

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty made on October 12, 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

B E T W E N:

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

H [REDACTED] Z [REDACTED]

REASONS FOR DECISION

Hearing Date: November 30, 2022, and January 9, 2023, via Zoom

Panel Members:

Cynthia Kuehl, Chair
Professor George Cree, Faculty Panel Member
Nik Khakhar, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

Lily Harmer, Assistant Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP
William Webb, Assistant Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP
Daniel Goldbloom, Counsel for the Student, Goldbloom Law
H [REDACTED] Z [REDACTED]

Hearing Secretary:

Christopher Lang, Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances

1. This hearing of the Trial Division of the University Tribunal was convened on November 30, 2022, and continued on January 9, 2023, by Zoom, to consider charges of academic dishonesty (the “Charges”) brought by the University of Toronto (the “University”) against H■■■■ Z■■ (the “Student”) under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995* (the “Code”). The Student was informed of the Charges by letter dated October 12, 2021.

The Charges

2. At the material times, the Student was registered as a student in the Faculty of Arts & Science at the University.

3. In the Charges, the Provost made the following two allegations:

- (i) On or about October 18 and 19, 2020, the Student knowingly used or possessed an unauthorized aid or obtained unauthorized assistance in Assessment #2 in ECO101H1F (20209) (the “Course”), contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the Code;
- (ii) In the alternative, on or about October 18 and 19, 2020, the Student knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation or otherwise described in the Code in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in connection with Assessment #2 in the Course, contrary to section B.1.3 (b) of the Code.

4. The Provost advised that it would withdraw Allegation 2 if findings were made on Allegation 1. Ultimately, Allegation 2 was withdrawn.

5. Detailed particulars in support of the allegations were provided in the Charges.

The Evidence

(a) Summary of Issue and Finding

6. The Student and the Provost provided a detailed Agreed Statement of Facts (“ASF”), which set out much of the background to the allegations, the result of which was that the hearing proceeded on a single issue only. That issue was whether the Student was, in fact, the person who participated in an online review session conducted during the time set aside for the completion of

an assignment in the Course. There was no dispute that, if the Provost established on a balance of probabilities that the Student did participate, then Allegation 1 would be established.

7. The Tribunal found that the Provost had met its burden.

(b) Evidence at the Hearing

8. The Student was enrolled in the Course, taught by Professor Gazzale and Professor Farhoodi. The syllabus for the Course directed students to review the Code, which included a specific direction that students were not to receive any assistance on or during any assessment or activity that counted towards the course grade. In addition, students were required to sign academic integrity statements for the Course, which the Student signed.

9. Assessment #2 in the Course was an asynchronous assignment, worth 10.5% of the final grade. It, therefore, fell within the scope of the direction in the Course, requiring that students not receive any assistance in respect of it.

10. For Assessment #2, Professor Gazzale wrote 77 different questions, 40 of which were multiple choice and 37 required that students provide a numeric answer. They were organized into 17 question pools, according to subject matter, each pool containing anywhere from 3 to 10 questions. Quercus then randomly selected one or more questions from each pool and assigned those questions to a student. Each student ultimately received 23 questions.

11. All students in the Course were required to write Assessment #2 on October 18 and 19, 2020. As an asynchronous assignment, students were given 90 minutes from the time they chose to start to write the assessment and its completion. All assignments had to be completed between October 18, 2020, at 7:00 p.m. and October 19, 2020, at 7:00 p.m. (the “submission window”).

12. Assessment #2 was open book and had very specific instructions that the students were not permitted to discuss the assessment with anyone while the submission window was open.

13. After the close of the submission window, Professor Gazzale was alerted by another student in the Course that Easy EDU, a commercial tutoring service, had held a review session during the submission window during which Easy EDU provided solutions to questions that were near identical to the questions on Assessment #2 (the “Review Session”). The students (of which

there were 180) in attendance at the Review Session received a study package of 22 questions, each one of which corresponded directly to one of the questions that Professor Gazzale had written for Assessment #2, with very minor modifications that were inconsequential to the substantive questions being asked.

