

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty filed March 16, 2021, and August 24, 2021,

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

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

G [REDACTED] K [REDACTED] R [REDACTED]

REASONS FOR DECISION

Hearing Date: June 8, 2022, via Zoom

Members of the Panel:

Mr. Douglas F. Harrison, Chair
Professor Margaret MacNeill, Faculty Panel Member
Ms. Madison Kerr, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

Ms. Lily Harmer, Assistant Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP
Ms. G [REDACTED] K [REDACTED] R [REDACTED]

Hearing Secretary:

Ms. Carmelle Salomon-Labbé, Associate Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances

Charges and Hearing

1. The Trial Division of the Tribunal held a hearing by videoconference on June 8, 2022, to address the following charges brought by the University of Toronto (the “University”) against G [REDACTED] K [REDACTED] R [REDACTED] (the “Student”) under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995* (the “Code”), which were set out in a letter to the Student dated August 24, 2021:

1. On or about February 14, 2021, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in an assignment that you submitted (“Assignment 1”) in STA302H1S: Methods of Data Analysis 1 (“Course”), contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the Code.
2. On or about February 14, 2021, you knowingly used or possessed an unauthorized aid or aids or obtained unauthorized assistance in Assignment 1 in the Course, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the Code.
3. In addition and in the alternative to charges 1 and 2, on or about February 14, 2021, 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 Assignment 1 which you submitted for academic credit in the Course, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the Code,
4. On or about March 28, 2021, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in an assignment that you submitted (“Assignment 2”) in the Course, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the Code.
5. On or about March 28, 2021, you knowingly used or possessed an unauthorized aid or aids or obtained unauthorized assistance in Assignment 2 in the Course, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the Code.
6. In addition and in the alternative to charges 4 and 5, on or about March 28, 2021, 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 Assignment 2 which you submitted for academic credit in the Course, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the Code,

7. In or about March or April 2021, you knowingly used or possessed an unauthorized aid or aids or obtained unauthorized assistance, or attempted to do so, in connection with academic work in the Course, contrary to sections B.I.1(b) and B.II.2 of the Code.
8. In addition and in the alternative to charge 7, in or about March or April 2021, 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 academic work in the Course, contrary to sections B.I.3(b) and B.II.2 of the Code.

Particulars of the offences charged are as follows:

1. At all material times you were a student at the University of Toronto Mississauga.
2. In Winter 2021 you enrolled in the Course, taught by Professor Katherine Daignault.
3. Students in the Course were required to submit three assignments. You submitted your three assignments in partial fulfillment of this requirement.
4. You were required to write your assignments independently without the use of any aids or assistance, and you were expressly reminded not to search for solutions online.
5. You did not write your assignments independently, but instead you knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance from Chegg.com, an online subscription service which provides “expert” answers to questions asked (“Chegg”), and/or from others who obtained such assistance and provided them to you.
6. You submitted your Assignment 1 on or about February 14, 2021, and Assignment 2 on March 28, 2021, knowing that they contained ideas, the expression of ideas, and verbatim or nearly verbatim text from the work of other people (the “Sources”) which were not your ideas or your original work.
7. You knowingly represented the work of another person or persons who wrote the Sources as your own. You knowingly included in your Assignment 1, question 1, and Assignment 2, question 1, ideas and expressions that were not your own, but were the ideas and expressions of another person, or persons, who wrote the Sources, which you did not acknowledge appropriately.
8. You knowingly submitted your Assignments 1 and 2 with the intention that the University of Toronto rely on them as containing your own ideas, expressions of ideas or work in considering the appropriate academic credit to be assigned to your work.

