

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty made on November 29, 2016

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 am. S.O.

B E T W E E N:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

D [REDACTED] K [REDACTED]

REASONS FOR DECISION

Hearing Dates: June 20, 2017 and July 18, 2017

Members of the Panel:

Mr. R.S.M. Woods, Barrister and Solicitor, Chair
Professor Faye Mishna, Faculty Panel Member
Ms. Alexis Giannelia, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

Ms. Lily Harmer, Assistant Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland, Barristers
Mr. Orlando Vinton, Elita Chambers, Counsel for the Student

In Attendance:

Ms. D [REDACTED] K [REDACTED], the Student (June 20, 2017 and July 18, 2017)
Ms. Chelsea Laidlaw, Assistant to Mr. Orlando Vinton, Elita Chambers (June 20, 2017 and July 18, 2017)
Professor Roberta Fulthorpe, University of Toronto Scarborough (June 20, 2017)
Professor Luc De Nil, Vice-Dean, Students, School of Graduate Studies (June 20, 2017 and July 18, 2017)
Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances (June 20 and July 18, 2017)

1. D [REDACTED] K [REDACTED] (“the Student”) is a graduate student enrolled in the Doctor of Philosophy program in the School of Graduate Studies, Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences at the Scarborough Campus of the University of Toronto (the “**University**”).

2. In the spring of 2016, the Student applied for a graduate research scholarship. The project the Student proposed involved a topic outside of her area of expertise, but within the area of others working in the same lab in which she worked. This led her supervisor, Professor Roberta Fulthorpe, to take a closer look at the application. Based on her review of it, Professor Fulthorpe concluded that the application was made up of extracts from the work of others. This led her to examine the papers the Student had submitted in the courses she had taken. They seemed to display the same problem.

3. Based on what appeared to be a series of incidents of plagiarism, the Vice-Provost charged the Student with the following offences under the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995 (the “**Code**”):

- (a) In or about Fall 2014, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in an essay that you submitted in EES1128 entitled “Demystifying belowground multispecies interplay in legume plant-mutualistic plant-microbial systems” (“**EES1128 Essay**”), contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.
- (b) In or about Winter 2015, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in an essay that you submitted in EES2200 entitled “Nitric oxide in plant signaling” (“**EES2200 Essay**”), contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.
- (c) In or about March, 2016, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in a research statement on the subject of “Microbial ecology of green roofs in Toronto” (“**Research Statement**”) that you submitted to the University in support of a scholarship request, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.

- (d) In the alternative to charges 1, 2 and 3, you knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation not otherwise described in the *Code* in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the *Code*, in connection with:
- (i) The EES1128 Essay in or about Fall 2014;
 - (ii) The EES2200 Essay in or about 2015; and
 - (iii) The Research Statement in or about March 2016.

The Hearing

4. We heard this matter over the course of two days. On June 20, 2017 we heard oral evidence from Professor Roberta Fulthorpe and the Vice-Dean, Students, Professor Luc De Nil. The Vice Provost's counsel also introduced into evidence, with the Student's consent, an affidavit from Professor Marney Isaac, a lecturer with the School of Graduate Studies. The Student gave evidence on her own behalf.

5. Following the evidence, we heard submissions from counsel for both parties. After considering the evidence and submissions we issued our decision on the charges, finding the Student guilty of charges 1, 2 and 3. We then adjourned the hearing to July 18, 2017, to allow the parties time to consider their evidence and submissions on the appropriate penalty. When we reconvened on July 18, 2017 we heard further evidence from the Student and submissions on penalty. After considering the evidence and the submissions of both parties, we issued our decision on penalty.

Decision

6. Based on the evidence before us, and the submissions of counsel for the parties, we conclude that the University has established that the Student is guilty of each of Charges 1, 2, and 3. Based on that decision, the University has withdrawn Charge 4.

7. Given the number and seriousness of the offences, as well as the Student's status as a doctoral student on a scholarship, notwithstanding the Student's submissions about her personal

background and the consequences the penalty would have on her, we have decided to impose the significant penalty outlined below, including recommending to the President of the University that he recommend the Student's expulsion to the Governing Council.

Merits of the Charges

Evidence

8. The Student is currently 38 years old. She grew up in Croatia and attended the J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek in Croatia, receiving a Master of Food Engineering in 2005. Based on her curriculum vitae, after receiving that degree, she continued to work at the Croatian university, while spending some time on research assignments in China, as well as one year at Wageningen University in the Netherlands. Although English is not her first language, over the course of her academic career, she wrote, or participated in writing, numerous English-language academic papers and chapters in academic publications.