14. By correlating the 22 questions in the study package to the assessment files for every student in the Course, Professor Gazzale was able to identify a student, Y.L., as being the one who had been assigned each of the 22 questions. Y.L. confirmed on October 22, 2020, that he had paid a tutor to check his answers during the submission window.

15. In the interim, Professor Gazzale, as well as the Student Academic Integrity Office, the Office of the Governing Council, the Department Chair and several other professors received an email from another student, now writing on behalf of a group of students in the Course, and stating that they were concerned about academic integrity and Assessment #2. That student provided details about Easy EDU, including that it had promoted the Review Session and required payment. The student also provided a link to the YouTube video of the Review Session, which confirmed it was held on October 18, 2020, at 9:08 p.m., during the submission window. Repeated references were made to the actual test during the Review Session. The 22 questions that had been assigned to Y.L. were answered.

16. The Review Session was held over Zoom. One of the names that appears in the Review Session video is the name of the Student (the “Student Zoom Account”). The name of the Student appears in the box on the Zoom platform in which participants are able to self-identify, and remains visible throughout the video. The Student is the only student with that name in the Course.

17. The Student Zoom Account participated quite extensively in the Review Session by typing in a number of comments, some of which were in Mandarin, the translation of which were agreed to by the parties. The Tribunal was provided with a list of all the comments made by the Student Zoom Account. Most of the comments were directed at providing answers to the questions that were being taught by Easy EDU as part of the review for Assessment #2, and included:

- comments about opportunity costs, marginal costs and marginal benefit;
- comments about absolute advantage and comparative advantage;

- comments about absolute advantage alone; and
- comments about surplus and willingness to pay.

In addition, there was one instance where the Student Zoom Account typed the name of “Lee Bailey” in relation to a question about a professor of the University of Toronto Mississauga campus who taught ECO100. The Student had not had Professor Bailey as a professor and this singular comment was the focus of evidence and speculation at the hearing.

18. The Student Academic Integrity Office scheduled a meeting with the Student to discuss the allegations that he had committed an academic offence in respect of Assessment #2. That meeting took place with Professor Graeme Hirst on July 9, 2021. The Student denied attending the Review Session and committing an academic offence. Rather, he said that a friend, X R had attended the session using the Student’s Zoom account on the Student’s gaming computer and without his knowledge. The Student and Mr. R were former roommates and the Student advised Prof. Hirst that he had loaned his gaming laptop to Mr. R.

19. Mr. R also spoke to Prof. Hirst. Mr. R advised that he had been seeking employment with Easy EDU as a “TA” (a teaching assistant), and had used the Student’s gaming computer and account to attend the Review Session at the suggestion of Easy EDU that he attend a session as a trial.

20. According to Easy EDU webpage submitted in evidence, Easy EDU tutors have “a strong understanding of the major courses of various departments in recent years, as well as the current status and niche of the entire major....All EZ Edu tutors have 3-5 years of teaching experience, with a cumulative teaching time of 800,000 hours”. There is no dispute that Mr. R does not meet this criteria.

21. In addition, the Easy EDU webpage included job descriptions for course instructor, instructor assistant, internal assistant, and course consultant. An instructor assistant’s role, which was likely the one that corresponded most closely to TA, was to “assist course instructors in completing teaching tasks, answer and explain questions raised by students, and collect, organize and create course materials”. Mr. R’s evidence, however, was that he was told that he just had to attend sessions and mark papers. He admitted in cross-examination, however, that students paying

money for TA assistance would expect him also to be able to answer questions about the substantive material in the course.

22. The Student admitted that he knew or ought to have known that attending the Review Session would have constituted obtaining unauthorized assistance and be contrary to the Code.

23. The hearing proceeded, therefore, on the sole issue of whether it was the Student or Mr. R who attended the Review Session. If the Tribunal found that the University established, on a balance of probabilities, that it was the Student who had attended, then the academic offence in Allegation 1 would be established.