9. For the purposes of obtaining academic credit and/or other academic advantage, you knowingly committed plagiarism in your Assignment 1, question 1, and Assignment 2, question 1.
10. You used the answers provided by Chegg to question 1 of each of Assignment 1 and Assignment 2 (“Chegg Answers”) as your own answers to provide the answers to question 1 on each of your Assignment 1 and Assignment 2.
11. The answers which you provided for question 1 of each of Assignment 1 and Assignment 2 are virtually the same as the Chegg Answers.
12. You knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with Assignment 1 and Assignment 2 in the Course.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Provost of the University and the Student filed a Joint Book of Documents (Re: Finding of Offence) (“JBD”), which included an Agreed Statement of Facts (“ASF”) that was signed by the Student on May 31, 2022. The University and the Student agreed that each document contained in the JBD could be admitted into evidence before the Tribunal for all purposes, including for the truth of the document’s contents, without further need to prove the document, and that if a document indicated that it was sent or received by someone, that was *prima facie* proof that it was sent and received as indicated.
3. In addition to the above-noted charges, the ASF also referred to an additional set of charges made by the University against the Student, dated March 16, 2021 (a copy of which was contained in the JBD), in respect of an assignment submitted by the Student in a first-year Astronomy course. As set out in the ASF, and as reiterated at the outset of the hearing by counsel for the University, the University agreed to withdraw these additional charges in their entirety and no evidence was presented to the Tribunal by the University with respect to them. The Tribunal accepted the withdrawal of these charges and accordingly, no order in respect of these charges was required and none was made.

Agreed Facts

4. The relevant facts in this matter, as set out in the ASF, are as follows.
 7. The Student first registered as a student at the University of Toronto Mississauga in Fall 2016. As of May 27, 2022, the Student has earned 20.0 credits with a Cumulative GPA of 2.82.

The Course

8. In Winter 2021, the Student enrolled in STA302H1, Methods of Data Analysis I (the “Course”), which was taught by Professor Katherine Daignault. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic the Course was taught online.
9. The syllabus contained a detailed section on Academic Integrity which provided the following guidelines:
 - You may consult class notes/lecture slides during tests and projects, however sharing or discussing questions or answers with other students is an academic offence.
 - Students must complete all assessments individually. Working together is not allowed.
 - Paying anyone else to complete your assessments for you is academic misconduct.
 - Sharing your answers/work/code with others is academic misconduct.
 - Looking up solutions to test problems online or in textbooks and copying what you find is an academic offence.
 - All work that you submit must be your own! You must not copy mathematical derivations, computer output and input, or written answers from anyone or anywhere else. Unacknowledged copying or unauthorized collaboration will lead to severe disciplinary action, beginning with an automatic grade of zero for all involved and escalating from there. Please read the UofT Policy on Cheating and Plagiarism, and don’t plagiarize.
9. Students in the Course were required to submit, among other things, three assignments, each worth 10%.
10. Assignment 1 was due February 14, 2021. Assignment 2 was due March 28, 2021. Both were required to be uploaded to Crowdmark.
11. Both assignments required students to answer three questions as follows:

The assignment is divided into three questions, each with subparts. Each question needs to be uploaded under the correct section in Crowdmark, otherwise it may be overlooked when graded. One question is a hand calculation-type question with some theoretical components, one will involve using R to perform a data analysis, and one requires an R simulation. You should make sure to show all your work for all hand-calculation/proof questions, while the R questions should be presented clearly with R code and output for each part provided and verbal explanations of the results.

12. The instructions for each of Assignment 1 and Assignment 2 contained the following detailed reminder about Academic Integrity:

Academic Integrity Reminder:

This assignment should be completed individually. Examples of what constitutes an academic offence on this assignment are:

- Sharing whole or partial solutions with other students in the class.
- Posting the assignment questions or solutions online.
- Searching for and/or using solutions found online or from external sources including other students).
- Providing solutions that are not 100% your own work.

Don't put your academic career on the line! Academic misconduct is serious.

13. [The Student] submitted her Assignment 1 on February 14, 2021, for academic credit.
14. [She] submitted her Assignment 2 on March 28, 2021 for academic credit.
15. In late February 2021, Professor Daignault became aware that solutions to her assignments were posted on Chegg.com. Chegg.com is a subscription-based website that allows students to post problems to the site (“Askers”), which are then answered by so-called “experts”. Subscribers are also able to access the questions and answers posted by others on the site (“Viewers”). The webpage advertises that a “Chegg Study” subscription costs \$18.95/month and will allow subscribers to “take a photo of your question and get an answer in as little as 30 mins” from an “expert”.
16. Chegg.com has an “Honor Code”, in which it states that its services are not intended to be used for any sort of cheating or fraud. Chegg.com permits instructors to request an “honor code investigation” for alleged violations of its “code”.

