



FOR INFORMATION

PUBLIC

OPEN SESSION

TO:	Academic Board
SPONSOR: CONTACT INFO:	Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances, (416) 946-7663, christopher.lang@utoronto.ca
PRESENTER: CONTACT INFO:	See Sponsor
DATE:	November 6, 2025 for November 13, 2025
AGENDA ITEM:	11b

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

University Tribunal, Information Reports, Fall, 2025.

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

The University Tribunal hears cases of academic discipline under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 2025* (the “Code”)¹ which are not disposed of under the terms of the Code by the Division.

Section 5.2.6 (b) of the *Terms of Reference* of the Academic Board provides for the Board to receive for information reports, without names, on the disposition of cases in accordance with the Code.

GOVERNANCE PATH:

1. Academic Board [for information] (November 13, 2025)

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

The last semi-annual report came to the Academic Board on May 29, 2025.

HIGHLIGHTS:

The purpose of the information package is to fulfill the requirements of the University Tribunal and, in so doing, inform the Board of the Tribunal’s work and the matters it considers, and the process it follows. It is not intended to create a discussion regarding individual cases, their specifics or the sanctions imposed,

¹ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm>

as these were dealt with by an adjudicative body with a legally qualified chair, bound by due process and fairness, and based on the record of evidence and submissions put before it by the parties.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications.

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:

- Information Reports of Tribunal Decisions under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 2025* (Fall 2025)

TRIBUNAL DECISIONS UNDER THE CODE OF BEHAVIOUR ON ACADEMIC MATTERS
(FALL 2025)

USED FORGED DOCUMENTS TO DEFER EXAMS

Suspension of four years; notation on the Student's transcript for five years; grades of zero in the courses; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student was found guilty of forgery by submitting three falsified Verification Of Illness or Injury ("VOI") Forms in support of a petition to defer final exams in three classes. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the sanctions, the Panel noted: the Student had no prior academic offences; the Student's lack of insight raised concerns about a potential repetition of the offence; the offence involved serious dishonesty regarding medical records; the offence implicated a third party; the Student purchased the forms, which is an aggravating factor; the need for deterrence is very important; there was no evidence of extenuating circumstances; the sanction is consistent with other cases with similar circumstances; and the University's failure to broadly publicize their change in policy regarding the need for VOIs to support petitions is a mitigating factor with respect to the sanction, as the Student's bad decision was made partly in response to a change in policy.

USED AN UNAUTHORIZED AID IN AN EXAM

Suspension of five years; notation on the Student's transcript until graduation; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to using a microphone with earpiece to obtain answers in an exam and agreed with the facts and the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: using spyware is one of the most egregious forms of cheating; it involves premeditation not only to hire the exam service, but to procure and wear the technology; the misconduct must be addressed and the sanction must be serious to properly reflect the seriousness of the misconduct and appropriately deter others; the presence of an agreed statement of facts and joint submission on penalty were significant mitigating factors; and the joint submission on penalty was not contrary to the public interest nor would it bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

HAD SOMEONE PERSONATE THEM DURING AN EXAM AND USED AN UNAUTHORIZED AID

Expulsion; suspension of up to five years from the date of the order or until Governing Council makes its decision, whichever comes first; corresponding notation on the Student's transcript; grades of zero in the courses; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student was found guilty of possession of an unauthorized aid (i.e. cell phone) during an exam in one course and hiring someone to personate them for an exam in a second

course. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the Provost's Guidance on Sanctions included a provision that a Tribunal would be requested to recommend that a student be expelled where the student had another student personate them in a test; the Student had neither cooperated with nor participated in the prosecution, so the panel was not provided with personal circumstances of the Student or other considerations in mitigation; not only did the Student have someone personate them, but they also committed the offence of unauthorized aid 8 months prior; and the sanction of expulsion was consistent with and justified by penalties imposed in similar cases.

