

THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty made on May 2, 2022, and July 6, 2023, revised on January 11, 2024, and February 1, 2024

AND IN THE MATTER OF the University of Toronto *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 2019*

AND IN THE MATTER OF the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*, S.O. 1971, C. 56 as amended S.O. 1978, C. 88

BETWEEN:

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

and

T [REDACTED] K [REDACTED]

AMENDED REASONS FOR DECISION

Hearing Date: August 12, 2024

Members of the Panel:

Alexandra Clark, Chair

Professor Richard B. Day, Faculty Panel Member

Zoë Reichert, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

Lily Harmer, Assistant Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP

Ryan Shah, Co-Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP

Hearing Secretary:

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

Not in Attendance:

T [REDACTED] K [REDACTED]

A. Charges

1. On August 12, 2024, the University Tribunal held a hearing to consider the charges brought by the University of Toronto (the “University”) against T [REDACTED] K [REDACTED] (the “Student”) under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 2019* (the “Code”).

2. Those charges were originally set out in letters dated May 2, 2022, and July 6, 2023 (the “Original Charges”), which were superseded and consolidated by revised charges set out in letters dated January 11, 2024, and February 1, 2024, (the “Revised Charges”). The Revised Charges, in chronological order, are:

BIO 207

1. On or about March 31, 2021, you knowingly represented as your own the idea or expression of an idea, and/or the work of another in respect of an assignment that you submitted in BIO207H5S, 2021(1) ("BIO 207") contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the Code (“Count 1”);
2. On or about March 31, 2021, you knowingly submitted academic work containing a purported statement of fact and/or reference to a source which has been concocted in an assignment that you submitted in BIO 207 contrary to section B.I.1(f) of the Code (“Count 2”); and
3. In the alternative to the charges above, on or about March 31, 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 an assignment in BIO 207, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the Code (“Count 3”, and together with Counts 1 and 2, the “BIO 207 Charges”).

JCP 221

4. On or about April 12, 2021, you knowingly did something for the purpose of aiding or assisting another member to use or possess an unauthorized aid or to obtain unauthorized assistance in respect of an assignment in JCP221H5S, 2021(1) ("JCP 221"), contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the Code ("Count 4);
5. On or about April 12, 2021, you knowingly did something for the purpose of aiding or assisting another member to represent as the member's own your idea or expression of an idea and/or your work in respect of an assignment in JCP 221, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the Code ("Count 5", and together with Count 4, the "JCP 221 Charges").

BIO 202

6. On or about June 11, 2021, you knowingly possessed an unauthorized aid or obtained unauthorized assistance in respect of the final report that you submitted in in [sic] BIO202H5F, 2021(5) ("BIO 202"), contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the Code ("Count 6");
7. On or about June 11, 2021, you knowingly represented as your own the idea or expression of an idea, and/or the work of another in respect of the final report that you submitted in BIO 202, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the Code ("Count 7");
8. In the alternative to each of the above charges, on or about June 11, 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 the final report in the BIO 202, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the Code ("Count 8", and together with Count 6 and Count 7, the "BIO 202 Charges").

BIO 354

9. On or about February 17, 2022, you knowingly used or possess an unauthorized aid or obtained unauthorized assistance and/or you did something for the purpose of aiding or assisting another member to use or possess an unauthorized aid or to

obtain unauthorized assistance in respect of a mid-term exam that you submitted in BIO354H5S - Vertebrate Form and Function in Winter 2022 ("BIO 354") contrary to section B .I.1(b) of the Code ("Count 9").

10. In the alternative to the charge above, on or about February 17, 2022, 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 mid-term exam in BIO 354 contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the Code ("Count 10", and together with Count 9, the "BIO 354 Charges").

SLA 100

11. In or about September 2022, you knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified any document or evidence required by the University, and/or uttered, circulated or made use of such forged, altered or falsified document, namely, evidence of your knowledge of the Russian language required by the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures in connection with SLA100 — Russian for Beginners ("SLA 100") contrary to section B.I.1(a) of the Code ("Count 11").
12. In the alternative to the charge above, in or about the Fall term of 2022 from September to December 2022, 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 the assessments in SLA100, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the Code ("Count 12", and together with Count 11, the "SLA 100 Charges").

B. Notice to the Student

3. At the outset of the hearing, Mr. Shah, counsel for the Provost informed the panel that, while the Student had been properly served with copies of both the Original Charges and the Revised Charges, he did not anticipate that she would participate in the hearing.

4. On the issue of proper notice to the Student, he tendered two affidavits: one from Lisa Devereaux who is the Director, Academic Success & Integrity at the University of Toronto Mississauga (the “Director”), and one from a legal assistant employed by his firm (the “Legal Assistant”). Based on the uncontradicted evidence provided in these two affidavits, it appears that the Student had initially engaged with the disciplinary process and had communicated both by telephone and via email with Counsel. She had also entered into an Agreed Statement of Facts with regard to some, but not all, of the charges against her.

5. In particular, the Director’s affidavit established that the Student had apparently not accessed her email account listed in her Repository of Student Information (“ROSI”) since March 25, 2024. The Legal Assistant’s affidavit, however, established that an initial copy of the charges and several related documents had been provided to the Student through her ROSI email account on May 2, 2022. Later that same day, the Student and the Assistant Discipline Counsel who was assigned to the matter at that time exchanged email messages and then had a telephone conversation. The next day, Assistant Discipline Counsel advised the Student that there were additional allegations against her and that the proceeding would be put on hold to allow her to meet with a Dean’s Designate about the new allegations.

6. On July 6, 2023, the new allegations were served on the Student using her ROSI email account. There were email messages sent to her by Assistant Discipline Counsel on July 11 of that year and a disclosure package was sent to her on October 27, 2023. There were subsequent emails and a telephone call between the Student and Assistant Discipline Counsel in October and November of 2023. Finally, on January 11, 2024, the Student was served with the Revised Charges via her ROSI email account, which was followed by a further version on February 1, 2024, which corrected some formatting errors in the January 11 document.