17. Professor Daignault submitted a request to Chegg.com to take down her assignment questions and the posted solutions and requested that an investigation be opened pursuant to their advertised “Honor Code” to find out who accessed the questions and answers, and to obtain the solutions provided to subscribers. She received the posted solutions in late March, and then proceeded to review all student submissions for both Assignment 1 and 2.

...

20. Upon her review, Professor Daignault determined that the answers given by the Student to the following questions were virtually identical to the Chegg solutions:

- a. Assignment 1 question 1 (a) through (e),
- b. Assignment 2 questions 1(a), (b) and (c).

...

22. The matter was subsequently forwarded to the Office of the Dean.

Meeting with the Dean’s Designate

23. On June 8, 2021, the Student met with Professor Michael Georges, Dean’s Designate for Academic Integrity. The Student admits that Professor Georges read to her the required warnings from the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*.

24. During the meeting, the Student claimed that she:

- a. did not have access to Chegg.com as she would need a premium account to obtain access;
- b. watched a lot of videos provided by Khan Academy;
- c. had a link to a video that was somewhat of a similar question because it showed her how to use regression;
- d. used information from a website that does almost the same steps as her answer;
- e. did not copy her answers to Assignment 1 or Assignment 2 but was “learning how to solve the problem”;
- f. her answers were exactly how the online solution was answered on Khan Academy;

g. she didn't look at Chegg.com, but she looked at the other website to understand how to do questions like this and it was the same; and

h. she denied that she had committed an academic offence.

5. In addition to the above agreed facts, the ASF also states that:

Admissions and acknowledgements

25. The Student admits that she knowingly accessed Chegg.com to obtain unauthorized assistance while working on each of Assignment 1 and Assignment 2, and in doing so she used the answers that had been posted to Chegg.com to provide answers for all of question 1 in her Assignment 1, and questions 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) in her Assignment 2.

26. The Student admits that she is guilty of obtaining unauthorized assistance on each of Assignment 1 and Assignment 2.

27. The Student acknowledges that she signed the ASF freely and voluntarily, knowing of the potential consequences she faces, and that she was given the opportunity to seek the advice of counsel before doing so.

Finding on Charges

6. The Student was charged under s. B.I.1(b) of the Code with having knowingly used or possessed an unauthorized aid or aids or obtained unauthorized assistance in both Assignment 1 and Assignment 2 in the Course, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the Code, as set out in paragraphs 2 and 5 of the charges (see paragraph 1, above).

7. The Student was also charged under s. B.I.1(d) of the Code with having represented as her own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in both assignments that she submitted.

8. In addition, the Student was charged, in the alternative, under s. B.I.3(b) of the Code with having 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 both assignments, which she submitted for academic credit in the Course.
9. Based on the ASF, including the Student's admissions contained in it, the Tribunal is satisfied that the offence of knowingly using or possessing an unauthorized aid or aids or obtaining unauthorized assistance in both assignments has been made out by the University.
10. Therefore, the Tribunal finds that the Student is guilty of having knowingly used or possessed an unauthorized aid or aids or obtained unauthorized assistance in both Assignment 1 and Assignment 2 in the Course, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the Code.

Withdrawal of Alternative charges

11. Upon these findings, Counsel for the University advised that the University was withdrawing the other charges and alternative charges, as set out in paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 of the charges (see paragraph 1, above), which was done. The Tribunal notes that with respect to the charges listed in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the charges, there was nothing contained in the ASF and no evidence was presented at the hearing.