NOTE: THE STUDENT APPEALED THE SANCTION – APPEAL DISMISSED

The Student appealed the penalty and sought to reduce the sanction to a suspension. In upholding the Trial Division's decision, the Discipline Appeals Board noted the following: personation is inherently premeditated; the case law makes it clear that it is one of the most serious offences, frequently punished with a recommendation of expulsion; where expulsion is not recommended, the penalty is normally a five-year suspension and usually the result of mitigating factors; however, there were no mitigating factors in this case; there was evidence before the Tribunal that there was a commercial element to both offences, which is an aggravating factor; the penalty imposed by the Tribunal was reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances; any early cooperation by the Student must be discounted by the Student's subsequent non-responsiveness and given little weight; and a recommendation of expulsion may be the appropriate penalty for personation even where mitigating circumstances are present.

PURCHASED AN ESSAY

Suspension of five years; notation on the Student's transcript for six years; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to purchasing an essay and agreed with the facts and the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and in imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the Student cooperated and participated in the academic discipline process; the Student did not have any prior offences; the risk of reoffending is less of a concern given the Student's proximity to graduation; purchasing a paper and knowingly representing the work as your own is one of the most egregious offences; the act of paying someone to complete an assignment is at odds with the academic assessment process; the purchase of the work was a deliberate decision that required planning and the commercial element causes serious detriment to the University; the purchase of a custom paper makes it very difficult for the University to detect, and fundamentally undermines the University's evaluative process; it is important to send a strong message that this type of misconduct cannot be tolerated; and, on review of the case law, the joint submission was reasonable.

POSSESSED AN UNAUTHORIZED AID IN TWO EXAMS

Suspension of three years, eight months; notation on the Student's transcript for slightly more than four years; grades of zero in the courses; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to using an unauthorized aid (i.e. cell phone) in two exams and agreed with the facts and the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the Student participated in the process and was present for the hearing; they admitted guilt, relieving the University from proving the elements of the offence; the Student had been facing mental health challenges; the Student was remorseful for their academic misconduct, recognized their mistakes, and took responsibility for their actions; the Student was near graduating, so the likelihood of repetition was low; the Student had two prior offences; and the joint submission falls in the range of similar cases and would not bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

FORGED A DOCUMENT TO DEFER AN EXAM

Suspension of two years; notation on the Student's transcript for three years; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student purchased and submitted a forged VOI Form to support their request for a deferred exam. The Student plead guilty and agreed with the facts and the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and in imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the Student admitted guilt and expressed regret very early in the process; they had no prior offences; the likelihood of repetition was low, as the Student was very close to completing their degree; given the seriousness of the offence, including the commercial element, it is important to drive home the message that this type of offence cannot be tolerated; the University's procedure for granting accommodations is undermined every time someone violates the process; and, on review of the case law, the joint submission was reasonable.

USED AN UNAUTHORIZED AID IN EXAMS IN EIGHT COURSES

Degree Recall and Cancellation; notation on the Student's transcript of five years; grades of zero in eight courses; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to using unauthorized aids in exams in eight courses by communicating answers over a phone and through a shared online document with other students. The Student agreed with the facts and the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the offences committed by the Student were serious and significant in that they were clear and repeated breaches of academic integrity; the Student was enrolled in a graduate program and had already benefitted from a longer academic career; the Student was enrolled in a health care program and therefore it was important that they have the necessary skills relating to their degree; the sanction must recognize the detriment to the University that

they have caused as well as the need to deter others from committing similar offences; the Student was given a great deal of credit for proactively bringing the issue of their academic misconduct to the attention of the University; they plead guilty and showed remorse, all of which was considered mitigating; the academic offences were committed during a stressful time in the Student's life; the risk of reoffending is low, as the Student's post-offence behaviour demonstrated that they clearly understood the importance of academic integrity; the notation length is at the lower end of the range, which recognized the level of cooperation and remorse and the fact that the misconduct did not involve greater consequences such as those where concoctions occur in research or publications; there have been similar fact patterns involving voluntary and unprompted admissions by graduate students, and in each of those cases, the degree was recalled; and the joint submission presented to the Panel was well situated within the ASF and within the range of sanctions for similar fact patterns.

