

**GOVERNING COUNCIL JUDICIAL BOARD
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic misconduct filed on January 12, 2023,

AND IN THE MATTER OF the *University of Toronto Act, 1947*, S.O. 1947, c. 112, as am.

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

B E T W E E N:

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- AND -

Y| W [REDACTED] W|

REASONS FOR DECISION

Hearing Date: September 25, 2025, via Zoom

Members of the Judicial Board:

Roslyn M. Tsao, Associate Senior Chair

Professor Ron Levi, Teaching Staff Member

Albert Pan, Student Member

Appearances:

Lily Harmer, Counsel for the University, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP

William Webb, Co-Counsel for the University, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP

Daniel Walker, Counsel for the Former Student, Bobila Walker Law

Hearing Secretary:

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

In Attendance:

Y| W [REDACTED] W|

Charges and Appearances

1. This Judicial Board was duly established by the Governing Council of the University of Toronto (the "University") on June 24, 2025 to consider charges brought against Y■ W■ ■■■■■ W■ (the "Graduate") on January 12, 2023.
2. The matter was heard on September 25, 2025, to consider the following charges laid under section 48(c) of the University of Toronto Act, 1947 (the "Act") against the Graduate:
 - (a) On or about October 18, 2020, he was guilty of infamous conduct in that he aided and assisted students in ECO101: Principles of Microeconomics (the "Course") to obtain unauthorized aid or assistance with their Term Assessment 2 (the "Assessment") by hosting an online review session specifically devoted to the Assessment.
 - (b) On or about October 18, 2020, he was guilty of disgraceful conduct in that he aided and assisted students in the Course to obtain unauthorized aid or assistance with their Assessment by hosting an online review session specifically devoted to the Assessment.
 - (c) On or about October 18, 2020, he was guilty of conduct unbecoming a graduate of the University in that he aided and assisted students in the Course to obtain unauthorized aid or assistance with their Assessment by hosting an online review session specifically devoted to the Assessment.
3. The University and Graduate, through counsel, submitted an Agreed Statement of Facts dated April 29, 2025 ("ASF") and Book of Documents ("BoD") wherein the Graduate pleaded guilty to all charges and admitted all particulars stated therein.
4. The Graduate was present at the hearing with his lawyer, Mr. Walker. Mr. Walker confirmed that the Graduate had signed the ASF and admitted all documents in the BoD.

Facts as Admitted in the ASF

5. The Graduate first registered at the University of Toronto in Fall 2012 and was an undergraduate student in the Faculty of Arts and Science at the University of Toronto from Fall 2012 to Summer 2015. The Graduate graduated with an Honours Bachelor of Science from the University of Toronto in November 2015.

6. The Graduate was the Chief Product Officer at Easy Group Inc. from 2015 to 2023. Easy Group Inc. is a group of related companies, including Easy Edu, that offer a variety of services to students.
7. The Graduate was a graduate student in the School of Graduate Studies at the University of Toronto from Fall 2016 to Winter 2017 and an economics teaching assistant employed by the University of Toronto from January to June 2017.
8. The Graduate attended the requisite training sessions as a teaching assistant which addressed, among other things, their responsibility to uphold academic integrity, the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* (the “Code”), and academic misconduct.
9. The Graduate graduated with a Master of Arts in economics from the University of Toronto in June 2017.
10. In Fall 2020 and Winter 2021, ECO101H1F: Principles of Microeconomics (“course”) was offered by the University. Students in the course were required to write several term assessments, including Term Assessment 2 (the “Assessment”), which was worth 10.5% of the final grade in the course.
11. Each student would be randomly assigned (by Quercus) a configuration of 23 questions out of a possible 77 questions which were written by one of the professors in the course (the "Professor") for the Assessment.
12. The Assessment was scheduled to be administered online from October 18, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. to October 19, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. (the “Assessment Period”). Students had 90 minutes to complete the Assessment from the time that they opened the Assessment on Quercus. Students only gained access to the questions when they began the Assessment.
13. The Assessment was an open book assessment, but the Assessment instructions stated that students were not permitted to discuss the Assessment with anyone during the Assessment Period. The instructions stated that discussing the Assessment with anyone during the Assessment Period violated the academic integrity rules.