Sanction

12. The parties filed a Joint Submission on Penalty ("JSP"), which was signed by the Student on May 31, 2022, that the sanction in this matter be as follows:
 - a. a final grade of zero in STA302H1S (20211);

- b. a suspension from the University commencing from the date of the Tribunal's order until May 31, 2027;
 - c. a notation of the sanction on her academic record and transcript from the date of the Tribunal's order for six years or until her graduation from the University, whichever comes first; and
 - d. that the Tribunal order that this case be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanctions imposed, with the name of the student withheld.
13. Along with the JSP, the parties also filed a Joint Book of Documents (Re: Sanction) which included an Agreed Statement of Facts on Sanction for the penalty phase of the hearing, which was signed by the Student on May 31, 2022. As with the JBD, the parties agreed that each document contained in the Joint Book of Documents (Re: Sanction) could be admitted into evidence before the Tribunal for all purposes, including for the truth of the document's contents, without further need to prove the document, and that if a document indicated that it was sent or received by someone, that was *prima facie* proof that it was sent and received as indicated.
14. The Agreed Statement of Facts on Sanction set out that the Student had committed four prior offences of academic misconduct. Prior to signing the Agreed Statement of Facts on Sanction, the Student acknowledged that the Provost had advised her of her right to obtain legal counsel and that she signed the Agreed Statement of Facts on Sanction freely and voluntarily, knowing of the potential consequences she faced. The four prior offences and how they were addressed are as follows.

A. First Offence – CSC108H5F, Assignment 1 – Fall 2016

3. In Fall 2016, the Student enrolled in CSC108H5F: Introduction to Computer Programming (“CSC108”) at the University of Toronto, Mississauga (“UTM”).
4. In October 2016, [the Student] submitted her Assignment 1 in CSC108, worth 5% of her final grade in CSC108. She was required to work on Assignment 1 independently.
5. On or about October 18, 2016, [the Student] admitted to the CSC108 instructor that she had collaborated with another student in the course, M.H., to complete Assignment 1.
6. [The Student] signed an Admission of Guilt form in which she admitted to obtaining and providing unauthorized aid and assistance in connection with Assignment 1.
7. [The Student] received a mark of zero for Assignment 1. A letter dated October 24, 2016, reporting this sanction was sent by Professor Khanin, Chair of the Department of Mathematical & Computational Sciences at UTM, to the Student. In this letter, Professor Khanin noted that since this incident was considered the Student’s first academic offence, he trusted that she had “had time to reflect on the seriousness of this incident and will not commit another academic offence again.”

B. Second Offence - CSC108H5F, Assignment 2 – Fall 2016

8. In November 2016, the Student submitted her Assignment 2 in CSC108, worth 10% of her final grade in CSC108. Students were expected to complete this assignment independently.
9. The CSC108 instructor determined that [the Student]’s Assignment 2 was unusually similar to the Assignment 2 of another student in CSC108, S.B. He met with [the Student] on or about November 9, 2016, to discuss his concerns.

C. Third Offence – PHY100H5F – Fall 2016

10. In Fall 2016, [the Student] was also enrolled in PHY100H5F (“PHY100”) at UTM. As part of PHY100, [the Student] was required to complete Assignment 9 for 4% of her grade.
11. The PSY100 instructor noted that the Assignment 9 that the Student submitted was unusually similar to the Assignment 9 submission from another student in PHY100, N.F. He met with [the Student] on December 5, 2016, to discuss his concerns about her PHY100 Assignment 9.

D. Fourth Offence – ERS120H5S – Winter 2017

12. In Winter 2017, [the Student] was enrolled in ERS120H5S (“ERS120”) at UTM.
13. As part of ERS120, the Student was required to complete Lab 6, worth 4% of her grade in ERS120. Lab 6 required students to complete sections of their lab notebook during the time allotted for Lab 6, based on the work performed by the students during the lab, and not prior to that time.
14. On February 17, 2017, the Teaching Assistant for [the Student]’s lab section found that two pages of [the Student]’s lab notebook had been completed prior to the start of Lab 6.
15. [The Student] met with the ERS120 instructor on February 27, 2017, to discuss the instructor’s concerns with [the Student]’s Lab 6.