POSSESSED AN UNAUTHORIZED AID IN AN EXAM

Suspension of five years; notation on the Student's transcript until graduation; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to using an unauthorized aid (button camera and earpiece) in an exam and agreed with the facts and the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the sanctions, the Panel noted the following: sanctions for this type of conduct range from expulsion to a five-year suspension; the Student engaged in an extremely serious breach of academic integrity which is deserving of a harsh sanction; their actions were completely premeditated and deliberate; the Student's apology was meaningful and insightful and demonstrated a genuine commitment to learning from their mistake and not repeating it in the future; the Student entered into an undertaking to complete academic success workshops; and the joint submission was not unconscionable or contrary to the public interest, nor would it bring the administration into disrepute.

USED UNAUTHORIZED AID IN TERM TEST

Suspension of four years; notation on the Student's transcript for five years; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student was found guilty of using an unauthorized aid in a term test, specifically using an online source. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the Student had a prior discipline history of three offences and received a suspension of one year for the last offence; the mental health challenges the Student mentioned in their Dean's Designate meeting were not established nor were they a mitigating factor; rehabilitation is of minor importance given the Student had not been registered since summer 2023 and their multiple prior incidents of academic dishonesty did not discourage them from committing this offence; the repeated use of unauthorized aids and, in particular, online technology websites which assist students to share answers for credit cannot be excused; general deterrence and public protection is paramount in this

case and requires a meaningful penalty; and a review of other decisions with similar circumstances would suggest that the requested penalty by the University is the minimum sanction in the given circumstances.

HAD SOMEONE PERSONATE THEM DURING AN EXAM AND FORGED A TCARD

Suspension of five years; notation on the Student's transcript for six years; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to having someone personate them during a deferred final exam and to forging a TCard with their name and student number that they used at the deferred final exam. The Student also agreed to the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the Student admitted the offence at the Dean's Meeting and cooperated and participated in the academic discipline process; the Student apologized and submitted a personal letter to the Panel; there was no record of prior offences, and the Student had the requisite number of credits required to graduate; impersonation is considered one of the most egregious offences and is also very hard to detect; as a result, such offences usually attract the highest of penalties, a five year suspension or expulsion; given the seriousness of the offence, it is important to send a strong message that this type of misconduct cannot be tolerated; the Panel did not find any extenuating circumstances, though the Student did raise some personal hardships they were experiencing at the time of the offence; and the Panel agreed that the recommended sanctions were reasonable and appropriate.

FOUND NOT GUILTY OF POSSESSING UNAUTHORIZED AIDS IN AN EXAM

The Student was alleged to have brought a smartwatch into an exam and to have written notes on their wrist. The evidence was that the items were discovered and removed prior to the commencement of the exam and before the Student had received their exam. The Panel found the Student not guilty, as they decided that the Student did not possess the unauthorized aids "in an academic examination" as required by the Code. The Panel also found that the Student did not attempt to commit unauthorized aid, as they found the Student did not have the intent to commit an offence. The Panel accepted the Student's evidence that they intended to put the smartwatch under their desk prior to the exam and that they wrote notes on their wrist as a coping mechanism for their mental health concerns and forgot to wash them off.

POSSESSED AN UNAUTHORIZED AID IN AN EXAM

Suspension of five years; notation on the Student's transcript for 7 years; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to using an unauthorized aid, specifically a button camera and miniature earpiece, in an exam and agreed with the facts and the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the Student participated in the discipline process, admitted guilt, and was

remorseful for the misconduct they committed; they understood the importance of academic integrity and learned from their mistake; they are near to graduating, so the likelihood of repetition is low; the use of a button camera is a significant issue for the University and a penalty which is just short of expulsion is warranted and is an important deterrent; and the penalty submitted falls within the range of similar cases and is reasonable.