24. In addition to the fact that the name of the Student appeared on the Zoom screen and therefore visible throughout the Review Session; that the Student was the only student with that name in the Course; and the Student Zoom Account participated extensively in answering the questions that would be posed on the test in a manner that the Tribunal found was consistent only with someone interested in and knowledgeable about the Course materials (i.e., a student in the Course), the University also led evidence from Professor Gazzale as to similarities between the work that was presented during the Review Session and the rough work that was provided by the Student on Assessment #2. These similarities included:

- the use of vertical lines to indicate absolute value, something that Prof. Gazzale did not teach in the Course;
- the use of the acronym TB and the idea of total benefit, which Prof. Gazzale said in examination in chief that he did not introduce in the Course. On cross-examination, Professor Gazzale acknowledged that the language of “total benefit” did appear in one of the questions on the examination;
- the use of the acronym E to denote elasticity.

25. In addition, Professor Gazzale indicated that there was at least one question for which the Student got the right answer in a multiple choice format but did not draw a graph. A graph would, according to Professor Gazzale, be necessary to answer the question correctly (the suggestion being, unless the Student knew the answer from the Review Session).

26. The Student's evidence on this point was that he had simply guessed between two options, having otherwise logically eliminated some of the other answers. There was no explanation as to why the Student had not even tried to use a graph. Of note, in a similar type question, the Student guessed the other option in an effort to at least get 50% on these questions.

27. In addition, the Student explained that he had learned the symbol for absolute value in high school. He could not explain where he learned the concept of total benefit, although he said it could have been used in the Course, in other online study guides or from another student. Though counsel's final submissions suggested using E would be obvious, there was no evidence on that point.

28. In the singular and without the benefit of the overall context, any one of these explanations may have been plausible to the Tribunal. However, when reviewed together and in light of the striking similarity of the Student's rough work to that prepared by Easy EDU in the Review Session, the Tribunal does not accept these explanations.

29. The evidence of Professor Gazzale was challenged in respect of his interest in the outcome of this hearing as a result of the fact that he, together with the University, are currently involved in a lawsuit against Easy EDU for the copyright infringement of Professor Gazzale's intellectual work. The Statement of Claim references the fact that there have been numerous charges of academic misconduct that arose from Easy EDU's conduct. In cross-examination, Professor Gazzale denied that he was motivated by the lawsuit when giving his evidence. The outcome of this particular hearing would not affect the lawsuit itself, which was premised on Easy EDU's use of his work. No student, including Y.L, was named as a defendant.

30. Having reviewed the Statement of Claim, the Panel did not accept that Professor Gazzale's evidence was tainted by the fact that he and the University have commenced this action. The evidence is that 180 students attended the Review Session. Given that the allegations do not relate to a particular finding of academic offence by any individual student, there does not appear to be a gain that would actually be generated as a result of a particular outcome in this hearing.

31. Importantly, much of Professor Gazzale's evidence consisted of a comparison between the Student's work and the Review Session. While not looking for material that exonerated the Student, he admitted that not all similarities between the Student's work on Assessment #2 and

Easy Edu's tutoring could be attributed to the Student's attendance at the Review Session. Rather, there would be answers that the Student could get right without producing rough work. While he did not accept the Student would just guess between two possibly right answers and therefore did not need to do rough work, the Panel did not find that this affected his overall credibility. Rather, his evidence was based on a comparison, which was visual and attached to his affidavit, of the rough work in particular between the Student's work and that of Easy EDU.

32. Professor Hirst also gave evidence with respect to his academic meeting. That included the disparity of the evidence between Mr. R and the Student at the hearing, compared to what he would have been advised. Overall, the Tribunal was less troubled by these minor discrepancies as much as the evidence of Mr. R at the hearing which, for reasons described below, was not accepted.

33. Both the Student and Mr. R gave evidence. They were consistent with respect to how they had lived together in the summer of 2020 in a condominium, before the Student moved into residence in September 2020. Their evidence was that the Student left behind a gaming laptop so as not to be distracted from his work, which Mr. R continued to use after September 2020. They testified that they had an oral agreement that the gaming laptop would be sold to Mr. R, and produced some financial records of an e-transfer for \$950 in November 2020 (i.e. after the Review Session). Their evidence was that this was repaid to Mr. R when he departed for China in December 2020 in cash so that he could use that cash to convert to Chinese Yen at the airport. Mr. R did not take the gaming laptop with him to China, leaving it instead in storage at the condominium. The Student later retrieved it from there.