E. Dean’s Meeting – March 6, 2017

16. On March 6, 2017, [the Student] met with the Dean’s Designate, Professor Michael Georges, to discuss the allegations of academic misconduct concerning her Assignment 2 in CSC108, Assignment 9 in PHY100, and Lab 6 in ERS120.
17. At that meeting [the Student] admitted to knowingly committing academic offences by:
 - a. sharing her work with a friend for Assignment 2 in CSC108;

- b. copying her work directly from the internet in collaboration with N.F. for Assignment 9 in PHY100; and,
 - c. filling in answers in her lab notebook for Lab 6 prior to the commencement of the allotted time for Lab 6 in ERS120.
18. [The Student] signed forms admitting that she had committed academic offences in respect of each of Assignment 2 in CSC108, Assignment 9 in PHY100, and Lab 6 in ERS120.
19. Professor Georges imposed the following sanctions:
- a. a final grade of zero in CSC108, and a transcript notation for 24 months, from March 6, 2017 to March 5, 2019, stating: “Mark reduced in CSC108H5F 2016(9) due to academic misconduct”;
 - b. a final grade of zero in PHY100, and a transcript notation from March 6, 2017 to March 5, 2019 stating: “Mark reduced in PHY100H5F 2016(9), due to academic misconduct”; and
 - c. in respect of ERS120:
 - i. a suspension from the University of Toronto for a period of 8 months, from May 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017;
 - ii. a grade of zero in the course; and
 - iii. a transcript notation for 24 months, from March 6, 2017 to March 5, 2019, stating: “Mark reduced in ERS120H5S 2017(1) due to academic misconduct”.
20. Professor Michael Lettieri, Vice-Dean Academic Experiences at UTM, wrote a letter to [the Student] dated March 15, 2017, noting the sanctions she had received. In this letter, Professor Lettieri communicated the following to the Student:

As you are now aware, these are considered to be serious offences under the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (Code), and because you committed three offences in three courses, they would normally be severely sanctioned. It is essential for you to know that I reviewed the case again, including the Dean's Designate's record of his meeting with you in which you admit you contravened the Code. I appreciate that you were forthcoming with the truth and remorseful of your actions. Moreover, I believe you have learned a valuable lesson and that there will be not repetition of similar behaviour in the future. It is imperative that you understand that the penalty recommended by my designate was appropriate, warranted, and much more lenient than what is envisaged in the Provost's Guidelines (Appendix "C").

21. Professor Lettieri concluded the March 15, 2017 letter to [the Student] by stating the following:

I also strongly suggest that you contact a staff member from our Robert Gillespie Academic Skills Centre to ensure that you have a strategy in place to help you with your future academic work and goals.

I trust that you have had time to reflect on the seriousness of this incident and will not commit another academic offence. Please be advised that any subsequent allegations of offence are usually referred directly to the Tribunal for investigation. I also hope that you will do everything in your power to make a success of your academic career at the University of Toronto Mississauga.

14. In support of the JSP, the Tribunal was directed by the parties to a number of previous Tribunal decisions.

15. In *University of Toronto and S.P.* (Case No. 1276, (May 16, 2022)) ("S.P."), the student, who did not cooperate with the University and did not attend the hearing, was found to have used the Chegg.com website as an unauthorized aid during an online, open-book test. She was found to have posted questions from the test on Chegg.com and used an answer obtained from Chegg.com. She had no prior offences on her record. The student received a zero in the course, a three-year suspension from the University and a four-year notation on her record. The Tribunal in that case canvassed similar previous cases and reviewed the Provost's Guidance on Sanctions (Appendix "C" to the University's *Code of*

Behaviour on Academic Matters). The Guidance states that absent exceptional circumstances, the University will request that the Tribunal impose a final grade of zero in any course where the student is found to have committed an offence, and suspend a student for two years for any offence involving academic dishonesty, where a student has not committed a prior offence. The Tribunal noted that in previous cases, the suspension periods for students ranged from two to three years, although when the student had committed prior offenses, the suspensions tended to be on the higher end of that range. In addition, if it was not shown that the student had paid for access to Chegg.com, then that acted as a bit of a mitigating factor that brought the suspension period down.

16. One of the cases referenced by the panel in S.P. was *University of Toronto and T.J.* (Case No. 1102, November 5, 2021), another instance of a student using the Chegg.com website as an unauthorized aid in an exam. The Tribunal imposed on that student a three-year suspension and a four-year notation, noting, at paras. 11(c) and 11(e) of the decision:

[T]he Covid-19 pandemic has amplified the importance of trust. Online learning provides more opportunities for students to cheat. In this case, Professor Chandra and the University had to go to considerable lengths to detect and uncover the extent of the Student's misconduct. By cheating on his exam, the Student undermined the grades-based system of evaluation and broke the honour code that is essential to modern learning.

