

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty filed on February 7, 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 am. S.O. 1978, c. 88

B E T W E E N:

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

H [REDACTED] XI

REASONS FOR DECISION

Date of Hearing: July 18, September 24, and November 20, 2024, via Zoom.

Members of the Panel:

Sarah Whitmore, Chair
Professor Susanna Chow, Faculty Panel Member
James Wang, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

William Webb, Assistant Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP

Hearing Secretary:

Karen Bellinger, Associate Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances

In Attendance:

H [REDACTED] XI

Introduction

1. A hearing before the University Tribunal (the “Tribunal”) was convened on July 18, September 24, and November 20, 2024, via Zoom, to consider the Charges (as defined below) brought by the University of Toronto (the “University”) against the Student, H[REDACTED] X[REDACTED] (the “Student”) under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 2019* (the “Code”).

The Charges

2. The charges against the Student (the “Charges”) are as follows:

1. On or about December 7, 2023, you knowingly used and/or possessed an unauthorized aid or aids and/or obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with a term test in ECO220Y1Y, and/or attempted to do so, contrary to sections B.I.1(b) and/or B.II.2 of the Code.
2. In the alternative, on or about December 7, 2023, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in connection with a term test in ECO220Y1Y, or attempted to do so, contrary to sections B.I.1(d) and/or B.II.2 of the Code.
3. In the alternative, on or about December 7, 2023, 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 term test in ECO220Y1Y, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the Code.

Particulars

3. The particulars of the offences charged are as follows:

1. At all material times you were a student enrolled at the University of Toronto, Faculty of Arts and Science.

2. In Fall 2023, you enrolled in ECO220Y1Y: Introduction to Data Analysis and Applied Econometrics, which was taught by Professor Jennifer Murdock.
3. Students in the course were required to write a term test, which was worth 16% of their final grade. Students were prohibited from using and/or possessing aids and/or obtaining assistance on the term test.
4. On or about December 7, 2023, you wrote and submitted the term test.
5. During the term test, you used and/or possessed:
 - (a) a camera and/or other electronic device(s) to transmit video footage and/or images of the term test to another individual or individuals from whom you obtained or attempted to obtain assistance in connection with the term test; and/or
 - (b) an earpiece and/or other electronic device(s) to transmit and/or receive audio from another individual or individuals from whom you obtained or attempted to obtain assistance in connection with the term test.
6. You knew or ought to have known that, in connection with the term test:
 - (a) you were not permitted to use and/or possess a camera, an earpiece, and/or other electronic device(s); and/or
 - (b) you were not permitted to obtain assistance from others.
7. You wrote and submitted the term test:
 - (a) to obtain academic credit;
 - (b) knowing that it contained ideas, expressions of ideas or work that were not your own, but were the ideas, expressions of ideas or work of others; and
 - (c) knowing that you did not properly reference the ideas, expressions of ideas or work that you drew from others.
8. You paid a tutor, a tutoring company, and/or others to assist you with the term test.
9. You knowingly submitted or intended to submit the term test with the intention that the University rely on it as containing your own ideas or work in considering the appropriate academic credit to be assigned to your work.

Evidence

4. The evidence tendered at the hearing by the University consisted of two affidavits, one from Professor Jennifer Murdock, a Professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Toronto and the Students Professor in ECO220Y1Y, and one from Laurie O'Handley, an Academic Integrity Specialist at the University of Toronto.

5. While given the opportunity to do so, the Student chose not to cross-examine Professor Murdock or Ms. O'Handley.

6. On cross-examination, the Student accepted that Professor Murdock and Ms. O'Handley's affidavits were accurate with one exception in Professor Murdock's affidavit, noted below. On that basis, the Panel accepted the evidence of Professor Murdock and Ms. O'Handley. The summary of events set out below is therefore drawn from Professor Murdock and Ms. O'Handley's affidavits.

The Course

7. The Student was a student in ECO220Y1Y in Fall 2023 when Professor Murdock taught the course. Students in the course were required to write four term tests (worth 16%, 16%, 14%, and 14%, respectively), participate in class workshops (worth 8%), complete several practicums (worth 8%), and write a final exam (worth 24%).