34. The Student denied that he participated in the Review Session. His evidence was that he found out in December 2020 that there was some concern of academic misconduct. He then contacted a number of his friends. When it was put to him in cross-examination that he did so to find out if they were also in trouble, like him, he acknowledged that it was for "something like that". This did not include Mr. R, who was not in the Course. It was suggested to, but denied by him, that the Student was trying to find a friend who would agree to say it was them who participated so as to exonerate the Student.

35. At some time in December 2020, he, Mr. R and another friend (who did not attend to give evidence) were out for dinner during which the Student disclosed to Mr. R that he was being investigated for academic misconduct. Mr. R then advised that he had been applying for a job

with Easy EDU as a TA. Though their evidence was not clear, the gist of it was that there was some question as to whether Mr. R had used the Student's gaming laptop to attend an Easy EDU session, which they later confirmed was the case. This was the explanation, therefore, for why the Student's name appeared on Zoom, even though it was Mr. R who had attended.

36. Mr. R explained that he had completed part of ECO100 with Professor Lee Bailey, but then had dropped the course. He had no other economics background. However, he was trying to find a part-time job and his father suggested that he contact Easy EDU, because of some family connection with D■■■■ M■■, who he understood was affiliated with the company. According to Mr. R, he got in touch with Mr. M■■ in May or June and sent him his transcript. At that time, the transcript would have likely revealed that he had no economic courses (having dropped ECO100), three courses with a grade below 65, and his highest mark in Sociology (a 74). In respect of MAT136 (a course for which he had engaged in academic misconduct himself), it would, at best, not have been on the transcript or possibly would have been a zero or a F. However, according to Mr. R, as he had partially completed ECO100, Mr. M■■ suggested that he could be an Economics TA. All of these discussions took place over We-Chat, the log for which has subsequently, according to Mr. R, been deleted, because he switched phones. He was not able to produce any other evidence of any of these discussions, nor did he provide particular details of how his family actually knew Mr. M■■.

37. These initial discussions took place in May or June 2020. Mr. M■■ then suggested that Mr. R could observe one of the courses as a trial, following which he could provide some feedback to them about the course. This would be an introduction to Easy EDU and part of the process towards possible employment as a TA.

38. Mr. R then did not hear from Mr. M■■ until shortly before the October 2020 Review Session. He said he just assumed Mr. M■■ would get in touch with him and he did not want to bother him, so he never reached back out to Mr. M■■. In the meantime, he was still looking for part-time work.

39. As requested by Mr. M■■, he then attended the Review Session. For reasons that he did not provide, he used the gaming laptop rather than his own. During the Review Session, he realized that he was logged in as the Student. He did not think it would be an issue, and said that he was not sure how to change the Zoom name. His evidence was that he was the one who entered in all

the comments onto the Session. He has no reason for his participation other than “for the heck of it”. He also said that he answered the question with respect to Professor Bailey as he knew him from ECO100. He denied ever telling the Student about Professor Bailey, who had never taught the Student. In cross-examination, however, he admitted that Professor Bailey was known at UTM (where the Student had attended) for being a hard grader. The Tribunal accepted this as an explanation for how the Student would have known the name of a professor that had taught his former roommate.

40. He never did contact Easy EDU after that, because he was concerned that doing so may make the situation worse for the Student.

41. He also confirmed the evidence of the Student with respect to the intention to purchase the gaming laptop, and the return of the funds.

Panel’s Decision on Findings

42. Having considered the ASF, the affidavit and oral evidence, the Tribunal found that the Student had committed an academic offence, in that he obtained unauthorized assistance in the Course contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the Code.

43. The Tribunal was convinced on the balance of probabilities that the Student Zoom Account was the same person as the Student who is the subject of these charges. Only the Student was motivated to attend this session, and the Student was the only person with that name in the Course. The Tribunal was struck by the level of participation by the Student Zoom Account. That person clearly was interested in understanding the course content and participating in a manner that was educative in nature. The Tribunal also noted that it was on this assignment that the Student did best overall in the Course, by a significant margin. Though the Student’s explanation was that this was because it was multiple choice or numeric and did not require long essay questions, the Tribunal did not accept this explanation given all the evidence that pointed to the Student’s attendance at the Review Session.

