

APPENDIX "B"

POL440Y5Y

1. At all material times you were a student in POL440Y5Y taught by Professor A. Braun during the fall and winter term of academic year 2004-2005.
2. You submitted an essay, "The Reason For Failure of a Capitalist Economy in Post Soviet Russia", on or about March 15, 2005, in completion of the course requirements in POL440Y5Y.
3. Large portions of this paper were reproduced verbatim, or nearly verbatim, from unacknowledged internet sources.
4. Footnotes in this paper referenced sources which were concocted.

POL200Y5Y

5. At all material times you were a student in POL200Y5Y taught by Professor R. Beiner during the fall and winter term of academic year 2004-2005.
6. You submitted an essay, "Hobbes & The End of the State of Nature", on or about March 30, 2005, in completion of the course requirements in POL200Y5Y.
7. Large portions of this paper were reproduced verbatim, or nearly verbatim, from unacknowledged Internet sources.

POL478Y5Y

8. At all material times you were a student in POL478Y5Y taught by Professor R. Day during the fall and winter term of academic year 2004-2005.

9. You submitted an essay, "National Socialism", on or about April 1, 2005, in completion of the course requirements in POL478Y5Y.
10. Large portions of this paper were reproduced verbatim, or nearly verbatim, from unacknowledged internet sources.
11. Footnotes in this paper referenced sources which were concocted.
12. You submitted six reports as follows, in completion of the course requirements in POL478Y5Y:
 - (a) "Jurgen Habermas"
 - (b) "Alfred Marshall"
 - (c) "J.M. Keynes: Political Determination of Macro-Markets"
 - (d) "FDR's New Deal: Political Economy of Democratic Totalization"
 - (e) "Postwar Japan"
 - (f) "HAYEK: Universal Evolution, "Just Conduct" and the limits of Reason"
13. Large portions of each of these reports were reproduced verbatim, or nearly verbatim, from unacknowledged internet sources.

APPENDIX "C"

University of Toronto and The Student

Agreed Statement of Facts

I. Procedural History and Background

1. on September 21, 2005, the University of Toronto filed charges against The Student under its *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* ("Code"). A copy of those charges is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 2 ("Charges").
2. The University Tribunal delivered a Notice of Hearing to The Student. A copy of that Notice of Hearing is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 3.
3. The University of Toronto admitted The Student to Erindale College as a non-degree visiting student in the Fall of 2001. In the Fall of 2002, he transferred into the Honours Bachelor's Degree Program at Erindale College. A copy of The Student's academic record dated March 13, 2006, is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 4.
4. For the academic year 2004-2005, The Student enrolled in four full-year courses (POL200, POL320, POL440 and POL478) and two half courses in the Winter 2005 term (ANT101 and AST201). These proceedings concern three full-year courses: POL 200, POL 440, and POL 478.

II. POL 478Y — Political Economy

5. In September 2004, The Student enrolled in POL 478, which was a fourth-year political science course titled Political Economy: Moral Reason and Economic History ("Political Economy"). Professor R. Day taught Political Economy and a copy of the course outline is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 5.
6. The course requirements included:
 - a. one 12 to 15-page essay worth 50% of the final grade; and
 - b. seven 250-word reports on weekly seminar issues, each of which was worth 1.43% (a "Report") and which together comprised 10% of the final grade.
7. Prof. Day gave each student in Political Economy a hand-out, which was titled "A Warning About Plagiarism." The Student admits that he received this handout, a copy of which is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 6, and acknowledges that he read and understood it.

a) *The Hayek Report*

8. On or about January 27, 2005, The Student submitted a Report titled "HAYEK: Universal Evolution, 'Just Conduct' and the limits of Reason", a copy of which is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 7 ("*Hayek*").

9. The Student did not write *Hayek*. Instead, he copied it virtually entirely from an article as described below. The Student admits that he took, verbatim and without attribution, all of *Hayek* from the article described below except for a few insignificant word deletions, additions, and changes, which he made to disguise his actions.

10. The Student included verbatim and unattributed sections from Stephen Macedo's article "Hayek's Liberal Legacy" ("Macedo's article") in *Hayek*. A copy of Macedo's article, which was first published in the *Cato Journal*, vol. 19 No. 2 (Fall 1999), is posted on the Internet at <http://cato.org/pubs/journal/cj19n2/cj19n2-6.pdf> and is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 8.

1. Dean's Meeting

11. On May 16, 2005, The Student met with Professor Roger Beck, the Dean's Designate for academic offences, pursuant to s. C.I.(a)5 of the Code. Professor Beck warned The Student, pursuant to s. C.I.(a)6 of the Code, that anything he said at that meeting could be used or received in evidence against him at a Tribunal hearing.

12. The Student stated that he thought that he only had to demonstrate that he had done some reading from the world wide web and that he was not expected to use appropriate citations in the *Hayek* Report. This explanation also applied to the other Report offences described below.

2. Admissions

13. The Student admits that:

- a. he copied all of *Hayek* from Macedo's article and that he did so without attribution;
- b. he did no meaningful academic work on *Hayek* before submitting it to for academic credit to Professor Day;
- c. he knew, in respect of this Report and all others described below, that he was expected to provide original work that did not contain plagiarism;
- d. by submitting *Hayek* on or about January 27, 2005, he knowingly represented as his own, an idea, an expression of an idea, and the work of another in academic work which he submitted to fulfil the course requirements of Political Economy, contrary to s. B.I.1(d) of the Code; and
- e. he is guilty of Charge #19 contained in the Charges, which are included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 2.

b) Habermas Report

14. On or about February 3, 2005, The Student submitted a Report titled "Jurgen Habermas", a copy of which is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 9 ("*Habermas*").

15. The Student did not write *Habermas*. Instead, he copied it virtually entirely from an article as described below. The Student admits that he took, verbatim and without attribution, all of *Habermas* from the article described below except for:

- a. the final sentence; and
- b. a few insignificant word deletions, additions, and changes, which he made to disguise his actions.