PLAGIARISED AN ESSAY

Suspension of five years; notation on the Student's transcript until graduation; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to purchasing an essay and agreed with the facts and the proposed sanction. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the sanctions, the Panel noted the following: The Student had five prior academic offences over three years; the past misconduct was in part due to the Student's symptoms of their undiagnosed ADHD; the Student acknowledged the impact of their diagnosis and took steps to address it; but for the extenuating circumstances, the risk of repetition of the offence is high; the Student did not intend to plagiarize, but the misconduct was the outcome of their inability to organize their thoughts; the repeated misconduct undermines the confidence placed by the community in the University processes and the degrees it confers; the lengthy suspension was intended to make clear that instances of plagiarism, especially with this type of discipline history, will not be countenanced; and the sanction was consistent with other cases with similar circumstances.

USED FORGED DOCUMENTS TO DEFER EXAMS

Suspension of five years; notation on the Student's transcript until graduation; grades of zero in the courses; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student was found guilty of purchasing and submitting four forged VOI forms and supporting documentation to support their requests for deferred exams in three courses. In finding the Student guilty and in imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: failing to admit the allegations and cooperate with the University are not aggravating factors; the Student broke the honour code that is essential to modern learning and committed a serious form of misconduct; students must learn that this kind of misconduct will have serious repercussions so that they will be dissuaded from the temptation to use false and/or forged documents; the Student committed the offences knowingly and deliberately; there were no significant mitigating factors, so the need to deter the Student and others from committing similar offences weighs heavily in the circumstances of the case; the fact that there was a commercial element is an aggravating factor; given that this was a first offence, a five-year suspension was sufficient to deter the Student and others.

USED FORGED DOCUMENTS TO DEFER TWO EXAMS

Suspension of two years, five months; notation on the Student's transcript for three years, five months; grades of zero in the courses; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student admitted to purchasing forged documents in order to defer exams in two classes. In finding the Student guilty and in imposing the sanctions, the Panel noted the following: forgery is a serious offence that undermines the University's accommodation scheme; paying for academic advantage is particularly egregious; the offences occurred almost immediately one after the other, in contrast to a situation where a student commits an offence, has time to reflect, and commits it again; the Student's remorse appeared genuine; the Student had made specific reference to their desire to change their behaviour in the future; and the fact that real doctors' names appeared on the notes was not an aggravating factor, as the Student did not create the notes.

PLAGIARISED A PAPER

Suspension of two years; notation on the Student's transcript for three years; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student was found guilty of plagiarism in connection with an essay worth 40% of their mark. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the sanctions, the Panel noted the following: in nine of ten decisions the Panel reviewed, a two-year suspension was made; in the tenth case, the suspension was three years; there are no exceptional circumstances that would warrant deviating from a two-year suspension; the Student did not engage with the discipline process and did not attend the hearing, so there is no evidence of remorse or that the Student will not reoffend; as the Student did not attend the hearing, the Panel had been provided with no comfort that the Student had reflected or reassessed their behaviour or had insight into their conduct; the grave threat that plagiarism poses to the core of academic integrity warrants a strong penalty; and the sanction must serve as a deterrent to others.

NOTE: THE STUDENT APPEALED THE SANCTION – APPEAL DISMISSED

The Student appealed the penalty and sought to reduce the sanction to a one-year suspension. In upholding the Trial Division's decision, the Discipline Appeals Board noted the following: the fact that the Tribunal was not referred to or did not refer to every potential relevant decision made by the Tribunal does not mean that its decision was procedurally unfair or wrong in fact or law; the Tribunal made no reversible error by relying on the cases cited by the University; neither case raised by the Student are of assistance in this case; even if the Tribunal erred in not considering these decisions, that error would not have resulted in a variation of the penalty; if the Student does not participate, the Tribunal must proceed with the evidence it has; the Tribunal properly considered the sanctioning factors in coming to its decision; even if the Tribunal had committed a reviewable error in its decision on sanction, the Board would not have varied the penalty; and the sanction imposed on the Student was appropriate.