8. The Student attended all course workshops in September and October 2023. During that time, he completed most of the in-class practicums. The Student also wrote and submitted Term Test 1 in-person on October 27, 2023. He received a grade of 21/95 (22.1%) on Term Test 1.

9. The Student attended some course workshops in November and December 2023. During that time, he completed all of the in-class practicums.

Term Test 2

10. Term Test 2 was scheduled for December 7, 2023, in-person. Leading up to Term Test 2, Professor Murdock posted announcements to the course page on Quercus about the Term Test. These included a warning about academic integrity, which Professor Murdock had also posted on Quercus prior to Term Test 1. The warning read in part: Make sure to completely turn off and shut down all electronic devices and put them in your bag.

11. In addition to these warnings about academic integrity posted to Quercus in advance of the Term Tests, the syllabus for ECO220Y1Y contained a warning about academic integrity that stated: "Please do not create a horrible situation for yourself, your classmates, our TAs, and me. Even if you are suffering stress, under extreme pressure, far behind, facing failure, and/or lacking self-confidence, cheating is not worth it. Infractions can take many, many agonizing months to resolve and sanctions can be severe. We must all work together supporting the integrity of our course and U of T."

12. While the syllabus for ECO220Y1Y made various references to the resources available to students who needed help with the course material, including ways to obtain assistance from Professor Murdock, the Student did not seek out any assistance from Professor Murdock at any point in Fall 2023.

13. On December 7, 2023, while Term Test 2 was underway, Professor Murdock observed that the Students behaviour was odd. He was not writing, reading, or engaging with the Test. He appeared calm. This struck Professor Murdock as similar to behaviour she had observed in other students she had caught attempting to use miniature cameras and earpieces to obtain answers from others during in-person tests and exams. As a result, Professor Murdock asked a teaching assistant to keep an eye on the Student.

14. Shortly thereafter, a teaching assistant reported to Professor Murdock that the Student was wearing a large black button on the front of his shirt. At approximately 7:02 p.m., Professor Murdock approached the Student, who was sitting in the back row of the exam room, and she saw the large black button on his shirt that looked similar to the

miniature cameras Professor Murdock had seen in the other cases where she had caught students cheating.

15. When Professor Murdock approached the Student, he attempted to hide the large black button by attempting to pull it down, but Professor Murdock intercepted the button, which was, in fact, a miniature camera.

16. Professor Murdock then confiscated the following items from the Student:

- a) A miniature camera that was disguised as a button;
- b) A tiny microphone on a wired loop that was concealed in the Student's hair;
- c) An "HD Camera Pro 4G LTE Invisible Communication" device (the "Hub") which was turned on, and a strap that attached the Hub to the Student's body; and
- d) Left- and right-hand control buttons with wires that connected to the Hub; and
- e) A small earpiece that was placed in the Student's ears.

Collectively the "Confiscated Devices"

17. After retrieving the Confiscated Devices from the Student, Professor Murdock required the Student to remain in the exam room until 7:30 p.m. and permitted him to continue working on the Term Test. At approximately 7:30 p.m., the Student handed in his Term Test, which was largely blank. The Student's answers were incorrect, and he received a 0% on Term Test 2.

18. After the exam, and after Professor Murdock advised the Student that she would be referring the matter to the Student Academic Integrity office and that she would get back to him on whether she could return the Confiscated Devices, the Student returned to the exam room. Professor Murdock was alone in the exam room. The Student was accompanied by a man that Professor Murdock did not know. The Student asked Professor Murdock to return the Confiscated Devices.

19. Professor Murdock's evidence was that at this point in the evening she was scared, because she had already told the Student that she would need to get back to him about returning the Confiscated Devices, she was alone at night, and she did not know the man the Student had brought with him. This was the only evidence of Professor Murdock's that the Student disputed.

20. The Students evidence on this point was that the man was simply his roommate and there was no ill intent in his request to have the Confiscated Devices returned that evening. Nothing turns on this evidence and therefore the Panel makes no findings of fact on the identity of the man who accompanied the Student to request the return of the Confiscated Devices on the evening of December 7, 2023.

21. Professor Murdock submitted a report of the events relating to the Students possession of the Confiscated Devices at Term Test 2 to the Student Academic Integrity office shortly after Term Test 2.