16. The Student included verbatim and unattributed sections from a website on Jurgen Habermas: On Society and Politics ("Case Western article") in *Habermas*. A copy of the Case Western article, which was generated by members of Case Western Reserve University, is posted on the Internet at <http://home.cwru.edu/~nqb2/Authors/Habermas.html> and is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 10.

17. The Student admits that:

- a. he copied all of *Habermas* from the Case Western article without attribution;
- b. he did no meaningful academic work on *Habermas* before submitting it to for academic credit to Professor Day;
- c. by submitting *Habermas* on or about February 3, 2005, he knowingly represented as his own, an idea, an expression of an idea, and the work of another in academic work which he submitted to fulfil the course requirements of Political Economy, contrary to s. B.I.1(d) of the Code; and
- d. he is guilty of Charge #9 contained in the Charges, which are included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 2.

c) *Marshall Report*

18. On or about February 24, 2005, The Student submitted a Report titled "Alfred Marshall", a copy of which is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 10 ("*Marshall*").

19. The Student did not write *Marshall*. Instead, he copied it virtually entirely from an article as described below. The Student admits that he took, verbatim and without attribution, all of *Marshall* from the article described below except for:

- a. the final sentence; and
- b. a few insignificant word deletions, additions, and changes, which he made to disguise his actions.

20. The Student included in *Marshall* verbatim and unattributed sections from a biography of Alfred Marshall ("Marshall biography"). A copy of the Marshall biography, which was generated by members of the The Library of Economics and Liberty, is posted on the Internet at <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/bios/Marshall.html> and is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 11.

21. The Student admits that:

- a. he copied all of *Marshall* from the Marshall biography without attribution;
- b. he did no meaningful academic work on *Marshall* before submitting it to for academic credit to Professor Day;
- c. by submitting *Marshall* on or about February 24, 2005, he knowingly represented as his own, an idea, an expression of an idea, and the work of another in academic work which he submitted to fulfil the course requirements of Political Economy, contrary to s. B.I.1(d) of the Code; and
- d. he is guilty of Charge #11 contained in the Charges, which are included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 2.

d) Keynes Report

22. On or about March 3, 2005, The Student submitted a Report titled "J.M. Keynes: Political Determination of Macro-Markets ", a copy of which is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 12 ("*Keynes*").

23. The Student did not write *Keynes*. Instead, he copied it virtually entirely from book reviews as described below. The Student admits that he took, verbatim and without attribution, all of *Keynes* from the article described below except for:

- a. the final clause of the final sentence; and
- b. a few insignificant word deletions, additions, and changes, which he made to disguise his actions.

24. The Student included verbatim and unattributed sections from book reviews of "The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money ("Book Reviews"). The Book Reviews, from Amazon.com at <http://www.amazon.com/qp/product/1573921394/002-4106077-5208851?v=qlance&n=283155>, are included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 13.

25. The Student admits that:

- a. he copied verbatim, and without attribution, all of *Keynes* from the Book Reviews;
- b. he did no meaningful academic work on *Keynes* before submitting it to for academic credit to Professor Day;
- c. by submitting *Keynes* on or about March 3, 2005, he knowingly represented as his own, an idea, an expression of an idea, and the work of another in academic work which he submitted to fulfil the course requirements of Political Economy, contrary to s. B.I.1(d) of the Code; and

- d. he is guilty of Charge #13 contained in the Charges, which are included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 2.

e) FDR Report

26. On or about March 10, 2005, The Student submitted a Report titled "FDR's New Deal: Political Economy of Democratic Totalization", a copy of which is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 14 ("*FDR*").

27. The Student did not write *FDR*. Instead, he copied it virtually entirely from an article as described below. The Student admits that he took, verbatim and without attribution, all of *FDR* from the article described below except for:

- a. the final sentence; and
- b. a few insignificant word deletions, additions, and changes, which he made to disguise his actions.

28. The Student included verbatim and unattributed sections from Jacob Hornberger's article "FDR and the End of Economic Liberty" in *FDR*. ("Hornberger's article"). A copy of Hornberger's article, which was published on a website sponsored by The Future of Freedom Foundation at <http://www.fff.org/freedom/0891a.asp>, is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 15.

29. The Student admits that:

- a. he copied verbatim, and without attribution, all of *FOR* from Hornberger's article;
- b. he did no meaningful academic work on *FOR* before submitting it to for academic credit to Professor Day;
- c. by submitting *FOR* on or about March 10, 2005, he knowingly represented as his own, an idea, an expression of an idea, and the work of another in academic work which he submitted to fulfil the course requirements of Political Economy, contrary to s. B.I.1 (d) of the Code; and
- d. he is guilty of Charge #15 contained in the Charges, which are included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 2.

f) Postwar Japan Report

30. On or about March 24, 2005, The Student submitted a Report titled "Postwar Japan", a copy of which is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 16 ("*Postwar Japan*").

31. The Student did not write *Postwar Japan*. He copied it virtually entirely from an article. The Student admits that he took, verbatim and without attribution, all of *Postwar Japan* from the article described below except for:

- a. the final sentence; and

- b. a few insignificant word deletions, additions, and changes, which he made to disguise his actions.

32. The Student included in *Postwar Japan* verbatim and unattributed sections from an article on Japan's industrial sector found on the asianinfo.org website ("Industrial article"). A copy of the Industrial article, which can be accessed at <http://www.asianinfo.org/asianinfo/japan/economy.htm>, is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 17.

33. The Student admits that:

- a. he copied verbatim, and without attribution, all of *Postwar Japan* from the Industrial article;
- b. he did no meaningful academic work on *Postwar Japan* before submitting it to for academic credit to Professor Day;
- c. by submitting *Postwar Japan* on or about March 24, 2005, he knowingly represented as his own, an idea, an expression of an idea, and the work of another in academic work which he submitted to fulfil the course requirements of Political Economy, contrary to s. B.I.1(d) of the Code; and
- d. he is guilty of Charge #17 contained in the Charges, which are included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 2.

g) *The National Socialism Essay*

34. On April 1, 2005, The Student submitted an essay titled "National Socialism", a copy of which is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 18 ("*National Socialism*"). This essay was worth 50% of the final grade in the course.