7. There were further email exchanges between the Student and Counsel in January of 2024 regarding the scheduling of the hearing and, on February 2, 2024, the Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances (the “ADFG Office”) issued a Notice of Virtual Hearing setting the matter down for March 20, 2024. On March 19, 2024, one day before the scheduled hearing, Downtown Legal Services emailed the ADFG Office and advised that they had just been retained to represent the Student and requested an adjournment of the hearing date. The Chair at that time granted the requested adjournment. On April 18, 2024, however, a representative from Downtown Legal Services emailed Mr. Shah to inform him that they were no longer representing the Student.

8. In the period between April 18 and July 28, 2024, Mr. Shah sent a number of messages to the Student’s email account requesting that she participate in efforts to reschedule the hearing date and to prepare for the hearing. A hearing date of August 12 at 5:15 p.m. was eventually fixed, and the ADFG Office notified the Student via her ROSI email account of this fact on May 3, 2024.

9. Mr. Shah also attempted to contact the Student by calling her on a cell phone number that she had previously provided to him, but she never answered the phone and he left voicemail messages for her on July 11, 17 and 28, 2024. In addition, Mr. Shah attempted to send a package, which included a copy of the Notice of Virtual Hearing, on July 11, 2024, via courier and on July 15, 2024, via registered letter with Canada Post to the mailing address listed in her ROSI account. The courier package was returned to sender and the registered letter was not collected by the Student.

10. Although the Panel delayed the start of the present hearing by 15 minutes, the Student did not appear on the scheduled Zoom call and had not appeared by the time that the hearing finished nearly four hours later.

11. Based on the facts outlined above, however, and in particular based on the fact that the Student demonstrated her awareness of the charges against her through email exchanges and telephone calls with Mr. Shah about them, as well as by executing an Agreed Statement of Facts regarding certain charges, we are satisfied that she received adequate notice of these proceedings and of all of the charges against her.

12. Although she apparently stopped accessing her ROSI email account in March of 2024, the Provost made subsequent efforts to contact her by alternate means including via cell phone and by postal mail and courier. It is clear that she stopped accessing her email account at a point where she was well aware that there were disciplinary charges outstanding against her and that the matter would be proceeding to a hearing. We therefore find that she has been provided with reasonable notice of these proceedings.

C. Evidence Tendered

13. The Provost tendered an Agreed Statement of Facts executed by the Student and by Assistant Discipline Counsel on February 26, 2024 (the “ASF”) and an attached Book of Documents (the “Book of Documents”). The ASF relates to only some of the charges brought against the Student, specifically the BIO 207 Charges and the BIO 202 Charges. The evidence relating to those charges is summarized below and is based on the ASF and the Book of Documents.

The BIO 207 Charges

14. The Student enrolled in BIO 207 in Winter 2021, which was taught by Professor Karen Williams. The BIO 207 syllabus brought the Code to students’ attention.

The Case Study Assignment

15. Students in BIO 207 were required to submit a case study assignment worth 10% of the final mark in BIO 207. In the case study, students were required to write a three-page analysis of a genetic disease. The instructions for the case study assignment required students to provide a list of references cited and provided them with a link to a guide on how to appropriately cite sources.

16. On April 3, 2021, the Student submitted her case study assignment. Her case study assignment examined polycystic kidney disease. The University's Turnitin.com service identified that the Student's case study assignment contained verbatim and near verbatim similarities to online sources and papers submitted by other students at the University.

The Plagiarism Sources

17. The Student's case study assignment contained verbatim and near verbatim text without acknowledgement or citation from the following sources: (a) a journal article titled "*The Liver and Polycystic Kidney Disease*," by Monica Souza de Miranda Henriques and Erick Jose de Maris Villar (2015); and (b) a web source identified as being located at "kidney.healthfitnessseek.com" by Turnitin.com (together, the "Plagiarism Sources").

18. The Student copied text directly from the Plagiarism Sources into her case study assignment. The Student did not cite or reference the Plagiarism Sources in her case study assignment or otherwise indicate that the text taken from the Plagiarism Sources was the work of others.

The Misrepresented Source

19. The Student's case study also contained a reference to an article: Vinita Takiar and Michael J. Caplan "*Polycystic Kidney Disease: Pathogenesis and Potential Therapies*" *Biochim Biophys Acta* (2011) (the "Takiar Source").

20. The Student cited the Takiar Source in the context of a discussion of polycystic kidney disease. Specifically, she cited the Takiar Source for the following proposition: "[i]n women, under hormonal influence, the cysts grow very quick, and when its in highest point, the cysts can cause liver parenchyma atrophy".

21. Though the Takiar Source does generally discuss polycystic kidney disease, it discusses neither the influence of hormones on cysts nor the liver. Specifically, the Takiar Source does not address the ideas, words or phrases contained in the proposition attributed to it by the Student.

22. The Student met with Professor Williams on May 6, 2021, to discuss these allegations.

The BIO 202 Charges

23. The Student enrolled in BIO 202 in the Summer 2021 term. BIO 202 was taught by Professor Nagham Abdalahad. The syllabus contained a warning regarding academic integrity that provided examples of potential academic offences, including "[u]sing someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement." Students in BIO 202 were required to submit a rough and subsequently a final copy of a lab report, worth 10% and 30% of the final mark respectively.

24. On May 25, 2021, the Student submitted her rough lab report. The University's Turnitin.com service identified that the Student's rough lab report contained similarities with another student paper submitted to the University. On June 11, 2021, the Student submitted her

final lab report, which was based on her rough lab report. The University's Turnitin.com service again identified that the Student's final lab report also contained similarities with another student paper submitted to the University.

25. The Student wrote neither her rough lab report nor her final lab report independently. Instead, the Student copied substantially all of her rough lab report and final lab report from a lab report submitted by another student, S.L., in BIO 202 in Summer 2020. The Student did not cite or reference S.L. in her final lab report and did not in any way indicate that the text of her lab report was written by someone else.

26. The Student met with Professor Abdalahad on June 15, 2021, to discuss these allegations.

Dean's Designate Meeting

27. On September 14, 2021, the Student attended a meeting with Dean's Designate Michael Georges to discuss the allegation that she committed academic offences in BIO 207 and BIO 202. In this meeting, the Student admitted to committing plagiarism on her case study assignment in BIO 207 and her final lab report in BIO 202.