The Dean's Designate Meeting

22. On December 13, 2023, the Student Academic Integrity office wrote to the Student requesting that he attend a Dean's Designate meeting to discuss the allegations in Professor Murdock's report that he committed an academic offence in connection with Term Test 2 (the "Dean's Designate Meeting"). The Meeting occurred on January 16, 2024, with the Student and Professor Graeme Hirst, a Dean's Designate for academic integrity. Ms. O'Handley attended the meeting as well.

23. At the Dean's Designate Meeting, the Student confirmed that (i) he had read the December 13, 2023 letter about the alleged offence, (ii) he had read the Code, and (iii) he had met with his registrar. Professor Hirst also read the dean's warning in the Code and explained to the Student that it was alleged that during Term Test 2, Professor Murdock found the Student using spy wear or wearing a hidden camera to cheat on the Test.

24. In response to Professor Hirst's request that the Student give his "side of the story", the Student explained as follows: he was sorry for his "mistake"; he had a camera on his shirt; he took photos of the exam questions; somebody would help give him the answers; somebody gave him the answers, but he was too nervous and afraid, and he did not use it; he was nervous and wanted to quit when he came into the exam room but he could not quit; he could not leave because his exam paper said that he could only leave the exam room after 60 minutes; he did not use it as he was so nervous; and Professor Murdock caught him with the camera around 30 minutes into the test.

25. The Student further explained at the Dean's Designate Meeting that he had the Confiscated Devices on during the Term Test but did not use them. The Student also explained that he had received the camera for free from a man who contacted him on WeChat offering to help him pass exams.

26. The Student said he found ECO220Y1Y very hard; he had a fever; his parents wanted him to pass the course; he was worried that he could not pass the Term Test; he did not want to disappoint his parents and therefore he made a "wrong decision" to wear the camera, and he was sorry.

27. In response to a question from Professor Hirst, the Student agreed that by wearing the Confiscated Devices to Term Test 2 he committed an academic offence.

The Student's Evidence

28. The Student gave *viva voce* evidence at the hearing. The Student's evidence was that his actions in deciding to bring the Confiscated Devices into Term Test 2 were intentional and he described these actions as "cheating". Nevertheless, he explained that he did not intend to interfere with the fairness or integrity of Term Test 2.

29. The Student confirmed that he understood the content of the course syllabus for ECO220Y1Y, including the warning about academic integrity. However, the Student explained that due to his mental health his judgment was impaired, and he brought the

Confiscated Devices into Term Test 2. However, the Student further explained that he did not obtain any answers through use of the Confiscated Devices.

30. The Student also explained that he felt that he had been victimized by the man he met on WeChat who provided him with the Confiscated Devices.

31. In support of his position on liability that he had not committed an academic offence, the Student sought to introduce medical evidence relating to his mental health and the impact this had on his judgment and whether he knew or ought to have known that bringing the Confiscated Devices into Term Test 2 was an offence. The Student also sought to rely on this medical evidence in support of an argument that he ought to receive a reduced penalty in the event liability was established.

32. On July 18, 2024, the Panel ordered that if the Student intended to rely on the medical evidence at the hearing, he was required to (i) comply with the *Rules of Practice and Procedure* (the “Rules”), including rules 77, 78 and 79 regarding expert or medical witnesses, (ii) provide to the Provost a copy of the clinical notes and records of any medical expert or treating physician for which a report has been provided no later than 10 days prior to the hearing, (iii) provide certified English translations of any expert or medical documents on which the Student intends to rely at the hearing, (iv) ensure the attendance of the expert(s) and/or treating physician(s) at the hearing. The July 18, 2024 Order further provided that if the Student failed to comply with any of these terms, he would not be entitled to rely on the medical evidence.

Admissibility of the Student’s Medical Evidence

33. The Student did not comply with the July 18, 2024 Order. He did not comply with the requirements of rules 77, 78, or 79 of the Rules. Instead, the Student simply provided Assistant Discipline Counsel with three medical notes he sought to rely on.