35. The Student did not write *National Socialism*. Instead, he copied it virtually entirely from an article as described below. The Student admits that he took, verbatim and without attribution, all of *National Socialism* from the article described below except for:

- a. all of the footnote references, which The Student concocted and inserted to disguise his actions; and
- b. a few word deletions, additions, and changes, which he made to disguise his actions.

36. The Student included verbatim and unattributed sections from Karlheinz Weissmann's article "The Epoch of National Socialism" ("Weissmann's article") in *National Socialism*. A copy of Weissmann's article, which was first published in *The Journal of Libertarian Studies* 12:2 (Fall 1996), is posted on the Internet at http://mises.org/journals/jls/12_2/12_2_3.pdf and is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 19.

3. Dean's Meeting

37. As previously described in paragraph 11, on May 16, 2005, The Student met with professor Roger Beck, the Dean's Designate for academic offences, pursuant to s. Ci.(a)5 of the Code. Professor Beck warned The Student, pursuant to s. C.I.(a)6 of the Code, that anything he said at that meeting could be used or received in evidence against him at a Tribunal hearing.

38. The Student denied committing plagiarism in *National Socialism*. He told Professor Beck that:

- a. he had written a paper but had forgotten to bring it to the University on the day it was due;
- b. he called his room mate to ask him to print out the paper;
- c. his room mate printed the wrong file;
- d. he did not review the document his roommate printed for him before he submitted it; and
- e. he had submitted the wrong document.

39. The Student stated that he had brought the "final version" of his paper with him and gave the "final version" to Prof. Beck. A copy of the "final version" is included in this joint book of documents at Tab 20.

4. Admissions

40. The Student admits that:

- a. he copied verbatim, and without attribution, all of *National Socialism* from Weissmann's article;
- b. he fabricated the explanation he provided to Prof. Beck at the Dean's Meeting;
- c. he fabricated the "final version" of the paper and created it after the fact and solely for the purposes of the Dean's Meeting;
- d. he did no meaningful academic work on *National Socialism* before submitting it for academic credit to Professor Day.
- e. by submitting *National Socialism* on or about April 1, 2005, he knowingly represented as his own, an idea, an expression of an idea, and the work of another in academic work which he submitted to fulfil the course requirements of Political Economy, contrary to s. B.I.1(d) of the Code; and
- f. by submitting *National Socialism* on or about April 1, 2005, he knowingly submitted academic work containing a reference to sources which had been

concocted to fulfil the course requirements of Political Economy, contrary to s. B.I.1(f) of the Code; and

- g. that he is guilty of Charge #6 and Charge #7 contained in the Charges, which are included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 2.

III. POL 440 — Politics and Government of Eastern Europe

41. In September 2004, The Student enrolled in POL 440, which was a fourth-year political science course on the Politics and Governments of Eastern Europe ("Eastern Europe"). Professor A. Braun taught Eastern Europe, which examined the political systems and cultures of the states of Eastern Europe in the immediate pre-socialist, socialist, and especially post-socialist periods. A copy of the course outline for Eastern Europe is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 21.

42. The course requirements included:

- a. two seminar reports and seminar participation, worth 40% of the final grade; and
- b. two research papers, each worth 30% of the final grade.

43. Prof. Braun gave each student in Eastern Europe a hand-out, which was titled "A Warning About Plagiarism." The Student admits that he received this handout, a copy of which is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 22.

44. On March 15, 2005, The Student submitted a research paper titled "The Reason for Failure of a Capitalist Economy in Post-Soviet Russia", a copy of which is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 23 ("*Economic Failure*").

45. The Student did not write *Economic Failure*. He obtained it from a friend who, The Student understood, had received a very high grade for the paper at another university. He submitted the paper he received from his friend in whole, and without modification for academic credit in Eastern Europe.

46. *Economic Failure* was copied virtually entirely from a series of websites except for:

- a. the third sentence on page 2;
- b. the second full paragraph on page 4;
- c. the first full paragraph on page 6;
- d. the concluding paragraph on page 7;
- e. all of the footnote references, which were concocted; and
- f. a few insignificant word changes.

47. The Student admits that he did no meaningful academic work on *Economic Failure* before submitting it to for academic credit to Professor Braun. The Student admits that by submitting *Economic Failure* on or about March 15, 2005, he knowingly:

- a. represented as his own, an idea, an expression of an idea, and the work of another in academic work which he submitted to fulfil the course requirements of Eastern Europe, contrary to s. B.I.1(d) of the Code; and
- b. submitted academic work containing references to sources which had been concocted to fulfil the course requirements of Eastern Europe, contrary to s. B.I.1(f) of the Code, in an effort to disguise his actions.

48. The Student admits that he is guilty of Charge #1 and Charge #2 contained in the Charges, which are included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 2.

IV. POL 200 — Political Theory

49. In September 2004, The Student also enrolled in POL 200, which was a second-year political science course on Political Theory ("Political Theory"). Professor R. Beiner taught Political Theory, which examined ancient political theorists (Plato and Aristotle) and the early modern theorists (Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Locke). A copy of the course outline for Political Theory is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 24. The Student admits that he received the course outline, which warned students against plagiarism. The Student acknowledges that he read and understood this warning about plagiarism.

50. The course requirements included:

- a. two ten-page essays, each worth 30% of the final grade;
- b. class participation, worth 10% of the final grade; and
- c. a final examination, which was worth 30% of the final grade.

51. On March 30, 2005, The Student submitted an essay titled "Hobbes & the End of the State of Nature", a copy of which is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 25 ("*Hobbes*").

52. The Student did not write *Hobbes*. As described below, he copied it virtually entirely from a series of internet websites. The Student admits that he took verbatim and without attribution all of the text of *Hobbes* from the websites described below except for

- a. all of the footnote references, which The Student altered and inserted to disguise his actions; and
- b. a few word deletions, additions, and changes, which he made to disguise his actions.