USED AN UNAUTHORIZED AID IN AN EXAM AND FORGED A MEDICAL NOTE TO OBTAIN A DEFERRAL OF AN EXAM

Suspension of five years; notation on the Student's transcript for seven years; grades of zero in the courses; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student admitted to purchasing a forged medical note in order to defer an exam. The Student also plead guilty to wearing a button camera, transmitter, smart watch and phone to obtain assistance in a final exam, also agreed with the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and in imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the Student entered an undertaking to never re-register for courses or to re-apply to any program within the University; the offences constituted an extremely serious breach of academic integrity and are deserving of a harsh sanction; the Student was cooperative and demonstrated genuine remorse; a joint submission should only be rejected if it is truly unreasonable or unconscionable; and considering the cases referred to by counsel, the joint submission was appropriate and called for in the circumstances of the case.

PLAGIARISED SEVEN ESSAYS IN SIX DIFFERENT COURSES

Suspension of four years; notation on the Student's transcript for five years; grades of zero in the courses; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to seven counts of plagiarism in six courses over three years. The Student also agreed to the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: while the Student did not attend the hearing, they made admissions in writing and cooperated in the process; in pleading guilty, the Student took responsibility and demonstrated remorse; there was a high likelihood of repetition, considering the several pieces of work that were plagiarised over years, including after the receipt of direct warnings regarding plagiarism; plagiarism is an extremely serious offence that strikes at the heart of the integrity of academic work and cannot be tolerated; a strong penalty to deter others is warranted; there was no evidence of extenuating circumstances; and the joint submission was in line with past cases and was fair and appropriate, striking a balance between the mitigating and aggravating factors.

USED UNAUTHORIZED AIDS IN TWO EXAMS IN DIFFERENT COURSES

Suspension of five years; notation on the Student's transcript for seven years; grades of zero in the courses; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to using unauthorized aids in exams in two courses. In one exam, the Student brought notes and formulas into the exam. In the other exam, the Student had a button camera and earpieces. The Student agreed with the facts and the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: using spyware to cheat is an extremely serious breach of the standards expected of students; students found to have used spyware must receive a very

significant sanction to demonstrate the University's condemnation of the conduct and to deter others; absent extenuating circumstances, the Tribunal will recommend that students found guilty of using spyware be expelled; the Student's initial dishonesty when confronted with their actions and their use of less sophisticated aids in the second course point towards expulsion; however, the Student's eventual admission and their statement acknowledging and apologizing for their wrongdoing was some evidence of good character; it also makes the risk of repetition lower than otherwise would be suggested by the commission of two similar offenses in a relatively short period of time; the undertaking signed by the Student not to register or enroll in courses at the University in future also lowers the risk of repetition; finally, the sanction was consistent with the evidence and case law.

RECEIVED UNAUTHORIZED AID FOR TWO FINAL EXAMS

Expulsion; suspension of up to five years from the date of the order or until Governing Council makes its decision, whichever comes first; corresponding notation on the Student's transcript; grades of zero in the courses; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to receiving unauthorized aid in one exam and was found guilty of unauthorized aid in having a button camera and earpiece in a second exam. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the Student's character was a negative factor; they paid for unauthorized assistance in one course and, while that discipline matter was in process, they used an unauthorized aid in another; when the Student was caught, they invented a story about abandoning their intention to cheat; the likelihood of repetition is high; the Student was aware of the consequences of cheating again, having already attended a Dean's Designate meeting related to the first offence; there were no mitigating factors; the nature of the offence was incredibly serious; the detriment to the University cannot be overstated if obtaining unauthorized assistance goes unchecked; there are services and technologies that make it more and more difficult to detect this offence; this form of cheating undermines the integrity of the University and its degrees, so the need for general deterrence is very strong; every sanctioning factor conclusively pointed to the penalty of a recommendation for expulsion; and the sanction is consistent with prior decisions of this Tribunal.