28. The Student has admitted that in her case study assignment in BIO 207 she:

(a) copied verbatim and near verbatim text from the Plagiarism Sources without proper attribution or citation; and

(b) misrepresented the contents of the Takiar Source as supporting the proposition that "[i]n women, under hormonal influence, [polycystic kidney disease] cysts grow very quick, and when its in highest point, the cysts can cause liver parenchyma atrophy."

29. The Student has also admitted that, in her final lab report in BIO 202, she copied verbatim and near verbatim text from S.L.'s final lab report, without proper attribution or citation.

30. In summary, the Student has admitted that:

(a) on April 3, 2021, she knowingly represented as her own the idea or expression of an idea, and/or the work of another in respect of her case study assignment in BIO 207 contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the Code;

(b) on April 3, 2021, she knowingly submitted academic work containing a purported statement of fact and/or reference to a source which has been concocted in her case study assignment in BIO 207 contrary to section B.I.1(f) of the Code; and

(c) on June 11, 2021, she knowingly represented as her own the idea or expression of an idea, and/or the work of another in respect of her final lab report in BIO 202 contrary to B.I.1(d) of the Code.

Findings Regarding the BIO 207 Charges and the BIO 202 Charges

31. Based on the facts and admissions summarized above, we were persuaded on a balance of probabilities that the Student had committed the offences discussed above and we made a finding of guilt on Count 1, Count 2 and Count 7. The Provost did not lead any evidence regarding Count 3, Count 6 and Count 8, and we have treated these charges as withdrawn.

The JCP 221 Charges

32. To address the JCP 221 Charges, the Provost tendered an affidavit from David McMillen, who is an Associate Professor in the Department of Chemical and Physical Sciences at the

University of Toronto Mississauga (the “McMillen Affidavit”). The summary of facts set out below is drawn from the McMillen Affidavit.

33. In Winter 2021, Professor McMillen was the instructor for JCP 221, which was titled “Thermodynamics”, and the Student was enrolled in this course.

The Course and the Assignment

34. JCP 221 is a second-year physical chemistry course that examines the laws of thermodynamics. The syllabus for JCP 221 contained a warning regarding academic integrity that brought the Code to students attention and described the following potential academic offences: (a) posting test, essay, or exam questions to message boards or social media; (b) creating, accessing, and sharing assessment questions and answers in virtual "course groups"; and (c) working collaboratively, in-person or online, with others on assessments that are expected to be completed individually.

35. Students in JCP 221 were required to submit an assignment worth 20% of the final mark in JCP 221. This assignment was due on April 9, 2021, and required students to perform a variety of physics calculations and to prepare several graphs. Question 2 of this assignment asked students to create several graphs comparing two different equations that predict the relationship between volume, pressure and temperature in gases: the Redlich-Kwong equation (the “RWE”) and the ideal gas law.

36. Question 2 was comprised of three sub-questions:

(a) for question 2(a), students were asked to plot the relationship between pressure and temperature under the RWE and ideal gas law on two graphs, each with their own value

range. For one graph, students were asked to choose a value range where the RWE and ideal gas law showed good agreement and, for the other, students were asked to choose a value range where the RWE and ideal gas law showed poor agreement;

(b) for question 2(b), students were asked to complete the same exercise as question 2(a), except with pressure and volume instead of pressure and temperature; and

(c) for question 2(c), students were asked to create a plot of the relationship between a variable called the “compression factor” and pressure under the RWE.

37. On April 12, 2021, the Student submitted her assignment in JCP 221. Professor McMillen reviewed the Student’s assignment and determined that her answers to question 2 contained graphs that were virtually identical to those submitted by another student in JCP 221, namely J.S.

38. Both students’ graphs for questions 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c) were virtually identical in a highly unusual manner. These unusual similarities include: (a) the fonts, value ranges, colours and graph data points were virtually identical even though students had the freedom to choose these for themselves; (b) the text in the labels provided in the legends were identical; and (c) the graphs in both assignments spell the word “gases” inconsistently. Sometimes this word is instead spelled “gasses.” Both assignments use this inconsistent spelling in exactly the same places.

39. Based on these similarities and given that there were countless possible ways that students could have prepared these graphs, Professor McMillen concluded that it was highly unlikely that these similarities were a coincidence. We reviewed attachments to the McMillen Affidavit that contained copies of the Student’s answer to these questions, J.S.’s answers to these questions, and a chart comparing the two sets of answers.

J.S.'s Statements

40. On April 23, 2021, Professor McMillen met with J.S. to discuss the allegation that she had committed academic misconduct in submitting her answers to this assignment. She admitted to him that she had downloaded the graphs that she submitted in her answers to question 2 of the assignment from a WhatsApp group chat. However, J.S. stated that she used the graphs downloaded from WhatsApp inadvertently and that she had intended to use graphs that she had prepared independently.

41. Later, J.S. sent Professor McMillen screenshots of graphs and calculations that she claimed to have prepared independently and had intended to submit in response to question 2 of the assignment in JCP 221. Professor McMillen also noted that he had exchanged emails with the Student regarding these allegations on April 20, 2021. He was made available during the hearing to provide oral testimony and to answer any of the Panel's questions, but we had no questions for him.

42. The Provost also tendered an affidavit from Professor Michael Georges who, as discussed above, is a Dean's Designate for academic matters (the "Georges Affidavit"). We will discuss the contents of the Georges Affidavit later in these reasons, but as regards the JCP 221 Charges, Professor Georges confirmed that he met with both the Student and J.S. to discuss these allegations.

43. According to the Georges Affidavit, on June 22, 2021, he met with J.S. to discuss the allegation that she had committed academic misconduct in submitting her assignment JCP 221. During that meeting, J.S. said the following things:

- (a) she admitted that she had submitted graphs on her JCP 221 assignment that were not hers but were created by another person;

(b) the graphs that she had submitted on her JCP 221 assignment were sent to a WhatsApp group, where she accessed them;

(c) she believed that the graphs were deleted from this WhatsApp group chat shortly after they were sent; and

(d) she admitted to committing an academic offence.

44. Later that same day, J.S.'s admission was recorded in a letter sent to her by Vice-Dean Michael Lettieri. We reviewed a copy of this letter which was attached to the Georges Affidavit.