14. Various circumstances lead to an investigation of the course Assessment results from the students in the class, including:
- (a) On October 18, 2020, at 8:02 p.m., a student ("Student 1") in the course submitted the answers to their Assessment of 23 questions ("Answer 1");
 - (b) On October 19, 2020, another student ("Student 2") in the course told the professor that they attended a review session that provided solutions to questions that were similar to the questions on the Assessment (the "Review Session"). Student 2 advised that Easy Edu held the Review Session, that Easy Edu provided students with a study package, and that they understood that the questions were based on questions from the *actual* Assessment based on what the person from Easy Edu said during the Review Session. After they met, Student 2 sent the Professor a copy of the study package, which contained 22 questions (the "Study Package").
 - (c) The Study Package stated that it was prepared in relation to a University of Toronto Course ECO101 in Fall 2020 and upon review, the Professor found that each one of the 22 questions in the Study Package corresponded directly with one of the questions that he wrote for the Assessment. The questions in the Study Package were substantially the same as the questions that the Professor wrote and contained only superficial differences.
 - (d) The document properties for the Study Package showed that it was created on October 18, 2020, at 8:46 p.m. The document properties showed that there were four authors, one of whom was the Graduate.
 - (e) The Professor matched the 22 questions in the Study Package with the questions that he wrote, and downloaded the Assessment files for every student in the Course. Student 1 was the only student who had been assigned each one of the 22 questions that corresponded with the Easy Edu Study Package. While other students in the Course received one or more of the 22 questions in the Study Package on their version of the Assessment, only Student 1's version of the Assessment contained all 22 questions in the Study Package.

- (f) After being contacted by the Professor about the situation, Student 1 admitted, by email, that he paid a tutor to check his answers.
- (g) On October 21, 2020, another student (“Student 3”) emailed the Professor, the Student Academic Integrity office, the Office of the Governing Council, the Chair of the Department of Economics, and several other professors, about the Review Session as follows:

Dear Department Chair and Professors,

We are a group of current ECO101 students, and we decided to expose to you an academic offense behavior that happened during the open window of ECO101 term assessment 2, which we believe severely violated the academic code of conduct. Specifically, last Sunday from 9:30pm - 12:30am, more than 180 ECO101 students attended a term assessment 2 review session held by EZ(Easy) Education, in which their teacher went over some questions and cases which are rather similar to the actual term assessment 2 questions. During this review session, EZ’s teacher said himself that he had asked a couple of his ECO101 students to send him their assessment questions before this review session so that he was able to prepare everything specifically targeting the questions in this test. In addition, he also asked all of the students to add him on WeChat at the end of the review session so that they can ask him any question regarding the test during the test. We weren’t aware of this review session until this Tuesday afternoon, and we were so shocked when we were watching the video recording of this review session shared by a friend who paid for it. We have attached the Youtube link of this video recording down below in which you will find how easy it would be for a student to achieve a higher mark after watching the video.

In our perspective, this is a serious violation of the academic code of conduct of UofT. As we understand, we are not allowed to discuss anything about the test with anyone during the test window as the instruction of this test clearly states “This is an individual assessment. You may NOT discuss this assessment with ANYONE while the submission window is open. We would not allow you to communicate with anyone about the test, during the test.” We believe the average grade of this test would be dramatically affected since so many students actually benefited from this review session. It is very unfair to the other

hundreds of students like us who spent numerous hours studying the material, finished this test without any external help, and strictly followed the instruction and academic code of conduct.