53. The Student included verbatim and unattributed sections from George Anesi's paper "Of Man's Desires and Fears according to Thomas Hobbes" in *Hobbes*. George Anesi is an

undergraduate student at the University of Chicago. Anesi submitted his paper in the course "Classics of Social and Political Thought" in the Department of Social Sciences, University of Chicago, on January 29, 2004. A copy of Anesi's paper, which is posted on his home page at <http://home.uchicago.edu/~anesi/hobbes.html> is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 26 ("Anesi's paper").

54. The Student admits that, without any attribution, he copied:

- a. the first and third paragraph of page 1 of *Hobbes* from Anesi's paper; and
- b. the last line of page 2 and all of pages 3 to 8 of *Hobbes* from Anesi's paper.

55. The Student also included verbatim and unattributed sections from an article written by Garth Kemerling titled "Hobbes's Leviathan" ("Kemerling's article"). A copy of Kemerling's article, which is posted on the Philosophy Pages website at www.philosophypages.com/hy/3x.htm, is included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 27. The Student admits that, without any attribution, he copied:

- a. the second paragraph on page 1 of *Hobbes* from Kemerling's article; and
- b. the last paragraph on page 1 and all of page two, except for the last line, of *Hobbes* from Kemerling's article.

a) Dean's Meeting

56. On May 6, 2005, The Student met with Professor Roger Beck, the Dean's Designate for academic offences, pursuant to s. C.I.(a)5 of the Code. Professor Beck warned The Student, pursuant to S. C.I.(a)6 of the Code, that anything he said at that meeting could be used or received in evidence against him at the Tribunal hearing.

57. The Student told Professor Beck that he did not knowingly hand in plagiarized work and that he did not properly review and reference his work. He suggested that the "meat of the essay" was the quotes from Thomas Hobbes' work, which were correctly referenced to the Leviathan text.

b) Admissions

58. The Student now admits that:

- a. the explanation he provided to Prof. Beck was not true;
- b. at all times he knew he was plagiarizing and that it was wrong to do so;
- c. he did no meaningful academic work on *Hobbes* before submitting it to Professor Beiner for academic credit;
- d. by submitting *Hobbes* on or about March 30, 2005, he knowingly represented as his own, an idea, an expression of an idea, and the work of another in academic

work which he submitted to fulfil the course requirements of Political Theory, contrary to s. B.I.1(d) of the Code; and

- e. he is guilty of Charge #4 contained in the Charges, which are included in the Joint Book of Documents at Tab 2.

V. Conclusion

59. When he appears before the University Tribunal, The Student will plead guilty to charges #1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19 of the Charges.

60. The Student acknowledges that the University of Toronto has advised him to obtain independent legal advice before signing this Agreed Statement of Facts and that he has done so.

Signed in Toronto on March 29, 2006.

The Student

Witness

Signed in Toronto on April 5, 2006.

Lily Harmer
Assistant Discipline Counsel
University of Toronto

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty made on January 27, 2006,

AND IN THE MATTER OF the University of Toronto *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995*,

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

B E T W E E N:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

The Student

Members of the panel:

- Mr. Ron Slaght, Chair
- Professor Melanie Woodin, Faculty Panel Member
- Coralie D'Souza, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

- Mr. Robert Centa for the University of Toronto
- Ms Betty-Ann Campbell, assisting Mr. Centa
- Professor Roger Beck, Dean's Designate for Academic Discipline at the University of Toronto at Mississauga
- The Student did not appear.

PRELIMINARY

[1] The Trial Division of the University Tribunal was convened on May 3, 2006 to consider charges under the University of Toronto *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995* (the "Code"). The Notice of Hearing is dated April 24, 2006.

[2] Thirty minutes after the time at which the hearing was scheduled to begin, the student had still failed to appear. The University proposed to proceed in the Student's absence and the Tribunal heard submissions.

[3] Mr. Centa presented the panel with a Motion Record containing the affidavits of Mr. Andrew Graham, the instructor in the course in which the alleged offences occurred, Ms Lucy Gaspini, Executive Assistant in the Office of the Dean at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, and Ms Betty-Ann Campbell, a Law Clerk in the firm Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein representing the University. Each of the affidavits describes variously efforts to communicate with the student, to advise her of the seriousness of the charges and the proceedings of the Tribunal, to provide her with disclosure, and to provide her with notice of the hearing.

[4] The Tribunal heard that, in the University's submission, it is the Student's responsibility to maintain up-to-date and accurate contact information in the University's records and that the information on file with the University had been used in attempts to communicate with the Student.

[5] Moreover, Mr. Centa reported, the University had undertaken an investigation into the Student's whereabouts which included hiring a private investigation service to locate the Student. The private investigator confirmed to the best of his knowledge that the address on file with the University was in fact the Student's current address.

[6] The panel worried that the Notice of Hearing was dated only a week before the hearing. In response, the panel considered arguments from Mr. Centa outlining the history of attempts made by the University to provide the Student with appropriate notice including the details of correspondence with the Student going back as far as April 19, 2005, (sent by registered mail or delivered by hand) that clearly indicated a disciplinary process was underway and that a hearing in the near future was possible. The panel also considered evidence brought by the University that the student had received this correspondence.

[7] After considering the University's proposal, the panel was satisfied that the provisions in the *Code* and in the *Statutory Powers Procedures Act* had been met and that the University could proceed with the hearing in the Student's absence.

[8] In arriving at this decision, the panel wished to highlight the importance of the historical record of correspondence and attempted correspondence, the registered letters for which the student had signed (containing, among other things, the *Code* and Charges and notice that a hearing was to be held), and that the student's address in the University's computer system was confirmed by the report of the private investigator.

[9] The panel judged that they had two questions to answer:

- (1) As to the first, the panel is satisfied that delivery of the documents, including the Notice of Hearing, to the Student's address is reasonable notice of hearing in the circumstances and that it would come to the student's attention.
- (2) As to the second, that the official Notice of Hearing is dated April 24 is a challenge presenting some difficulties, and ideally the Notice would and should be given much earlier than one week before the hearing. However, having regard to the history and the Student's failure to respond to letters and documents that are known to have been received, the panel is prepared to accept that sufficient and reasonable notice was provided to the Student in all the circumstances.