The Student's Statements

45. On September 14, 2021, Professor Georges met with the Student to discuss the allegation that she had committed academic misconduct in JCP 221. During the meeting, the Student said the following things concerning the matters summarized in the JCP 221 Charges:

(a) she had uploaded a portion of her assignment to a WhatsApp group chat by mistake;

(b) in this WhatsApp group chat, another student had asked for help and other people had also shared their answers;

(c) the Student had only intended to share a handwritten graph that provided an idea of how to answer the relevant questions, but she had uploaded her answers by mistake;

(d) the Student immediately deleted her answers from the WhatsApp group chat, but she believes that another student may have downloaded the pictures before they were deleted; and

(e) she denied committing an academic offence.

Finding Regarding the JCP 221 Charges

46. We must consider whether the Student “knowingly did something for the purpose of aiding or assisting another member to...obtain unauthorized assistance in respect of an assignment” and also whether she “knowingly did something for the purpose of aiding or assisting another member to represent as the member’s own...your work in respect of an assignment”. We are persuaded, on a balance of probabilities, that she has committed both of these offences.

47. The syllabus for JCP 221 made it clear to all students that it would be considered an academic offence if they were involved in either “creating, accessing, and sharing assessment...answers in virtual “course groups”” or in “working collaboratively, in person or online, with others on assessments that are expected to be completed individually”. Based on the uncontradicted evidence presented in the hearing, the Student engaged in both of these practices and shared answers to the assignment with J.S.

48. The evidence presented in the McMillen Affidavit establishes that the Student’s answers to questions 2(a), (b) and (c) are too similar to J.S.’s answers to these questions to be the product of coincidence. In her statements to the Dean’s Designate, the Student indicated that she had “only intended to share a handwritten graph that provided an idea of how to answer the relevant questions” but had uploaded her actual answers to the assignment instead.

49. Whether she intended to upload a handwritten graph or her actual answers, however, she was deliberately providing answers to a fellow student in an online forum. This is a practice that was specifically warned against in the class syllabus and could foreseeably have given rise both to unauthorized assistance and to misrepresentation by another about the source of the answer.

50. In this case, as the attachments to the McMillen Affidavit suggest and the evidence of J.S. confirms, by posting proposed answers to the WhatsApp chat group, both of these risks materialized. We therefore find that both Count 4 and Count 5 are made out on the evidence before us. **At the hearing, Mr. Shah clarified that Count 4 was to be considered as the primary charge. The Panel is therefore making a finding of guilt in relation to Count 4 and is treating Count 5 as withdrawn.**

The BIO 354 Charges

51. To address the BIO 354 Charges, the Provost tendered an affidavit from Sanja Hinic-Frlog, an Associate Professor in the Department of Biology at the University of Toronto Mississauga and the Instructor for BIO 354 (the “Hinic-Frlog Affidavit”). As set out in the Hinic-Frlog Affidavit, BIO 354, which is titled “Vertebrate Form and Function”, is a third-year undergraduate biology course that examines the anatomy and evolution of vertebrates.

52. The syllabus for BIO 354 brought the Code to students’ attention and provided examples of potential academic offences including (a) “[l]ooking at someone else’s answers during an exam or test”; and (b) “[w]orking collaboratively, in-person or online, with others on assessments that are expected to be completed individually.”

The Mid-Term Test

53. Students in BIO 354 were required to write a mid-term test between February 13 and February 18, 2022. The mid-term test was conducted as an open book test and was administered online. It was worth 25% of the final mark in BIO 354. The mid-term test required students to answer two questions about vertebrate biology.

54. In class, Professor Hinic-Frlog had instructed students that the mid-term test was to be completed in the student's own words. Additionally, on the University's online Quercus platform where students submitted their mid-term tests, students were advised a second time that the mid-term test: "is an online only open book test and you are welcome to use lecture slides, notes...provided with each lecture and your textbook during the midterm test. All your answers must be written in your own words and paraphrased carefully."

The Student's Mid-Term Test

55. On February 17, 2022, the Student submitted her mid-term test in BIO 354. The University's Ouriginal online review service detected that there were several verbatim and near verbatim similarities between the Student's mid-term test and the mid-term test submitted by another student in the course, U.G. The Hinic-Frlog Affidavit included copies of the mid-term tests submitted by both the Student and by U.G, together with a chart comparing the answers submitted by each.

56. Professor Hinic-Frlog reviewed the Student's mid-term test and compared it to U.G.'s mid-term test. She noted that the Student's answers to questions one and two contained extensive similarities to U.G.'s answers to questions one and two. As she observed, the answers feature largely identical ideas organized in a near verbatim manner, with occasional changes to word ordering and choice.

57. Based on these extensive similarities and given that there were many possible ways that students could have written these multi-paragraph answers, Professor Hinic-Frlog concluded that it was highly unlikely that the Student had written her mid-term test independently. Professor

Hinic-Frlog also noted that she met with the Student in late March of 2022 to discuss these allegations with her.

The Evidence of U.G.

58. In this hearing, the Provost tendered an affidavit sworn by U.G. (the “U.G. Affidavit”). In the U.G. Affidavit, U.G. states that he was also a student at the University of Toronto Mississauga at the material time and that he was enrolled in BIO 354 along with the Student in the Winter 2022 term. In the U.G. Affidavit, he acknowledges that he wrote the mid-term test in BIO 354 on February 17, 2022, and he admits that he wrote the mid-term test in collaboration with two other students, one of whom was the Student.

59. In the U.G. Affidavit, he admits that he and the Student wrote the mid-term test together by working together in a university library to locate sources for their answers and then by copying their answers from these sources directly into the mid-term test.

60. He also acknowledges that on October 4, 2022, he met with Dean’s Designate Michael Georges, to discuss the allegations that he obtained unauthorized assistance on his mid-term test in this course. During that meeting, he began by stating that he met with a fellow student before he wrote the mid-term test to discuss possible sources for answers to the mid-term but claimed that he did not share his answers with anyone. The Georges Affidavit repeats this statement and also reflects the fact that U.G. denied sharing his mid-term test answers with anyone and denied committing an academic offence in this meeting.

61. In the U.G. Affidavit, however, he now admits that the statements made to the Dean’s Designate were not true and that he and the Student both shared their answers for the mid-term test with each other as they had copied them directly from the same sources, and that he thereby

committed what constituted an academic offence. U.G. was made available as a witness in the hearing but the Panel had no questions for him.