As far as we know, EZ education started to advertise and promote this review session a few weeks ahead. You can find the ads poster in the attachment. They attracted tons of students by setting the price extremely low. Students only have to pay 9.9 Canadian dollars to attend a 3 hour review session where they can get so much help during the test. To be honest, this is just very tempting to most students. Plenty of our friends and classmates are seeking help from EZ Education as EZ Education has hundreds of teachers providing services to students in hundreds of courses and they are willing to provide help to students during tests and exams. We understand that the academic integrity is difficult to uphold because everything is done online during COVID-19. However, if no measure was taken to control this situation, more students would be drawn to these convenient and efficient cheating services, and potentially conduct academic offense without even realizing it while the majority of the students would suffer from an unfair academic environment where a minority of the students would achieve high grades with misleading external help.

Sincerely,

Anonymous ECO101 students

15. Student 3 also explained that Easy Edu started to advertise and promote the Review Session a few weeks ahead of the Assessment, and attached a copy of a poster for the Review Session that advertised the Graduate running a review session for Term Test 2 for ECO101, and that Easy Edu was charging students money to attend.
16. Student 3 further sent the Professor a hyperlink to a YouTube video of the Review Session. The YouTube video (translated) shows that Easy Edu held the Review Session via Zoom at 9:08 p.m. EST on October 18, 2020, which was within the Assessment Period. The YouTube video shows that the Graduate was the host of the Review Session and led the entire Review Session.

17. Throughout the Review Session, the Graduate referred to the Assessment itself. For example, the Graduate stated: "I'm trying to mock the test in our review, and in the real test the wording might be more precise, accurate. But the logic is the same."
18. Near the end of the video, the Graduate stated: "This time there are 23 exam questions in the test. If all questions are the same, they are all covered. If there are some differences, based on the information we have, all the test patterns and the key points are covered. [...] How random are the exam questions are? We're not sure. We can see all those exam questions are special, not in the examination pool. If everyone develops 22 exam questions, and all of them are not identical, a big pool needs to be created. It is likely only those figures are different. The test patterns and key points are the same. So you can take this review as a good reference."
19. At the end of the video, the Graduate gave students his WeChat name and said that if they had any questions, they could ask in the WeChat group.
20. After reviewing the video of the Review Session which disclosed identities of attending students, approximately 100 students were investigated for academic dishonesty and most have been sanctioned. Student 1 had also been sanctioned.
21. The Graduate admits that he knew or was wilfully blind to the fact that students were prohibited from discussing the Assessment with anyone or obtaining assistance during the Assessment Period, and that he knew the dates and times of the Assessment Period.
22. The Graduate admits that he had access to a copy of the Assessment, that he received a copy of the Assessment from a student before the Review Session, and that he created the Study Package with the assistance of others by making changes to the questions on the Assessment.
23. The Graduate admits that he aided and assisted students with the Assessment during the Review Session for a commercial purpose. The Graduate admits that he provided these students with an unfair academic advantage. The Graduate admits that he knew or was wilfully blind to the fact that these students were committing academic offences, and that

he knew or was wilfully blind to the fact that he was aiding and assisting these students to commit academic offences.

24. The Graduate admits that he is guilty of conduct unbecoming a graduate of the University of Toronto, contrary to section 48(c) of the Act.
25. The Graduate acknowledges that he is signing this ASF freely and voluntarily, knowing of the potential consequences he faces, and does so with the advice of counsel or having waived the right to obtain counsel.

Finding

26. Based on the ASF and review of the BoD, the Panel accepts the plea of the Graduate and finds him guilty of conduct unbecoming a graduate of the University of Toronto as:
 - (a) his conduct displayed a blatant disregard about the damage caused by academic dishonesty to the value of the University as an institution and to the value of other graduates;
 - (b) he played a primary role in the commercial enterprise which profited from actions which assisted students to violate the University's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters;
 - (c) he used his own degrees from the University in furthering his commercial enterprise, without regard for the reputation of the University as a respected educational institution; and
 - (d) his conduct, if not discovered and sanctioned, would undermine the integrity of the grading system at the University among the student body.