...

... In today's online world, it is all too easy for students to find new outlets for unauthorized assistance. Students must understand that this kind of misconduct will have serious repercussions, so that they will be dissuaded from the temptation to cheat when under pressure.

17. In *University of Toronto and I.S.* (Case No. 1212, November 3, 2021), the student was found to have committed plagiarism in a final paper, almost all of which was taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from a published article that the student did not cite. In determining the sanction, the Tribunal took note of the fact that this Student had

committed four prior offences. As is the situation in the present case, that student's four prior offences had all been resolved at an earlier level. In addition, that student also cooperated with the University and expressed remorse. The Tribunal in that case was troubled by the multiple previous instances and concerned about possible future repetition. It was felt that a significant suspension was appropriate to guard against that possibility. Referring to previous decisions of the Tribunal, it was concluded that a five-year suspension with a six-year notation was within the reasonable range of disposition.

18. In determining the sanction in a particular case, the Tribunal is not bound to follow a JSP, if one is filed. The Tribunal has an obligation and responsibility to impose a sentence that is appropriate in the circumstances. However, when the recommended sanction is within the range of reasonable outcomes as indicated by the Guidance and by the prior cases, the Tribunal would have to find that that recommended sanction is truly unreasonable or unconscionable in order to reject it. As stated in *University of Toronto and Y.T.* (Case No. 1027, March 24, 2021), at para. 27, a JSP should "only be rejected in circumstances where giving it effect would be contrary to the public interest or would bring the administration of justice into disrepute." (see also *University of Toronto and S.K.* (Case No. 1031, November 11, 2019) at para. 30).

19. In the current case, the Tribunal acknowledges that while the Student has admitted she knowingly accessed Chegg.com to obtain unauthorized assistance, there was no proof of the Student having paid any money for that access. In addition, unlike a student who purchases an essay and submits it as their own, or presents another's work verbatim as their own, the Student here did not submit an entire assignment based on answers from Chegg.com.

20. However, it remains the case that this Student had not one, not two, not three, but four prior offences on her record. Given the admonitions in the letters she received from Professor Khanin in October 2016 and from Professor Lettieri in March 2017, one would have thought she would have taken the messages to heart. But unfortunately, she did not. The Tribunal notes her ultimate cooperation with the University in this matter, but also notes that her initial response was to deny any misconduct.
21. The recommended sanction here is serious and lengthy. The Student has enough credits to graduate but she will be unable to until any suspension ordered by the Tribunal has expired. Clearly, the temptation to cheat on assignments, due to access to websites like Chegg.com is great, and this Tribunal must do what it can to assist the University in ensuring that the penalties for those who are caught are harsh enough to make a potential cheater think twice.
22. The Guidance recommends an expulsion in cases where a student has submitted academic work that the student has purchased, in whole or in part, unless the student demonstrates through their cooperation that a lesser penalty is appropriate. In this case, the Tribunal does not recommend expulsion, as there was no proof the Student paid for access to Chegg.com and she did eventually cooperate by admitting her guilt and signing both the ASF and the Agreed Statement of Facts on Sanction. The Tribunal does, however, find that a lengthy suspension and notation is appropriate.
23. Therefore, the Tribunal accepts that the penalty submitted by the parties in the JSP is reasonable and within the range of appropriate sanctions for the offences the Student has been found to have committed.

24. The Tribunal therefore orders that the following sanctions be imposed on the Student:

- a. a final grade of zero in STA302H1S (20211);
- b. a suspension from the University commencing from the date of this order until May 31, 2027; and
- c. a notation of the sanction on her academic record and transcript from the date of the order for six years or until her graduation from the University, whichever comes first.

25. In addition, the Tribunal orders that this case be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanctions imposed, with the name of the Student withheld.

Dated at Toronto, this 7th day of September 2022.

Original signed by:

Mr. Douglas F. Harrison, Chair
On behalf of the Panel