USED AN UNAUTHORIZED AID IN A FINAL EXAM

Suspension of four years; notation on the Student's transcript for five years or until graduation, whichever occurs first; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student plead guilty to receiving unauthorized aid during an exam (via cell phone) and agreed with the facts and the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: there was some

evidence of a commercial element to the offence; the offence was clearly premeditated; the Student initially tried to conceal their offence, but admitted the offence at their Dean's Meeting and apologized for their misconduct; they also cooperated by pleading guilty; the offence was viewed very seriously; such conduct harms the institution and the academic process; there was no record of prior offences; and the sanction falls within the reasonable range – sending a clear message regarding the seriousness of the misconduct, but recognizing the Student's cooperation with the process.

RECEIVING AND PROVIDING UNAUTHORIZED AID IN A FINAL EXAM

Expulsion; suspension of up to five years from the date of the order or until Governing Council makes its decision, whichever comes first; corresponding notation on the Student's transcript; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student was found guilty of cheating on an exam by being part of a WeChat group that used prohibited technology to send questions to and receive answers from an outside individual. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the seriousness of the offence, in which the Student was a willing participant in a relatively complex and premeditated scheme, justifies the proposed sanction; the two cases involving the students who were also involved in the scheme resulted in an expulsion for the student who participated in the process, and a five-year suspension for the student where the parties had agreed to a joint submission on penalty; the Student did not participate in the hearing, so there was a total absence of possible mitigating factors; the premeditated and deliberate nature of the present offences make them particularly egregious; and the sanction is consistent with prior decisions of this Tribunal.

USED UNAUTHORIZED AID ON TWO CODING ASSIGNMENTS

Suspension of two years; notation on the Student's transcript for three years; grade of zero in the course; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student was found guilty of cooperating with other students on two coding assignments. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the sanctions, the Panel noted the following: as the Student did not participate in the hearing, there was no evidence regarding the Student's character other than the facts relating to the case, nor was there evidence of any extenuating circumstances; the Student did not have a prior record; there were two separate incidents, but they took place close in time and there was no intervening event that put the Student on notice about their conduct, therefore, the penalty imposed should reflect that typically imposed in relation to a finding of guilt in respect of one offence, rather than two; unauthorized assistance undermines the evaluative process and is profoundly unfair to other students; general deterrence is an important factor in these cases; the Tribunal must send a strong message that such misconduct is considered a serious offence; and the sanction imposed by the Panel is consistent with prior case law.

FORGED A TRANSCRIPT FROM ANOTHER UNIVERSITY TO OBTAIN ADMISSION TO A UNIVERSITY PROGRAM

Suspension of five years; notation on the Student's transcript for 6 years; publication of the decision with the Student's name withheld

The Student admitted to forging a transcript from another university in support of their request for guaranteed admission to the second year of the Rotman Commerce program. The Student agreed to the proposed sanctions. In finding the Student guilty and imposing the agreed-upon sanctions, the Panel noted the following: the Student admitted the offence and demonstrated remorse; it was the Student's first offence and they apologized for their behaviour; the Student demonstrated insight into their actions and there is little to no likelihood of repetition; the nature of the offence committed is egregious, as it required deliberation, planning, and implementation; the offence is not easy to detect and causes detriment to the University; a strong sanction is warranted, even when there is cooperation; had the University accepted the Student's forged transcript, the Student would have received a benefit to which they were not entitled, depriving another, worthy student of that benefit; had the Student gone on to graduate from the program, their degree would have tarnished the University's reputation, and the degrees rightly earned by other students; not only must a strong message be sent to the Student in this instance, but also to the wider community to deter others from attempting something similar; and the proposed sanction was reasonable and within the accepted range for similar cases.