The Dean's Designate Meeting

62. The Georges Affidavit reflects the fact that on September 22, 2022, Professor Georges held a Dean's Designate meeting with the Student to discuss the matters encompassed by these charges.

In that meeting, he reports that the Student responded to the allegations as follows:

- (a) she had completed the mid-term test herself;
- (b) she did not share her work with anyone;
- (c) she had worked on question one of her mid-term test in the library and was sitting with two other students while doing so: U.G., and a student referred to only as "M";
- (d) she was "brainstorming" with U.G. and M;
- (e) she had worked on question two of her mid-term at home;
- (f) she suspected that, while at the library, when she went to the washroom it may have been possible that someone took a picture of her handwritten notes that were left on the table; and
- (g) she denied committing an academic offence.

Finding Regarding the BIO 354 Charges

63. We must consider whether the Student "knowingly...obtained unauthorized assistance and/or...did something for the purpose of aiding or assisting another member...to obtain unauthorized assistance" when completing the mid-term test in this course. We are persuaded, on a balance of probabilities, that she committed this offence.

64. It was made clear to all students in BIO 354 that they were to answer the mid-term test using their own words and ideas, and there was no permission given to work in groups to reach the answers given. The instructions given for the test expressly state that “all your answers must be written in all your own words”.

65. We have reviewed the evidence appended to the Hinic-Frlog Affidavit, which includes copies of the Student’s answers to the two questions of this test, U.G.’s answers to the two questions of this test, and a chart comparing these answers. We agree with Professor Hinic-Frlog’s observation that “[t]he Student’s answers to questions one and two contained extensive similarities to [U.G.]’s answers to questions one and two. The answers feature largely identical ideas organized in a near verbatim manner, with occasional changes to word ordering and choice. Based on these extensive similarities, and given that there were many possible ways that students could have written these multi-paragraph answers, I concluded that it was highly unlikely that the Student wrote her mid-term test independently.”

66. This conclusion is reinforced by U.G.’s admission, as set out in the U.G. Affidavit, that he did, in fact, meet at a library to work with the Student to complete the test and that they had copied their answers directly from the same sources. U.G. made this admission even though it is likely to have disciplinary consequences for him, and he appeared at the hearing to be questioned about his admission, if required.

67. As discussed above, the Student did not appear at the hearing and did not tender any evidence to refute the BIO 354 charges. It appears, however, that in her meeting with the Dean’s Designate, she acknowledged that she had worked on the answers to this test at a library with U.G. and M. She further acknowledged that she had “brainstormed” with U.G. and M. at the library.

68. She told the Dean's Designate, however, that she only completed question one at the library, and that she completed the second question alone at home. With regard to the first question, she suggested that someone might have photographed her answer to this question without her knowledge while she was in the washroom.

69. We do not find this explanation of events to be plausible, particularly given that her answers to both the first and the second question strongly resemble those of U.G. In light of U.G.'s admissions, including his admission that he and the Student had copied their answers directly from library materials, and the evidence of Professor Hinic-Frlog, we conclude that the Student did more than "brainstorm" with U.G. and M. It is evident that she both received and gave unauthorized assistance in composing her answers to the mid-term test.

70. As the Panel observed in paragraph 19 of the case of *The University of Toronto v. M.L.* (Case No. 850, July 18, 2016), in cases alleging unauthorized assistance:

[i]t is not necessary for the Panel to decide whether it was the [accused student] or [another student] who drafted the original content of the Assignments, whether the students collaborated or whether the [accused student] copied [the other student's] Assignment or vice versa - all of these scenarios will attract a finding of guilt provided that we conclude that the Students collaborated or that [the other student] and/or the Student was aware that her/his work or the other's was being used for assistance.

71. We find that these observations apply with equal force to both to the JCP 221 Charges and the BIO 354 Charges. We therefore made a finding of guilt on Count 9. Count 10 was phrased as an alternative charge and we have treated it as withdrawn.

The SLA 100 Charges

72. In the Fall term of 2022, the Student enrolled in SLA 100 which was titled "Russian for Beginners". The Student enrolled in the evening section of this course which was taught by

Teaching Assistant Braxton Boyer under the supervision of Professor Julia Mikhailova. The Provost tendered affidavits sworn by Mr. Boyer (the “Boyer Affidavit”) and by Professor Mikhailova (the “Mikhailova Affidavit”).

73. The summary below is based on the information contained in the Boyer Affidavit and the Mikhailova Affidavit as well as information gained from the Panel’s questioning of Professor Mikhailova who, together with Mr. Boyer, was made available for questioning at the hearing. We had no questions for Mr. Boyer.

The Course and the Instructors

74. The academic backgrounds of Professor Mikhailova and Mr. Boyer (together, the “Instructors”) are relevant to the assessment of their evidence and can be summarized as follows: Mr. Boyer is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Toronto. He learned Russian as a second language and has an advanced proficiency in the language. He has been teaching Russian since 2017 and the Fall 2022 term was the third time that he had taught SLA 100. He is, therefore, familiar with what a beginner Russian speaker sounds like.

75. Professor Mikhailova’s native language is Russian. She has been teaching Russian since 1997. She obtained her Ph.D. in Slavic Linguistics and Pedagogy from the Ohio State University in 2005. Based on this background, she is also familiar with what a beginner Russian speaker sounds like.

76. SLA 100 is an entry-level Russian course that is intended for students who have no previous experience learning Russian. This was explicitly set out on page one of the course syllabus, which read: “[t]his course is for students who have no previous experience learning

Russian, and for whom Russian is a foreign language. No heritage speakers are allowed into this course”.

77. In addition to the statements contained in the course syllabus, Mr. Boyer affirmed that he communicated this prohibition to the students of SLA 100 during classroom sessions on several occasions.

Initial Concerns Regarding the Student’s Language Skills

78. Professor Mikhailova indicated, and Mr. Boyer confirmed, that there were initial concerns that the Student may have had a greater background knowledge of Russian and was not, in fact, a beginner student of the language. Mr. Boyer’s initial concerns were based on the Student’s pronunciation of Russian words, which he found did not sound like that of a beginner. In particular, he found that she simultaneously pronounced words very slowly while also reproducing Russian syllables in a uniformly accurate manner. Professor Mikhailova made the same observation of the Student’s performance in an oral test which she completed in mid-October of 2022.