34. The first note the Student sought to rely on purported to be from a doctor in China dated November 2023. This note was not in English, but a translation was provided. The

second note was dated August 6, 2024. This note is in English and appears to be from the University Health Network in Toronto. The third note is dated April 2, 2024. This note is also in English and appears to be from a University of Toronto clinic. None of the authors of the three notes were made available to be questioned about the contents of the notes.

35. On the basis of the Student's failure to comply with the July 18, 2024 Order, there was a sufficient basis for the Panel to refuse to permit the Student to rely on the medical evidence. In the alternative, the Panel also refused to admit the medical evidence for the reasons that follow.

36. Each of the three notes that the Student sought to have admitted as medical evidence are hearsay. The appropriate analysis for admissibility of these notes is therefore to weigh the probative value of the evidence against its prejudicial effect. Only the first note has possible probative value as it is dated around the time period of Term Test 2 and the Student's position was that these notes would be relied upon in support of his position that he did not know nor ought to have known that bringing the Confiscated Devices into Term Test 2 was an offence. The second and third notes are dated several months after Term Test 2 and make no reference to historical symptoms or to symptoms the Student was suffering at the time of Term Test 2. Further, none of the notes offer any clear and specific information about a medical condition that the Student was suffering at the time of Term Test 2 that may have impacted his judgment or otherwise have been a factor in the Panel's assessment of this matter.

37. As set out in prior cases of the Discipline Appeal Board in the *University of Toronto and W.K.*, (Case No. 719, February 20, 2018) and of the Tribunal in the *University of Toronto and Y.Y.*, (Case No. 851, March 1, 2017 (Sanction)) medical documents that are missing key information and that are not supported by the testimony of the author can give very little assistance in determining an appropriate sanction. We agreed with this conclusion in the present matter. None of the notes provided any clear and specific evidence relating to an illness that the Student was suffering at the time of Term Test 2

and what role, if any, that illness may have played in respect of his guilt or in respect of whether his illness was a mitigating factor.

38. On the other hand, there would be serious prejudice were the Panel to admit the three notes into evidence. There are no *curricula vitae* provided for the authors of any of the notes nor were any of the authors present at the hearing to be questioned. In the result, the University would have no opportunity to test whether the authors agree that the observations recorded in the notes are relevant to the arguments that the Student intended to advance in reliance on the notes.

39. On the basis of the above, the Panel decided not to admit the three notes that the Student sought to rely on as medical evidence.

Reasons for Decision on Count 1

40. There are two elements in the offence set out in section B.I.1(a) of the Code: (1) that the Student used and/or possessed unauthorized aids and/or obtained unauthorized assistance, or attempted to do so, in connection with Term Test 2 and (2) that the Student knew or ought to have known of the offence.

41. On the first element of the offence, the Student admits that he had the Confiscated Devices with him during Term Test 2. The University also tendered uncontested evidence from Professor Murdock of photographs of the Student with the Confiscated Devices during Term Test 2.

42. The Student also accepted Professor Murdock's evidence that electronic devices were prohibited. The Student testified at the hearing that he was not sure whether or not the earpiece and microphone were electronic devices. The Panel does not accept this explanation as it defies common sense and logic.

43. Finally, the Panel draws an inference based on the nature of the Confiscated Devices, which according to the research of Ms. O'Handley, which was uncontested, are

marketed as devices that enable cheating on in-person tests and examinations. The circumstances in which the Student explained that he procured the Confiscated Devices through the man on WeChat and the reason the Student wore the Confiscated Devices was to permit him the possibility to obtain unauthorized assistance on Term Test 2.

44. On the basis of these facts and admissions from the Student, the Panel was persuaded on a balance of probabilities that the Student possessed unauthorized aids in connection with Term Test 2.

45. On the second element of the offence, the Student gave contradictory evidence. At the hearing, the Student testified that he did not understand that possessing the Confiscated Devices impacted the fairness or integrity of Term Test 2 nor did he understand that it was contrary to the Code to do so. He also testified that he did not understand that the Confiscated Devices were forbidden. The Panel does not accept this evidence and finds instead that the Student did know, or ought to have known, that possessing the Confiscated Devices was an offence.