THE HEARING ON THE FACTS

[10] The charges are as follows:

1. Contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* (the “Code”), on or about March 28, 2005, you knowingly represented as your own, an idea or expression of an idea, and/or work of another in connection with a form of academic work, namely, your essay entitled “The Role of Religion in Daily Life: Examining the Impact of Religion in the Ancient Egyptian, Greek, and Roman Worlds” (“Essay”), which you submitted to fulfill the course requirements of CLA 160Y.
2. Contrary to section B.I.1(f) of the *Code*, on or about March 28, 2005, you knowingly submitted academic work, the Essay, which contained references to a source or sources which had been concocted.
3. In the alternative, contrary to Section B.I.3(b) of the *Code*, on or about February 6, 2004, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind by submitting the Essay, which you submitted to fulfill course requirements in CLA 160Y.
4. Pursuant to Section B of the *Code*, you are deemed to have committed an offence knowingly if you ought reasonably to have known that you:
 - a. represented as your own, an idea or expression of an idea, and/ or work of another in connection with a form of academic work;
 - b. submitted academic work that contained a reference to a source which had been concocted; or
 - c. engaged in any form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation in order to obtain academic credit.

[11] Particulars of the charges are as follows:

1. You were, at all material times, a student in CLA 160Y, which was taught by Dr. Andrew Graham.
2. On or about March 28, 2005, you submitted the Essay to fulfill partially the course requirements of CLA 160Y.
3. The Essay contained verbatim passages from various internet sources and you did not properly attribute these passages.
4. The Essay contained references to *Maenads, Martyrs, Matrons, Monastics: A Sourcebook on Women's Religion in the Greco-Roman World* by Ross S. Kraemer. These references were concocted.

[12] The University called two witnesses, Mr. Andrew Graham, the Student's Instructor in CLA 160Y, and Ms Marcia Christine Cassis, the Student's Teaching Assistant in CLA 160Y.

[13] Mr. Graham's testimony concerned Exhibits 3 through 7: an essay purporting to come from the Student with the Student's name and student ID number on the title page; and four sets of printed documents taken from the internet from which, the University alleged, the Student copied and pasted into her essay without attribution.

[14] The Panel was presented with a copy of Exhibit #3 (the essay purporting to be from the Student) that had been coloured to facilitate comparison with the internet documents.

[15] Mr. Centa led Mr. Graham through the coloured document and asked him to compare the coloured passages with passages from the internet documents. Mr. Graham agreed that the coloured passages in the former had been copied verbatim or nearly verbatim from passages in the latter.

[16] Mr. Graham also offered testimony on the circumstances of the essay's delivery to him and on the information regarding proper citation and plagiarism that he had provided to the class. Mr. Graham also noted that the instructions for the assignment in question had explicitly forbade the use of internet sources and that the footnotes in the essay had been concocted.

[17] Ms Cassis offered testimony on the Student's performance in the class and on the circumstances surrounding her delivery of a letter informing the Student of allegations of academic misconduct. Ms Cassis testified that she had given the letter directly to the Student.

[18] At the conclusion of the *viva voce* evidence, the University argued in its submissions that in all of the circumstances, given the means of delivery, the presence of the Student's name on the paper, the presence of the Student's ID number on the paper and the Student's reaction when confronted, it is reasonable to conclude that the paper in question is the Student's.

[19] The concocted references to books, Mr. Centa argued, indicate an attempt on the Student's part to conceal her efforts.

[20] Further, the University argued, the highlighted passages which were reproduced verbatim or nearly verbatim in the essay from internet sources with no quotes or indentations, together with concocted footnotes, combine to meet the test for plagiarism.

[21] Recalling the details in the course calendar, Mr. Graham's instructions to the class and the information he provided on proper citation and plagiarism, Mr. Centa argued that the Student had been warned about plagiarism both generally and specifically, and knew or ought to have known what it was and how to avoid it. The University requested that the panel accordingly find the Student guilty of Charges #1 and #2.

[22] After deliberation, the panel was satisfied that the paper in question was in fact the Student's and was submitted by the student or in her name with the intent that it be considered and graded in the normal way.

[23] The Panel was also satisfied that large passages from the essay were copied from unattributed sources on the internet and that the University had proved counts #1 and #2 of the Charges.

THE HEARING – PENALTY PHASE

[24] The remainder of the hearing considered the appropriate penalty in the circumstances.

[25] The University called Professor Roger Beck, Dean's Designate for Academic Discipline at UTM, who gave evidence in concert with Exhibit #9 on the number of cases of academic misconduct handled at the divisional level.

[26] The University submitted that the appropriate penalty in the circumstances is:

- (1) That the Student receive a 0 in the course CLA160Y;
- (2) That the Student be suspended from the University for a period of two years; and
- (3) That the Student's academic record and transcript include a notation recording the suspension for a period of two years.

[27] In addition, the University requests that a report of the decision be made to the Provost for publication in the University's newspapers with the Student's name withheld.

[28] The panel asked the University to explain why a two-year suspension was appropriate.

[29] The University noted that a two-year suspension for a first-time first-year offender was unusual, but that not only had the student not admitted the offence at the divisional level, she had also failed to engage in the disciplinary process altogether. She had thereby shown disrespect for the University and the process and put the University to considerable expense and effort.

[30] The University placed a Book of Authorities before the panel so that they might have an opportunity to review several decisions of other panels of the University Tribunal in similar cases. In particular, the panel reviewed the criteria for sanction first proposed by the late and former Mr. Justice Sopinka in the matter of the appeal of Mr. C. (November 5, 1976). According to these guidelines, the Tribunal should consider the following six criteria when deciding on an appropriate sanction:

- (1) the character of the person charged;
- (2) the likelihood of a repetition of the offence;
- (3) the nature of the offence committed;
- (4) any extenuating circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence;
- (5) the detriment to the university occasioned by the offence;
- (6) the need to deter others from committing a similar offence.