79. Based on Mr. Boyer’s initial concerns, Professor Mikhailova asked the Student to take a Russian language placement test to assess the appropriate course level for her based on her knowledge of the Russian language. In mid-September 2022, she met with the Student to conduct this placement test. In this meeting, she reminded the Student that SLA100 is only available to students with no knowledge of the Russian language and that students with prior knowledge of the language are not permitted to enroll in the course.

80. In the placement test, she attempted to engage the Student in Russian conversation. The Student did not respond, but instead advised in English that she had no knowledge of Russian and

that she was learning the language “from zero.” The Student did admit to knowing two derogatory words in Russian: “Собака” (dog) and “блядь” (bitch). The Student explained that her Russian speaking mother would occasionally call her by these words but clarified that she had no other knowledge of the Russian language. Accordingly, the Student advised that she would be unable to complete the written portion of the placement test and did not do so.

81. Because of the Student’s professed lack of knowledge of the Russian language, the Student was permitted to remain enrolled in SLA 100.

82. As SLA 100 continued, however, both Professor Mikhailova and Mr. Boyer had the opportunity to review the Student’s oral and written work, and both formed the opinion that the Student was not a beginner Russian speaker and that her representation that she was learning the language “from zero” was not true. The evidence that we found most pertinent to this conclusion is summarized in some detail below.

The Student’s Written Course Work

83. The Instructors found that the Student’s written work often used grammatical structures that were not taught in SLA 100 and in particular, noun cases. They explained that, unlike in English, Russian nouns change depending on the grammatical role they play in sentences, generally via the alteration of the noun’s ending. In SLA 100, students were only taught four noun cases:

(a) the nominative case (used when a noun is the sentence’s subject);

(b) the accusative case (used when a noun is the sentence’s direct object);

(c) the prepositional case (used when a noun is used in conjunction with a preposition); and

(d) the genitive case (used to show that a noun is possessed or owned by another noun).

Test 1

84. On or around October 12, 2022, students in SLA 100 were required to write Test 1, which was worth 10% of the final mark in the course. One question contained in Test 1 asked students to write a long-form composition in Russian. The Student's answer to this question contained advanced grammar, phrases and vocabulary that both Instructors found to be well above the level of beginner Russian speaker and/or were not taught in SLA 100. In particular they noted the Student's use of the following phrases in her answer to this question:

(a) у тебя как дела: this phrase means "how are you." Students in SLA 100 were taught to write this phrase in a different order: как у тебя дела. The word ordering used by the Student is more colloquial and would not be expected from someone who learned Russian in a classroom setting;

(b) я делала: this phrase means "I did my homework" and uses the past tense. Students in SLA 100 did not learn the past tense of any verb;

(c) помогала брату: this phrase means "I helped my brother" and uses the dative noun case. This noun case is first introduced in the successor course SLA 101;

(d) мне надо домой: this phrase means "I need (to go) home." In SLA 100, students were taught to write this phrase in the following, more formal manner, which includes the verb "to go": Мне (I) надо (need) идти (to go) домой (home). As with помогала брату, this phrase uses the dative noun case which is not taught to SLA100 students and is taught in the successor course.

Test 2

85. On or around November 16, 2022, students in SLA 100 were required to write Test 2, which was worth 10% of the final mark in the course. One question contained in Test 2 asked students to write a long-form composition in Russian. The Student's answer to this question contained advanced grammar, phrases and vocabulary that both Instructors found to be well above the level of beginner Russian speaker and/or were not taught in SLA 100. In particular they noted the Student's use of the following phrases in her answer to this question:

(a) учу: this word means "I study." This word was not taught in SLA 100. Instead, students were taught the word изучаю, which means "to learn";

(b) Сложно: this word means "difficult" and was not taught in SLA 100. Instead, students were taught the word трудный, which is a synonym for difficult;

(c) быть доктором: this phrase means "I want to be a doctor" and uses the "instrumental" noun case, which was not taught in SLA 100 but is typically taught in intermediate Russian courses;

(d) гулять пешком: this phrase means "I walk on foot." It also uses the instrumental noun case which was not taught in SLA 100. This expression is colloquial and informal and the Instructors would not expect someone who learned Russian in a classroom setting to be familiar with it;

(e) я много сижу дома: this phrase means "I sit at home a lot." This phrase contains an adverb that was not taught in SLA 100 (много, meaning a lot) and, as with the phrase

“гулять пешком” described in subparagraph (d) above, is a colloquialism that the Instructors would not expect a beginner Russian speaker to know.

The Essay

86. Students in SLA 100 were required to submit an essay as part of their written course work. A draft version of the essay was due on November 24, 2022, and a final version was due on December 8, 2022, and was worth 8% of the final grade in the course. On or around November 24, 2022, the Student submitted her draft final essay. Once again, the Student’s essay contained advanced grammar, phrases and vocabulary that were far above the level of a beginner Russian speaker and were not taught in SLA 100. In particular, her essay contained the following phrases:

(a) Я из Ташкента; this phrase means “I am from Tashkent.” The word for “Tashkent” is written in the genitive noun case, which was not taught in SLA 100;

(b) не одна: this phrase means “not alone.” This expression was not taught in SLA 100;

(c) Я родилась в: this phrase means “I was born in”. This phrase was not taught in SLA 100, but is instead taught in the successor course;

(d) Я умею: this phrase means “I know how to do something.” This verb was not taught in SLA 100;

(e) Хожу: this word means “to go to.” This verb was not taught in the course because its conjugation is more complicated than the verb гулять (“to walk), which was taught in SLA 100; and

(f) умею: this phrase means “I know how to...” This phrase was not taught in SLA 100.