46. The Student's evidence at the hearing that he did not know he was prohibited from bringing the Confiscated Devices into Term Test 2 was not credible. The Panel comes to this conclusion on the basis of the below summary of his evidence and in reliance on the decision of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice in *Metro Ontario Real Estate Ltd. v. Hillmond Investments Ltd.*, 2024 ONSC 2625. In that case, the Court set out factors that are relevant to assessing credibility, many of which are useful to the Panel in this case. The Court adopted reasons of the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Phillips et al. v. Ford Motor Co. of Canada Ltd. et al.*, [1971] 2 O.R. 637 (C.A.), which are useful in describing the exercise involved in assessing credibility:

The credibility of interested witnesses, particularly in cases of conflict of evidence, cannot be gauged solely by the test of whether the personal demeanour of the particular witness carried conviction of the truth. The test must reasonably subject his story to an examination of its consistency with the probabilities that surround the currently existing conditions. In short, the real test of the truth of the story of a witness in such a case must be its harmony with the preponderance of the probabilities which a practical and informed person would readily recognize as reasonable in that place and in those conditions.

47. The factors from the *Metro Ontario Real Estate Ltd.* case that assisted the Panel in assessing the Student's credibility included: (i) that his evidence was not internally consistent, logical, or plausible; and (ii) the absence of any independent evidence to confirm the Student's evidence. The Student's evidence was not logical and was internally inconsistent with his own actions.

48. First, the Student went to lengths to hide the Confiscated Devices during Term Test 2. The Student agreed on cross-examination that he hid mini earpieces in his ears, he hid the microphone in his hair, and he hid the camera as a button on his shirt. The Panel finds that the logical and common-sense explanation for why the Student hid the Confiscated Devices was because he knew he could not have them with him during the exam.

49. Second, the Student admitted at the Dean's Designate Meeting that he possessed the Confiscated Devices during Term Test 2, and he acknowledged that doing so was "cheating" and "wrong". At the hearing, the Student agreed that he had made those statements at the Dean's Designate Meeting, but he tried to walk them back by explaining that while he knew it was "wrong" to have the Confiscated Devices with him during the exam, he was "not fully aware of the consequences." He also explained that he was suffering from a medical condition at the time that impacted his judgment and memory.

50. As set out above, there was no admissible medical or expert evidence to support this latter explanation from the Student. On the former point, for the second element of the offence to be met, the Student did not need to be "fully aware of the consequences." It was sufficient for him to know that it was wrong for him to have the Confiscated Devices with him during Term Test 2. Nevertheless, that explanation was many months after the Dean's Designate Meeting where he had given the opposite evidence. The fact that he was "not fully aware of the consequences" does not explain why he acknowledged that what he had done was "cheating" at the Dean's Designate Meeting.

51. Third, the Student sent an email on January 4, 2024 to Professor Murdock and the Student Academic Integrity Team. In that email, the Student wrote "I know it goes against

academic integrity” when referring to his possession of the Confiscated Devices during Term Test 2. At the hearing the Student attempted to suggest that while he knew possessing the Confiscated Devices was against academic integrity, he was not aware of the consequences of this conduct. Again, this misses the point. It is not relevant to the Panel’s assessment on liability whether or not the Student knew the consequences of the misconduct.

52. Finally, the Student’s evidence was that he was not aware of, and did not check, the various statements concerning Term Test 2 and academic integrity more generally published by Professor Murdock. On this basis, the Student was recklessly indifferent to the academic integrity requirements for Term Test 2. His reckless indifference to the offence also meets the second element of the offence.

53. On the basis of the above, the Panel was persuaded on a balance of probabilities that the Student knew or ought to have known that his possession of the Confiscated Devices in connection with Term Test 2 was an offence.

54. The Panel therefore made a finding of guilt on Count 1 and the University withdrew Count 2 and Count 3.

Reasons for Decision on Penalty

55. The University submitted that the Tribunal should impose the following sanctions on the Student:

- a) a recommendation to the President of the University that the President recommend to the Governing Council that the Student be expelled from the University;
- b) an immediate suspension from the University of Toronto for a period of up to five years from the date of this Order or until Governing Council makes its decision on expulsion, whichever comes first, and that a corresponding

notation be placed on their academic record and transcript;

- c) a final grade of zero in ECO220Y1; and
- d) that this case shall 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.