[31] In addition, the University highlighted the importance, in its opinion, of students showing insight and remorse as part of the University's efforts to rehabilitate academic relationships. A guilty plea, Mr. Centa noted, is fundamental to this process.

CONCLUSION

[32] Following its deliberations, the panel was satisfied that the sanction requested by the University was appropriate in the circumstances and accordingly imposed the penalty noted above.

[33] The Panel offered the following additional reasons:

- (1) We are satisfied on the evidence of plagiarism and concoction, and with a regard for the cases from the Book of Authorities before us, that a two-year suspension and a two-year notation are appropriate.
- (2) We place considerable weight on our finding that the Student intentionally, knowingly, concocted the whole paper and took efforts to disguise the fact.
- (3) In addition, the Student failed to respond at all to the notice of the charges and to the various indications that she could intervene helpfully in the proceedings at any point along the way if she were only to engage in the process. If the Student had read the *Code* she would see that at the divisional level there was a maximum penalty of a one-year suspension that could have been imposed but which would require some acknowledgement by her that the values of the University had been invaded by her conduct. She did not avail herself of any of that process. We believe that, when considering the appropriateness of the penalty in this case, it is fair and relevant to take into account that the Student had chosen not to engage in the disciplinary process and as a consequence a matter that might have been disposed of at an earlier stage has come before the Tribunal.
- (4) Finally, there is no evidence before us from the Student which we might otherwise have taken into account in mitigation.

DATED at Toronto

June, 2006

Chair

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty made in January 28, 2005,

AND IN THE MATTER OF the University of Toronto *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995*,

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

BETWEEN:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

The Student

Members of the panel:

- Rodica David Q.C., Chair
- Professor William Weiss, Faculty Panel Member
- Ms Coralie D'Souza, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

- Mr. Robert Centa for the University of Toronto
- Professor Scott Graham
- Ms Lucy Gaspini
- The Student, by arrangement, did not appear

NOTICE OF HEARING AND CHARGES

[1] The Trial Division of the University Tribunal was convened on May 18, 2006 to consider charges under the University of Toronto *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995* (the "Code"). The Notice of Hearing is dated May 3, 2006. The charges are as follows:

1. Contrary to Section B.I.1(d) of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (the "Code"), on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly represented as your own, an idea or expression of an idea, and/or work of another in connection with a form of academic work, namely, your assignment entitled "Assignment 2: GISney World: Vector Analysis", which you submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.

2. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(d) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Assignment #2. Gisney World: Vector Analysis", which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
3. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(d) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Assignment #2. Gisney World: Vector Analysis", which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
4. Contrary to Section B.I.1.(b) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with a form of academic work, namely, your assignment entitled "Assignment 2: GISney World: Vector Analysis", that you submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
5. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(b) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Assignment #2. Gisney World: Vector Analysis", which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
6. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(b) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Assignment #2. Gisney World: Vector Analysis", which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
7. In the alternative, contrary to Section B.I.3(b) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in a report entitled "Assignment 2: GISney World: Vector Analysis", which you submitted to fulfill course requirements in GGR 261.
8. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.3(b) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Assignment #2. Gisney World: Vector Analysis", which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
9. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.3(b) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Assignment #2. Gisney World: Vector Analysis" which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.

10. Contrary to Section B.I.1(d) of the Code, on or about April 6, 2004, you knowingly represented as your own, an idea or expression of an idea, and/or work of another in connection with a form of academic work, namely, your assignment entitled "Municipality of GISney World Site Suitability Analysis Design for the Optimal Sites for a Pollution Monitoring Station: Raster and Vector Model Report", which you submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
11. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(d) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Spatial Analysis Proposal: Locating a Pollution Monitoring Station", which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
12. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(d) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Spatial Analysis Proposal: Locating a Pollution Monitoring Station", which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
13. Contrary to Section B.I.1.(b) of the Code, on or about April 6, 2004, you knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with a form of academic work, namely, your assignment entitled "Municipality of GISney World Site Suitability Analysis Design for the Optimal Sites for a Pollution Monitoring Station: Raster and Vector Model Report", that you submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
14. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(b) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Spatial Analysis Proposal: Locating a Pollution Monitoring Station", which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
15. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(b) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Spatial Analysis Proposal: Locating a Pollution Monitoring Station", which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
16. In the alternative, contrary to Section B.I.3(b) of the Code, on or about April 6, 2004, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in a report entitled "Municipality of GISney World Site Suitability Analysis Design for the Optimal Sites for a Pollution Monitoring Station: Raster and Vector Model Report", which you submitted to fulfill course requirements in GGR 261.
17. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to

commit an offence under section B.I.3(b) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Spatial Analysis Proposal: Locating a Pollution Monitoring Station", which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.

18. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.3(b) of the Code with respect to his assignment entitled "Spatial Analysis Proposal: Locating a Pollution Monitoring Station" which he submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
19. Pursuant to Section B of the Code, you are deemed to have committed the offence knowingly if you ought reasonably to have known that you
 - a. represented as your own, an idea or expression of an idea, and/ or work of another in connection with a form of academic work;
 - b. used or possessed an unauthorized aid or aids or obtained unauthorized assistance in any academic examination or term test;
 - c. engaged in any form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation in order to obtain academic credit;
 - d. did or omitted to do anything for the purpose of aiding or assisting another member to commit the offence; or
 - e. abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with another member to commit or be a party to an offence.

[2] Particulars of the charges are as follows:

1. You were, at all material times, a student in GGR261S by Professor Csillag the fall of Winter of 2004.
2. On or about February 13, 2004, you submitted "Assignment 2: GISney World: Vector Analysis" to fulfill the requirements of GGR261S. Your assignment very closely resembled the assignment handed in by Unnamed, another student in GGR261S.
3. On or about April 6, 2004, you submitted "Municipality of GISney World Site Suitability Analysis Design for the Optimal Sites for a Pollution Monitoring Station: Raster and Vector Model Report." This assignment very closely resembled the assignment handed in by Unnamed, another student in GGR261S.