44. The Tribunal also noted that there were a number of similarities including specific idiosyncratic notations between the Review Session and the Student’s rough work. While the Student provided some explanation for those responses (i.e. he learned absolute value), he gave no evidence with respect to all the notations, including the use of “E” for elasticity. The appearance

of the rough work that was completed in the Review Session and that was completed by the Student on Assessment #2 could not be ignored by the Tribunal.

45. In coming to its decision, the Tribunal considered all of the evidence, including that of Mr. R and the Student with respect to Mr. R's explanation that he was the one who attended the Review Session. Put bluntly, Mr. R's evidence was not credible, and at times bordering on the incredible. The Tribunal rejected his evidence on the following bases:

- (a) It made no sense that a person who wanted to obtain a job would wait from May or June 2020 until October 2020, without any contact, to follow up;
- (b) Mr. R's academic transcript and his knowledge of economics made him unsuitable for the role of a teaching assistant in economics. Put simply, he was not qualified for the job that he purported to be trying to obtain;
- (c) If part of the job interview was to attend the course and provide feedback, he failed in two respects:
 - (i) by not using his own computer which presumably had his own name on the Zoom platform (which he identified as "robinren") or by not changing the Student's name to his own while in the Review Session, he denied himself the opportunity for Easy EDU to know that he had attended the session as required by Mr. M. There was no indication to Easy EDU, his prospective employer, that he was taking the course and observing, which was required as part of the job interview process;
 - (ii) he ultimately provided no feedback whatsoever. Although Mr. R said he did not contact Easy EDU again because it may cause a problem for the Student, that explanation was not credible to the Panel. Mr. R and the Student both testified that Mr. R did not know of any problems for the Student relating to the Review Session until their dinner in December 2020, almost two months after the Review Session. It makes no sense if, as Mr. R claims, he was to attend the Review Session and provide feedback, that he did not do so at any point between October 18, 2020 and the dinner with the Student in December 2020.

- (d) Whomever logged in participated extensively, in answering questions relative to the content of the Course. Though Mr. R said it was him, there was no evidence given by him as to how he would actually understand any of the content that was given, given he had never taken the course, nor had he completed ECO100. While there was a suggestion by counsel in submissions that the courses would have a lot of similar introductory concepts, there was no evidence to that effect;
- (e) There was no credible explanation for his participation. There was no requirement that he participate and the fact he was there to observe. The level of participation is that of somebody who would have wanted to be educated from the Course and to understand the concepts in the Review Session. It is important that this was not one or two notes, but an extensive amount of participation and back and forth with the Easy EDU tutor.

46. The Tribunal rejected Mr. R's evidence. In the absence of there being any explanation as to who else may have attended, the Tribunal is left with the evidence of the name of the Student on the Zoom Account, the participation of the Student Zoom Account in the Review Session, the fact that only students in the Course would be interested in the Review Session, the similarities between the rough work of the Student and the Review Session tutor, and the Student's improved grade in Assessment #2. Taken together, this evidence is sufficient to establish Allegation 1.

47. Having been advised of these findings, the University withdrew Allegation #2.

Penalty

48. The University and the Student provided a joint submission on penalty which provided for the following sanctions to be imposed on the Student:

- (a) a final grade of zero in ECO101 H1F in fall of 2020;
- (b) a suspension from the University for two years and four months commencing on January 1, 2023; and
- (c) a notation of the sanction on the Student's academic record and transcript for four years from the date of this order until graduation, whichever comes first.

49. The parties also agreed that the case should be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the Tribunal's decision and the sanctions imposed, with the Student's name withheld.

50. In circumstances of a joint submission of penalty, the Panel is to accept the joint submission unless, to do so, would bring the administration of justice into disrepute. That high threshold is simply not met in this case.

51. The Tribunal considered the range of penalties that have been imposed in other cases where there have been allegations of unauthorized assistance or plagiarism. The University had provided a summary of cases, as well as 15 cases themselves that had set out the appropriate range in the circumstances. This included the case of *University of Toronto v. X.Z* (Case #1274, April 19, 2022), in which another student who participated in this Review Session had been found guilty of unauthorized assistance and received a 2.5 years suspension.