27. The University withdrew the other two charges.

Penalty

28. The Graduate and University submitted an Agreed Statement of Facts on Penalty ("ASFP") and a Joint Submission on Penalty ("JSP"), in support of the following penalty:

- (a) The Master of Arts degree conferred by the University of Toronto on the Graduate shall be cancelled and recalled;
 - (b) The Graduate is required and directed to surrender for cancellation the degree certificate evidencing the Master of Arts degree conferred on the Graduate by the University of Toronto;
 - (c) The name of the Graduate shall be erased from the roll or register of graduates of the University of Toronto in respect of the Master of Arts degree conferred on him by the University of Toronto; and
 - (d) The fact that the University of Toronto has cancelled and recalled the Graduate's Master of Arts degree for conduct unbecoming a graduate shall be permanently recorded on the Graduate's academic record and transcript; and
 - (e) This case shall be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the Judicial Board's decision and the sanctions imposed, with the name of the Graduate withheld.
29. Although this matter was presented to the Panel by way of an ASFP and JSP (both of which were submitted voluntarily by the Student after independent legal advice), we are still required to consider the *University of Toronto and Mr. C* factors (Case No.: 1976/77-3, November 5, 1976), to support our decision on penalty: character of student, likelihood of repetition of the offence, nature of the offence committed, existence of extenuating circumstances, detriment to the university, and general need for deterrence.
30. Unfortunately, the Graduate has been disciplined for prior academic misconduct at the University when he was a teaching assistant. The Graduate, then a student, pleaded guilty to 3 counts of unauthorized assistance related to his assisting another student with whom he was in an undisclosed romantic relationship¹. The sanction for this offence was a

¹ The Graduate provided assistance in a course for which he was not a teaching assistant but had been the teaching assistant in another course in which his girlfriend was enrolled. The failure to disclose that relationship in the other course was another example of misconduct as a breach of the conflict of interest policy for teaching assistants.

suspension of the conferral of his Master of Arts Degree for a period of three years commencing April 3, 2018.

31. With regard to the Graduate's conduct, the principal *Mr. C* factors to consider are the *nature (seriousness) of the offence, general deterrence and detriment to the university.*
32. It is patently clear that the Review Session required deliberate and orchestrated planning and was for commercial gain. Approximately 100 students were attracted to the Review Session seeking unauthorized assistance. The potential detriment to the University's reputation should such enterprises go unsanctioned is significant. These commercial enterprises erode the values of higher education, evaluation standards, and the ideals of the pursuit of knowledge.
33. Furthermore, there is a risk that students who have the moral integrity to refuse to avail themselves of such "short cuts" will become discouraged instead of inspired by the privilege of attaining a post-secondary education. The students who reported the Review Session details to the Professor did so from a sense of unfairness which is an unfortunate by-product of the Graduate's conduct.
34. It is also clear that the Graduate had little regard for the value of his education or degrees from the University. He was prepared to tarnish the academic integrity of the institution from which he held degrees, making his conduct all the more egregious.
35. Given the Graduate's prior disciplinary sanction from the University, specific deterrence of this Graduate is of lesser utility. The Panel's priority is to address general deterrence of such unbecoming conduct. The Graduate's Review Session, likely not unique, can be difficult to uncover without students who are prepared to come forward like Students 2 and 3. The Panel, therefore, encourages students to continue to do the "right thing" to support the reputation of the University.
36. As the Graduate has left the University, the available sanctions are limited. Accordingly, the revocation of his Master of Arts Degree is one of the most significant sanctions available.

37. The Panel was advised that the Graduate, through counsel, and the University counsel engaged in practical discussions to resolve the matter by ASF and JSP, saving the University resources.
38. We are aware that there is a very high threshold for departing from a joint submission on penalty requiring the Panel to find that the acceptance of same would be contrary to the public interest and bring the administration of justice into disrepute.
39. The Panel, therefore, accepts and orders the sanctions as set out in the JSP.
40. An Order was signed after the hearing by the Panel in accordance with above finding of "conduct unbecoming a graduate of the University" and the sanctions as set out in the JSP.
41. We thank both counsel for the efficiency of the Hearing.

Dated at Toronto, this 5th day of November, 2025

Original signed by:

Roslyn Tsao, Associate Senior Chair
On behalf of the Panel