THE HEARING

- [3] At the outset of the hearing the Tribunal was advised that the Student was not expected to appear before the panel. Instead, the Student submitted a sworn affidavit agreeing with the University to the facts of the case. In the affidavit, the Student agreed to plead guilty to Charges ## 4, 5, 10, 13 and 14. The University withdrew the remaining charges.

- [4] After reviewing the agreed set of facts set out in the Student's affidavit, the panel unanimously agreed after deliberation to accept the Student's guilty pleas.
- [5] The remainder of the hearing considered the appropriate penalty in the circumstances.
- [6] The Tribunal was advised that The Student and the University entered into a Joint Submission on Penalty. A copy of the Joint Submission on Penalty is attached hereto.
- [7] The University and the Student jointly submitted that the appropriate penalty was:
1. That the Student:
 - (1) receive a grade of zero in the course GGR 261;
 - (2) be suspended from the University for a period of two years from May 18, 2006 to May 17, 2008; and
 - (3) have her academic record and transcript bear a notation of these academic offences from May 18, 2006 to May 17, 2008.
 2. The University of Toronto and the Student submit that the University should publish these offences with the Student's name withheld.
- [8] Mr. Centa for the University presented brief submissions on penalty and presented the panel with a Book of Authorities, arguing for the appropriateness of the penalty.
- [9] The panel thanked the participants for their submissions and broke to deliberate.

CONCLUSION AND REASONS

- [10] In view of the Joint Submission on Penalty and the Student's sworn affidavit the panel unanimously accepts the Joint Submission and imposes the jointly submitted sanction noted above.
- [11] The panel notes that, in considering the appropriate sanction, they accept the principle that a joint submission on penalty cannot be taken lightly and must carry a great deal of weight.
- [12] Furthermore, the panel has had an opportunity to review several decisions of other panels of the University Tribunal and, in particular, the criteria for sanction first proposed by the late and former Mr. Justice Sopinka in the matter of the appeal of Mr. C. (November 5, 1976). According to these guidelines, the Tribunal should consider the following six criteria when deciding on an appropriate sanction:
- (1) the character of the person charged;
 - (2) the likelihood of a repetition of the offence;
 - (3) the nature of the offence committed;

- (4) any extenuating circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence;
 - (5) the detriment to the university occasioned by the offence;
 - (6) the need to deter others from committing a similar offence.
- [13] In the present case, with respect to the Student's character, the panel has no evidence before it except for the student's admissions and acknowledgement of misconduct. This acknowledgement speaks to some degree of the Student's character.
- [14] With respect to the likelihood of repetition, the panel considers the jointly submitted sanction sufficiently severe that it is their hope that the Student will not offend again.
- [15] The panel considers the offences in question to be serious offences and the sanction it has imposed reflects this.
- [16] There were no extenuating circumstances before the panel.
- [17] Clearly, in the panel's view, it is not in any way in the interest of the University to tolerate the offences considered in this hearing. The sanction outlined above and imposed by the panel speaks to the detriment to the University occasioned by the offences.
- [18] Similarly, noting in particular the Tribunal's order that the University should publish a notice of the Tribunal's decision and of the sanctions imposed in this matter with the student's name withheld, the panel believes that the sanction it has imposed addresses the University's interest in deterring other students from committing similar offences.
- [19] In the panel's view, all of the criteria advanced by the late and former Mr. Justice Sopinka are addressed and met by the sanction contemplated by the Joint Submission and imposed by panel.

DATED at Toronto, May 24, 2006

_____, Chair

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty made in January 28, 2005,

AND IN THE MATTER OF the University of Toronto *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995*,

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

B E T W E E N:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

The Student

Members of the panel:

- Rodica David Q.C., Chair
- Professor William Weiss, Faculty Panel Member
- Ms Coralie D'Souza, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

- Mr. Robert Centa for the University of Toronto
- Professor Scott Graham
- Ms Lucy Gaspini
- The Student, by arrangement, did not appear

NOTICE OF HEARING AND CHARGES

[1] The Trial Division of the University Tribunal was convened on May 18, 2006 to consider charges under the University of Toronto *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995* (the "Code"). The Notice of Hearing is dated May 3, 2006. The charges are as follows:

1. Contrary to Section B.I.1(d) of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (the "Code), on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly represented as your own, an idea or expression of an idea, and/or work of another in connection with a form of academic work, namely, your assignment entitled "Assignment #2. Gisney World: Vector Analysis"; which you submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.

2. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(d) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Assignment 2: GISney World: Vector Analysis", which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
3. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(d) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Assignment 2: GISney World: Vector Analysis", which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
4. Contrary to Section B.I.1.(b) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with a form of academic work, namely, your assignment entitled "Assignment #2. Gisney World: Vector Analysis", that you submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
5. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(b) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Assignment 2: GISney World: Vector Analysis", which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
6. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(b) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Assignment 2: GISney World: Vector Analysis", which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
7. In the alternative, contrary to Section B.I.3(b) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in a report entitled "Assignment #2. Gisney World: Vector Analysis", which you submitted to fulfill course requirements in GGR 261.
8. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.3(b) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Assignment 2: GISney World: Vector Analysis", which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
9. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about February 13, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.3(b) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Assignment 2: GISney World: Vector Analysis" which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.