56. The panel considered the foundational decision of *University of Toronto and Mr. C* (Case No. 1976/77-3, November 5, 1976) in assessing the sanction sought by the University. In particular, the panel turned its mind to the following factors:

- 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.

57. The University called the evidence of Ms. O'Handley at the hearing for its relation to the sanctions sought. Ms. O'Handley's evidence demonstrated that the Student had committed two offences prior to the offence he was found to have committed in ECO220Y1 in this matter.

58. The timing of these prior offences is relevant and concerning as the Student had been sanctioned prior to committing the offences at issue in this matter. As a result, the Student had been previously warned about academic integrity and the consequences of

violations of the Code. These facts suggest that the Student's likelihood of committing a further offence is serious and must be factored into his penalty.

59. The fact of, and timing of, the prior offences the Student committed also suggests that the Student has no demonstrated insight into the nature of his actions and that he has not taken responsibility for the serious violations of the Code that he has undertaken.

60. With respect to the nature of the Student's offence in this matter, obtaining unauthorized assistance is an offence that is on the most serious end of the spectrum of Code offences because this offence is a breach of the University's trust relationship with its students. Further, because this is a case involving real-time devices designed for cheating at an in-person exam, the Student had to undertake deliberate planning and subterfuge to bring the Confiscated Devices into Term Test 2 with him. This raises the seriousness of the offence.

61. Obtaining unauthorized assistance on a test or exam is, as noted, is an extremely serious offence. This offence harms the institution and the academic process. It is a serious breach of academic integrity and can be seen as an attempt to defraud the University. Obtaining, or planning to obtain, real-time assistance using tools such as the Confiscated Devices is "taking things to a new level" to quote from the Tribunal's decision in the *University of Toronto v. Q.C.* (Case No. 1505, November 24, 2023). Also, as noted by the Panel in that decision, "the fact that the Student was caught in this instance is a testament to Professor Murdock's vigilance in monitoring her students' progress and spotting anomalies."

62. The penalty for what occurred in this case must act as a general deterrent against the surreptitious behaviour that the Student engaged in. It must be serious.

63. The Panel concluded that there were no mitigating factors in this case. The Student bore the burden of demonstrating a mitigating factor and he failed to do so. The Panel did not admit the evidence that the Student sought to rely upon for his position that his penalty should be reduced on account of his mental health and lack of judgment. The Student did

not cooperate in the preparation of an agreed statement of facts and therefore, the University was required to expend significant resources investigating the charge and prosecuting it.

64. We note that the Student offered an apology. However, the Panel determined that even if it were an honest and earnest apology, the apology was not sufficient to be a mitigating factor. In any event, the Panel concluded that the apology was not earnest. Ms. O’Handley’s evidence demonstrated that the Student had offered a very similar apology in respect of one of the prior offences he committed only two months before he committed the offence in this matter in ECO220Y1.

65. The Student was found to have engaged in an extremely serious breach of academic integrity after very recently receiving warnings on academic integrity following prior offences he had committed. He had also very recently apologized for a prior breach of academic integrity. The Student’s conduct was premeditated and deliberate and meant to deceive the University. He went to a great deal of trouble to hide the Confiscated Devices, even if he did not ultimately use them. As a result, having regard to the above, and based on its review of similar cases presented by counsel for the University (including cases on personation which is akin to the conduct here where another person completes the academic work for a student or a student purchases academic work), the Tribunal’s decisions in the *University of Toronto v. S.Y.* (Case No. 1539, May 17, 2024) *University of Toronto v. J.O.* (Case No. 617, August 25, 2011), and *University of Toronto v. Z.Z.* (Case No. 862, August 23, 2016), the Panel agreed that the sanctions sought by the University are appropriate in the circumstances and therefore imposed the following sanctions on the Student:

- a) a recommendation to the President of the University that the President recommend to the Governing Council that the Student be expelled from the University;
- b) an immediate suspension from the University of Toronto for a period of up to five years from the date of this Order or until Governing Council makes

its decision on expulsion, whichever comes first, and that a corresponding notation be placed on their academic record and transcript; and

c) a final grade of zero in ECO220Y1.

66. This case shall 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 3rd day of March, 2025.

Original signed by:

Sarah Whitmore, Chair
On behalf of the Panel