52. In addition, the Tribunal was directed to the decision of *University of Toronto v. Y.Y.* (Case #851, July 8, 2026), in which this Tribunal noted that, generally, the penalty for cheating during exams by receiving unauthorized aids includes a suspension of at least two years for a first offence. In this case, however, there is some jurisprudence, including the decision of X.Z., in which the Tribunal has noted that the use of a commercial provider, like here, justifies consequences over and above the typical two years suspension for unauthorized assistance. In other words, the use of a commercial provider is considered to be an aggravating factor.

53. In this case, the Tribunal accepted the length of suspension, as being within the range and not reaching the threshold necessary to justify a more significant misconduct penalty. That said, the Tribunal was troubled by the fact that there was an attempt to cover up the Student's misconduct in this case by involving another former student in an elaborate story. But for the joint submission on penalty, that may have yielded a different result. While the Tribunal accepts that the Student's decision to defend himself is not (and should never be considered) an aggravating factor, the fact that another student was involved in creating this type of story was of grave concern to the Tribunal.

54. In addition to the reasonable range of outcomes established by the cases, the Tribunal had regard to the factors set out in *University of Toronto v. Mr. C.* (Case #1976/77-3, November 5, 1976) as follows:

(a) The character of the Student.

This was a first offence by the Student. The Tribunal noted, in particular, that this was a situation where at least 180 students attended the EASY EDU session. That said, as noted above, the Tribunal was concerned that there was negative reflection of the character on the Student by the means by which he elected to defend himself in this hearing, namely by the creation of an elaborate story to explain his conduct.

(b) The likelihood of repetition of the offence.

The Student did not have a prior record of academic offences. Although the Student defended himself in this hearing, it was clear that the Student did understand the significance of the allegations made against him and, in particular, admitted and acknowledged that, if the person who attended the Review Session was him, that would be an academic offence. This type of recognition of what constitutes an offence is, in the view of the Tribunal, an important factor that reduces the likelihood of repetition.

(c) The nature of the offence committed; and

(d) Any extenuating or mitigating circumstances.

As noted in X.Y., the University has to be able to trust that asynchronous testing will be completed with the same academic integrity as if the test was administered in person. This places significant responsibility on students to ensure that their academic performance is their own and that they not engage in unauthorized assistance. The type of warning that was provided by Professor Gazzale in this course could not have been more clear.

The Student submitted that an additional mitigating factor is the fact that the Student is an international student and this decision may have an effect on his immigration status. The Tribunal accepts the advice of Counsel for the Provost that, in previous cases, the Discipline Appeals Board has made clear that one does not adjust the sanction based on immigration status. In any event, this factor would not have affected the Panel's consideration of the joint submission on penalty, which was otherwise in the reasonable range of outcomes.

- (e) The detriment to the University occasioned by the result.

There is a real risk that the University's integrity will be affected whenever there is a mass cheating incident such as this. It reflects poorly on the University and its safeguards in the asynchronous learning environment.

- (f) The need to deter others from committing a similar offence.

Abuse of asynchronous/online testing is an ongoing issue at the University and, as exemplified by the cases presented to the Tribunal, has been of particular concern in the last several years. It is appropriate, particularly in these times but at all times, to send a very strong message to students that the use of unauthorized assistance is academic misconduct to be treated very seriously.

55. In light of these circumstances and the cases, the Tribunal accepted the joint submission on penalty.

56. Accordingly, at the conclusion of the hearing, the Tribunal made the following order:

- (i) **THAT** the Student is guilty of one count of unauthorized assistance, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the *Code of Behaviour and Academic Matters*;
- (ii) **THAT** the following sanctions shall be imposed on the Student:
 - (A) a final grade of zero in ECO1010H1F in fall 2020;
 - (B) a suspension from the University for 2 years and 4 months commencing on January 1, 2023; and
 - (C) a notation of the sanction on the Student's academic record and transcript for four years from the date of this order until graduation, whichever comes first.
- (iii) **THAT** this case be reported to the Provost for publication of the notice of the Tribunal's decision and the sanctions imposed, with the name of the Student withheld.

Dated at Toronto this 23rd day of March, 2023.

Original signed by:

Cynthia Kuehl, Chair
On behalf of the Panel