10. Contrary to Section B.I.1(d) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly represented as your own, an idea or expression of an idea, and/or work of another in connection with a form of academic work, namely, your assignment entitled "Spatial Analysis Proposal: Locating a Pollution Monitoring Station", which you submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
11. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(d) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Municipality of GISney World Site Suitability Analysis Design for the Optimal Sites for a Pollution Monitoring Station: Raster and Vector Model Report", which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
12. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(d) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Municipality of GISney World Site Suitability Analysis Design for the Optimal Sites for a Pollution Monitoring Station: Raster and Vector Model Report", which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
13. Contrary to Section B.I.1.(b) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with a form of academic work, namely, your assignment entitled "Spatial Analysis Proposal: Locating a Pollution Monitoring Station", that you submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
14. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(b) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Municipality of GISney World Site Suitability Analysis Design for the Optimal Sites for a Pollution Monitoring Station: Raster and Vector Model Report", which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
15. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.1(b) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Municipality of GISney World Site Suitability Analysis Design for the Optimal Sites for a Pollution Monitoring Station: Raster and Vector Model Report", which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
16. In the alternative, contrary to Section B.1.3(b) of the Code, on or about April 6, 2004, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in a report entitled "Spatial Analysis Proposal: Locating a Pollution Monitoring Station", which you submitted to fulfill course requirements in GGR 261.

17. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(ii) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly did or omitted to do something for the purpose of aiding or assisting Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.3(b) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Municipality of GISney World Site Suitability Analysis Design for the Optimal Sites for a Pollution Monitoring Station: Raster and Vector Model Report", which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
18. Contrary to B.II.1(a)(iv) of the Code, on or about April 5, 2004, you knowingly abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with Unnamed to commit an offence under section B.I.3(b) of the Code with respect to her assignment entitled "Municipality of GISney World Site Suitability Analysis Design for the Optimal Sites for a Pollution Monitoring Station: Raster and Vector Model Report" which she submitted to fulfill the course requirements of GGR 261.
19. Pursuant to Section B of the Code, you are deemed to have committed the offence knowingly if you ought reasonably to have known that you
 - a. represented as your own, an idea or expression of an idea, and/ or work of another in connection with a form of academic work;
 - b. used or possessed an unauthorized aid or aids or obtained unauthorized assistance in any academic examination or term test;
 - c. engaged in any form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation in order to obtain academic credit;
 - d. did or omitted to do anything for the purpose of aiding or assisting another member to commit the offence; or
 - e. abetted, counseled, procured or conspired with another member to commit or be a party to an offence.

[2] Particulars of the charges are as follows:

1. You were, at all material times, a student in GGR261S by Professor Csillag the fall of Winter of 2004.
2. On or about February 13, 2004, you submitted "Assignment 2. Gisney World: Vector Analysis" to fulfill the requirements of GGR261S. Your assignment very closely resembled the assignment handed in by Unnamed, another student in GGR261S.
3. On or about April 5, 2004, you submitted "Spatial Analysis Proposal: Locating a Pollution Monitoring Station." This assignment very closely resembled the assignment handed in by Unnamed, another student in GGR261S.

THE HEARING

- [3] At the outset of the hearing the Tribunal was advised that the Student was not expected to appear before the panel. Instead, the Student submitted a sworn affidavit agreeing with the University to the facts of the case. In the affidavit, the Student agreed to plead guilty to Charges ## 4, 5, 10, 13 and 14. The University withdrew the remaining charges.
- [4] After reviewing the agreed set of facts set out in the Student's affidavit, the panel unanimously agreed after deliberation to accept the Student's guilty pleas.
- [5] The remainder of the hearing considered the appropriate penalty in the circumstances.
- [6] The Tribunal was advised that The Student and the University entered into a Joint Submission on Penalty. A copy of the Joint Submission on Penalty is attached hereto.
- [7] The University and the Student jointly submitted that the appropriate penalty was:
 - 1. That the Student:
 - (1) receive a grade of zero in the course GGR 261;
 - (2) be suspended from the University for a period of two years from May 18, 2006 to May 17, 2008; and
 - (3) have her academic record and transcript bear a notation of these academic offences from May 18, 2006 to May 17, 2008.
 - 2. The University of Toronto and the Student submit that the University should publish these offences with the Student's name withheld.
- [8] Mr. Centa for the University presented brief submissions on penalty and presented the panel with a Book of Authorities, arguing for the appropriateness of the penalty.
- [9] The panel thanked the participants for their submissions and broke to deliberate.

CONCLUSION AND REASONS

- [10] In view of the Joint Submission on Penalty and the Student's sworn affidavit the panel unanimously accepts the Joint Submission and imposes the jointly submitted sanction noted above.
- [11] The panel notes that, in considering the appropriate sanction, they accept the principle that a joint submission on penalty cannot be taken lightly and must carry a great deal of weight.
- [12] Furthermore, the panel has had an opportunity to review several decisions of other panels of the University Tribunal and, in particular, the criteria for sanction first proposed by the late and former Mr. Justice Sopinka in the matter of the appeal of Mr. C .(November 5,

1976). According to these guidelines, the Tribunal should consider the following six criteria when deciding on an appropriate sanction:

- (1) the character of the person charged;
- (2) the likelihood of a repetition of the offence;
- (3) the nature of the offence committed;
- (4) any extenuating circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence;
- (5) the detriment to the university occasioned by the offence;
- (6) the need to deter others from committing a similar offence.

- [13] In the present case, with respect to the Student's character, the panel has no evidence before it except for the student's admissions and acknowledgement of misconduct. This acknowledgement speaks to some degree of the Student's character.
- [14] With respect to the likelihood of repetition, the panel considers the jointly submitted sanction sufficiently severe that it is their hope that the Student will not offend again.
- [15] The panel considers the offences in question to be serious offences and the sanction it has imposed reflects this.
- [16] There were no extenuating circumstances before the panel.
- [17] Clearly, in the panel's view, it is not in any way in the interest of the University to tolerate the offences considered in this hearing. The sanction outlined above and imposed by the panel speaks to the detriment to the University occasioned by the offences.
- [18] Similarly, noting in particular the Tribunal's order that the University should publish a notice of the Tribunal's decision and of the sanctions imposed in this matter with the student's name withheld, the panel believes that the sanction it has imposed addresses the University's interest in deterring other students from committing similar offences.
- [19] In the panel's view, all of the criteria advanced by the late and former Mr. Justice Sopinka are addressed and met by the sanction contemplated by the Joint Submission and imposed by panel.

DATED at Toronto, May 24, 2006

_____, Chair