taj Mahal" from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) website (at <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/252>) is included in the JBD at **Tab 12A**; and
- (b) "The Taj Mahal is so special – let us tell you why" from the Imagine Travel website (at <http://blog.imagine.travel.com/taj-mahal-definitely-bucket-list/>) is included in the JBD at **Tab 12B**.

(collectively, the "RLG450 Sources"). The ideas in the highlighted text at Tab 12 correspond to the same ideas in the highlighted text at Tab 12A.

31. The Student's RLG450 Paper contained ideas that were taken from the RLG450 Sources, which were not cited in the RLG450 Paper.

32. On March 31, 2017, Professor Ruffle sent the Student an email advising him that she had received his paper and asking him to meet with her. On April 1, 2017, the Student responded:

Oh I definitely would've but I'll be in states. One of my relative is unfortunately not well at all so I'll have to be there but what's it about maybe we can facetime or something?

Also, I was about to email you actually I realized one of the references from the paper is missing. It's this one

Centre, UNESCO World Heritage. "Taj Mahal." *UNESCO World Heritage Centre*. Web. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/252>

I really apologize for this inconvenience there was a confusion. Sparavigna should've been replaced with the above reference in the second paragraph. But I used some of Sparavigna's ideas in the essay too so it's cited.

Let me know what it's about if we can maybe reschedule it or talk on email whichever way I convenient for you.

33. A copy of the Student's email exchange with Professor Ruffle is included in the JBD at **Tab 13**.

34. On April 17, 2017, the Student met with Professor Ruffle to discuss the allegation of academic misconduct in the RLG450 Paper.

D. Dean's Designate Meeting

35. On July 17, 2017, the Student met Professor Michael Georges, Dean's Designate to discuss the alleged offences in RLG312, RLG314 and RLG450. Professor Georges gave the Student the warning that was required to be given under the *Code*.

36. The Student attended the meeting with a representative from Downtown Legal Services. During the meeting, the Student read from a prepared statement in which he admitted to the offences alleged. In his statement, he also described the difficulties that he was experiencing in Fall 2016 and Winter 2017, including the illness of his grandfather (who subsequently passed away) and his own health challenges (for which he sought accommodations from the University). He claimed that the plagiarism was unintentional and were mistakes. He also relied on the fact that he had emailed Professor Ruffle with the omitted citation when he became aware of it. A copy of the Student's prepared statement is included in the JBD at **Tab 14**.

37. A copy of the minutes of the meeting on July 27, 2017, which was prepared by the University of Toronto Mississauga is included in the JBD at **Tab 15**. The parties agree that the minutes accurately reflect the discussions that took place at the meeting.

38. At the meeting, the Student signed Admission of Guilt forms for the alleged offences in RLG312, RLG314 and RLG450. Copies of the Admission of Guilt forms are included in the JBD at **Tab 16**.

E. Admissions and Acknowledgements

39. With respect to the RLG312 Essay, the Student admits that he knowingly:

- (a) included verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas in the RLG312 Essay that were taken from the RLG312 Source;
- (b) failed to attribute the verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas appropriately using citations, references or other appropriate means;
- (c) represented in the RLG312 Essay the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, or the work of another person as his own; and
- (d) committed plagiarism, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.

40. With respect to the assignments submitted in RLG314:

- (a) *November 18 Response*: the Student admits that he knowingly:
 - (i) included verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas in the November 18 Response that were taken from the November 18 Source;
 - (ii) failed to attribute the verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas appropriately using citations, references or other appropriate means;
 - (iii) represented in the November 18 Response the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, or the work of another person as his own; and
 - (iv) committed plagiarism, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.

- (b) *November 25 Response*: the Student admits that he knowingly:
 - (i) included verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas in the November 25 Response that were taken from the November 25 Sources;
 - (ii) failed to attribute the verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas appropriately using citations, references or other appropriate means;
 - (iii) represented in the November 25 Response the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, or the work of another person as his own; and
 - (iv) committed plagiarism, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.

- (c) *RLG314 Paper*: the Student admits that he knowingly:
 - (i) included verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas in the RLG314 Paper that were taken from the RLG314 Source;

- (ii) failed to attribute the verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas appropriately using citations, references or other appropriate means;
- (iii) represented in the RLG314 Paper the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, or the work of another person as his own; and
- (iv) committed plagiarism, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.

41. With respect to the RLG450 Paper, the Student admits that he knowingly:

- (a) included verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas in the RLG450 Paper that were taken from the RLG450 Sources;
- (b) failed to attribute the verbatim or nearly verbatim text and ideas appropriately using citations, references or other appropriate means;
- (c) represented in the RLG450 Paper the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, or the work of another person as his own; and
- (d) committed plagiarism, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.

42. The Student acknowledges that:

- (a) the Provost has advised him of his right to obtain legal counsel, and he has done so; and
- (b) he is signing this ASF freely and voluntarily, knowing of the potential consequences he faces.

Signed on June 26, 2018.



Signed on June 27, 2018.



Tina Lie
Assistant Discipline Counsel
University of Toronto

Doc 2500224 v1