The Final Test

87. Students in SLA 100 were required to write a final test worth 33% of the final mark in the course. The final test was held in class and was conducted as a closed book test. In mid-December 2022, the Student wrote the final test. The final question of the final test asked students to write a long-form composition in Russian. Once again, the Student's answer to this question contained advanced grammar, phrases and vocabulary that were above the level of a beginner Russian speaker and were not taught in the course. In particular, the Student's essay contained the following phrases:

(a) Родилась: this phrase means “to be born.” Students in the course did not learn any verbs in this form;

(b) Могу: this word means “I am able” and it contains what is called a “consonant mutation” consonant ч (мочь to be able to, Infinitive) goes to г in I form (могу). Neither this word nor any consonant mutations were taught in SLA 100. This is instead taught in the successor course;

(c) на турецком: this phrase means “I speak Turkish” and uses the instrumental noun case, which was not taught in SLA 100;

(d) учу: this word means “I study.” This word was not taught in SLA 100. Instead, students were taught the word изучать, which means “to learn”;

(e) быстро бегая: this phrase means “I run quickly.” This expression was not taught in SLA 100;

(f) от вкусных ресторанов: this phrase means “from a tasty restaurant” and contains an adjective in the genitive case. This adjective case was not taught in SLA 100. Further, the noun ресторанов is in the genitive plural form. This was not taught in SLA 100 but is instead taught in the successor course;

(g) научиться: this phrase means “I want to learn how.” This phrase was not taught in SLA 100 and is instead introduced in more advanced Russian language courses at the University;

(h) братишка: this is a diminutive expression for “brother”. It is highly colloquial and, as far as the Instructors are aware, it is not taught in any of the University’s Russian-as-a-second-language courses;

(i) быстро: this word means “quickly.” This word was not taught in SLA 100. It is instead taught at the end of the successor course;

(j) мне нравится: this phrase means “I like.” This phrase uses the dative noun case, which was not taught in SLA 100; and

(k) от парка и рядом с метро: this phrase means “from a park and next to the subway.” This phrase uses the phrase “рядом с” which is a preposition that was not taught in SLA 100.

The Student’s Social Media Posts

88. Finally, Mr. Boyer located a Facebook page which appeared to belong to the Student, which he shared with Professor Mikhailova, and a screenshot of this page was attached to the Mikhailova Affidavit. Mr. Boyer took particular note of a post by the Student, dated August 24,

2020, containing a collage of pictures of her (or, at least, a child with the same name as the Student) and her classmates in her first grade class. This post read: “[t]ry to find me grade 1 😬😭 где мои волосы ? Ps. Бантик был прикреплѐн фотешопом.”

89. According to the Instructors, the text that follows the two emojis is in Russian and means: “Where is my hair? Ps. The little bow was attached with a photoshop.” Professor Mikhailova also noted that the collage contains several words and phrases in Russian.

90. While these Facebook posts are suggestive, we assigned little weight to this evidence as it did not seem that the Provost had established that this Facebook page did, indeed, belong to the Student, or that she had made the posts attributed to her.

Finding Regarding the SLA 100 Charges

91. The Provost urged us to make a finding that, in knowingly enrolling and completing SLA 100 even after she was advised that only those with no prior knowledge of Russian were eligible to do so, the Student had violated section B.I.1(a) of the Code, as set out in Count 11. The Provost suggested that her concealment of “evidence of her knowledge of the Russian language” constituted a knowing falsification of “evidence required by the University”. We, however, were not persuaded that the Student’s prior knowledge of Russian constituted “evidence” in the sense intended by this provision and declined to make a finding of guilty on Count 11.

92. The alternative charge, Count 12, alleges that the Student “knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or...misrepresentation not otherwise described in the Code in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in connection with the assessments in SLA 100”.

93. The particulars associated with this charge allege that the Student falsely claimed during the placement test with Professor Mikhailova that she had no knowledge of oral or written Russian. They also assert that she “knowingly claimed to be a beginner Russian speaker, when [she was] not, so that [she] could use her more advanced Russian language skills to obtain an academic advantage”, and that her advanced skills gave her an academic advantage in all of the course work that she submitted. We find that the Provost has made out all of these allegations on a balance of probabilities.

94. In particular, we find that the Student was advised on multiple occasions, beginning with the course syllabus, that SLA100 was intended for beginners only, and that students with more advanced Russian language skills were not permitted to enroll in or to complete the course for credit. It is also clear that the Student made a direct misrepresentation to Professor Mikhailova in stating that she had no background knowledge of Russian other than two specific words used by her mother.

95. We equally find, based on the numerous examples enumerated under the headings of “Test 1”, “Test 2”, “The Essay” and “The Final Test” above, that the Student possessed Russian language skills and knowledge that went well beyond what a true beginner would have. While a few examples of advanced phrasings or more complicated grammatical constructions might be explained as fortuitous or the result of advanced or additional study, the sheer number of examples provided by the Instructors render such explanations exceedingly unlikely. In addition, we considered the evidence of both Instructors that the Student’s oral Russian, while slow in pace, was produced with perfect pronunciation. This strongly suggested that her Russian language skills were, in fact, quite advanced.

96. Because she did not participate in the hearing, we have no evidence from the Student regarding her position on these charges, nor any possible explanations that she may have offered for these events.

97. Based on the evidence summarized above, however, we find that she perpetuated the misrepresentation of her Russian language skills to Professor Mikhailova by remaining enrolled in the course and in completing all of the course work for credit even after she had been clearly informed that only those with no prior knowledge of Russian were eligible to do so. We infer that her motive for doing so was to gain an academic advantage in the course. Indeed, the Boyer Affidavit established that the Student obtained a grade of “A+” in all of the written work discussed above. We therefore made a finding of guilt on Count 12.

D. Sanction

98. Counsel indicated that the sanctions sought by the Provost in this case include: a mark of zero in all of the courses discussed above, a recommendation that the Student be expelled from the University, and an immediate suspension of the Student for up to five years pending the outcome of the decision regarding expulsion.

99. As additional evidence relating to the requested sanction, the Provost tendered a further affidavit from Lisa Devereaux (the “Devereaux Sanction Affidavit”). In the Devereaux Sanction Affidavit, she reports that the University’s discipline records reveal the fact that the Student had committed one prior academic offence in ANT102H5F, Introduction to Sociocultural and Linguistic Anthropology (“ANT 102”) in Summer 2020.

100. Specifically, on February 23, 2021, the Student admitted that she obtained unauthorized assistance on three quizzes and one term test worth a total of 55% of the final grade in ANT 102.

Based on an attached letter summarizing the offence, it appears that the Student committed this academic misconduct in collaboration with U.G., the same student with whom she is alleged to have collaborated in the BIO 354 charges.

101. When determining the appropriate sanction in a given case, the Tribunal should generally consider the factors set out in the decision of the *University of Toronto and Mr. C.* (Case No. 1976/77-3, November 5, 1976), namely (a) the character of the person charged; (b) the likelihood of a repetition of the offence; (c) the nature of the offence committed; (d) any extenuating circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence; (e) the detriment to the University occasioned by the offence; and (f) the need to deter others from committing a similar offence.

102. Mr. Shah addressed each of these factors and placed particular stress on the repetitive nature of the Student's offences, which were all of a serious nature and which carried on over an extended period of time. He stressed that the Student continued to commit new academic offences even after she had been caught out in prior offences and was advised of the consequences of such conduct. He tendered a timeline of her offences which we found helpful and we have slightly modified and attached to these reasons as Appendix "A".

103. While the Student initially engaged with the discipline process, and signed an agreed statement of facts with regards to two sets of charges, she denied the remaining charges and ultimately failed to appear at the hearing. She therefore did not provide any additional mitigating or character evidence in her own defence.

104. Mr. Shah also tendered or referenced several prior discipline cases where the penalties imposed had included a recommendation of expulsion from the University. We have reviewed

these cases and find that they consider repeated offences that are of comparable severity and duration to those committed by the Student.

105. As an example, the case of the *University of Toronto v. H.W.* (Case No. 1486, August 8, 2024), the panel considered the actions of a student who committed 11 offences over three academic years. This type of repeated academic offence presents a high likelihood of further violations of the Code. As that panel observed:

[t]here is a serious risk that the Student would offend again, given the opportunity to do so. The Student committed his first offences in 2020. The Student admitted that he received unauthorized assistance in relation to two term tests. The Student proceeded to use unauthorized assistance by googling answers, using Chegg and copying from other students over five courses in 2021 and 2022. The risk that the Student will offend again, given this pattern of serial cheating is palpable.

106. We also found the case of the *University of Toronto v. L.Y.* (Case No. 479, June 22, 2009) helpful, in that it considered the case of a student who committed two sets of plagiarism and unauthorized assistance offences in sequence. The panel in that case emphasized the danger of recidivism that such facts presented as follows:

[u]niversity counsel submitted that a further aggravating factor was the timing of the offence. That is, on July 27, 2006 there was a meeting in respect of a plagiarism charge, which the student admitted, in another course. On August 10, 2006, a letter was sent (although there was no evidence available to the Panel about the date on which it was received) indicating that the sanction for that plagiarism would be a 10% reduction in the course mark. Nonetheless, on August 22, 2006, the student engaged in a further academic offence by possessing an unauthorized aid in an economics examination. On February 27, 2007, the student met with Professor Graham about that use of unauthorized aid. Yet, on April 18, 2007, about six weeks later, the student engaged in a further academic offence in the philosophy examination.

107. As that panel summarized later in their reasons, their concern was with “the timing of the offences (each offence occurred after a previous offence had been brought to the attention of the student)”. That same concern is raised by the Student’s conduct in this case.

108. Finally, in the case of the *University of Toronto v T.K.* (Case No. 614, January 26, 2011), which involved four charges of plagiarism, the Tribunal recommended expulsion and said:

[t]here are no extenuating circumstances. In light of the student's disciplinary history indicating repeated plagiarisms, there is every likelihood that the student will repeat the offence. This type of conduct is highly detrimental to the reputation of the University. It must be made clear to the public that the University will take all reasonable steps to protect its reputation and the integrity of its academic process. The students of the University must be discouraged from attempting such conduct and be made aware that the University will impose severe sanctions.

109. The same could certainly be said of this Student's two counts of obtaining unauthorized assistance, two counts of plagiarism, one count of concocting references and one count of academic misconduct not otherwise described in the Code. These repeated offences of dishonesty must be denounced, and they require the strongest available sanctions in order to deter others.

110. At the conclusion of the hearing, and for the reasons outlined above, we therefore signed an order:

1. requiring that the Student shall receive a final grade of zero in:
 - (a) BIO 207 in Winter 2021;
 - (b) JCP 221 in Winter 2021;
 - (c) BIO 202 in Summer 2021;
 - (d) BIO 354 in Winter 2022; and
 - (e) SLA 100 in Fall 2022;
2. recommending to the President of the University that the President recommend to Governing Council that the Student be expelled from the University; and

3. requiring that the Student be immediately suspended from the University for a period of up to five years from the date of our order or until Governing Council makes its decision on expulsion, whichever comes first, and requiring that a corresponding permanent notation be placed on the Student's academic record and transcript.

111. We also added the standard requirement that this case be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the decision of the University Tribunal and the sanctions imposed with the name of the Student withheld.

Dated at Toronto, this 21st day of November, 2024

Amended on this 18th day of December 2024

Original signed by:

Alexandra Clark, Chair
On behalf of the Panel

Appendix “A” – Timeline of Offences

February 23, 2021	The Student admitted to committing academic misconduct on several assessments in ANT 102.
April 3, 2021	The Student committed academic misconduct on her case study assignment in BIO 207.
April 12, 2021	The Student committed academic misconduct on her assignment in JCP 221.
April 20, 2021	The Student exchanged emails with JCP 221 instructor to discuss allegations of academic misconduct in connection with JCP 221.
May 6, 2021	The Student attended a meeting with BIO 207 instructor to discuss allegations of academic misconduct in connection with BIO 207.
June 11, 2021	The Student committed academic misconduct on her lab report in BIO 202.
June 15, 2021	The Student attended a meeting with BIO 202 instructor to discuss allegations of academic misconduct in connection with BIO 202.
September 14, 2021	The Student attended a meeting with the Dean’s Designate to discuss allegations of academic misconduct in connection with BIO 207, BIO 202 and JCP 221.
February 17, 2022	The Student committed academic misconduct on her mid-term test in BIO 354.
Late March 2022	The Student attended a meeting with BIO 354 instructor to discuss allegations of academic misconduct in connection with BIO 354.
September 20, 2022	The Student attended a meeting with the Dean’s Designate to discuss allegations of academic misconduct in connection with BIO 354.
Fall 2022	The Student committed academic misconduct in SLA 100.