9. In 2014, the University admitted the Student as a doctoral student in the School of Graduate Studies, studying in the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences under Professor Fulthorpe. Professor Fulthorpe is an environmental biologist. The Student was planning to focus her studies on microbial biology. She eventually decided to concentrate upon the interaction between microbes and coffee plants.

10. Professor Fulthorpe testified that the Student's record was so good that Professor Fulthorpe's department decided to put her up for a Connaught Scholarship. This made it affordable for the department to take the Student on as a student because, as a Connaught Scholar, the Student would only have to pay the same student fees as domestic students. The Student's evidence was that the scholarship was worth about \$35,000 annually.

11. Having been admitted to the University, and been awarded the Connaught Scholarship, the Student was given a student visa to enter Canada. At the University, she worked alongside other students in a lab under Professor Fulthorpe's supervision.

12. Professor Fulthorpe testified that the Student's progress was slower than her other students. She described the Student's progress as "painstakingly slow". The Student took much more time to complete routine lab work as compared to her colleagues in the lab.

13. Nevertheless, the Student did attend the required courses and submit the papers needed to complete those courses. In particular, in the fall of 2014, she attended EES1128 and submitted the EES1128 Essay in fulfillment of the requirements of that course. That paper was worth 40% of her final mark. She received a mark of 87% for that paper. In the winter of 2015 she attended EES2200. She submitted the EES2200 Essay in fulfillment of the requirements of that course. At the time, no one raised any questions with either of those papers.

14. In February 2016, the University and The Toronto-Dominion Bank created the TD Graduate Research Scholarships in Environmental Science (the "**TD Scholarships**"). According to the email sent to doctoral students in Environmental Science, the goal of the TD Scholarships was "to promote research projects that are related to the sustenance of the natural environment, particularly in a near-urban setting." The total value of the available scholarships was \$10,000. The email invited interested students to submit a one page statement of how their research plans addressed the above criteria, along with an updated curriculum vitae.

15. The Student applied for one of the TD Scholarships. In the Research Statement, which she submitted as part of her application, she proposed a project investigating "the ecological processes that shape green roof microbial composition, population dynamics and function, and how plant-microbial feedbacks facilitate the ecosystem services".

16. Professor Fulthorpe testified that she first saw the Research Statement at a meeting convened to review applications for the TD Scholarships. She described the Research Statement as coming "out of the blue" because it was not within the Student's area of study. There was a component of the proposed project, looking at the microbial ecology of roofs, that was within the Student's area, but she was studying a very different habitat. Green roofs were something that were being studied by an undergraduate student in the lab in which the Student was working, but she was not part of that project.

17. Professor Fulthorpe sent the Research Statement to Scott McIvor, who together with Professor Marc Cadotte, was supervising the undergraduate student's work. He told Professor Fulthorpe that portions of the Research Statement had been plagiarized from the work of others. Professor Fulthorpe testified that she then reviewed the Research Statement and was able to confirm that parts of it had been taken verbatim from the work of others.

18. Counsel for the Student did not challenge on cross-examination Professor Fulthorpe's evidence that the Research Statement outlined a project that was outside of the Student's area of study and being undertaken by another student in the lab in which the Student was working.

19. Given what she had discovered in the Research Statement, Professor Fulthorpe decided to look at the papers the Student had submitted in the courses she had taken at the University. In particular, Professor Fulthorpe looked at the EES1128 Essay, the essay the Student had submitted in EES1128, an essay entitled "Demystifying belowground multispecies interplay in legume plant-mutualiztic plant-microbial systems", and the EES2200 Essay, the essay the Student had submitted in EES2200 entitled "Nitric oxide in plant signalling". Professor Fulthorpe also asked Professor Marney Isaac, who had taught EES1128, to review the EES1128 Essay.

20. Both Professor Fulthorpe and Professor Isaac concluded that large portions of the EES1128 Essay had been taken verbatim, or nearly verbatim, from the work of others. In the affidavit she submitted, Professor Isaac identified multiple passages that were taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from articles authored by others. For her part, in her testimony, Professor Fulthorpe went over for us a highlighted copy of the essay which identified sentences, and in some cases paragraphs, that were taken verbatim from scholarly articles written by others. The Student's counsel did not challenge any of this evidence.

21. Professor Isaac's affidavit evidence was admitted without any cross-examination, and the Student's counsel did not cross-examine Professor Fulthorpe on her evidence that the paper was plagiarized.

22. Professor Fulthorpe testified that most of the EES2200 Essay was composed of extracts taken verbatim from articles written by others. A large part of the essay was taken verbatim

from one article, an article (the “**Freschi Article**”) by Luciano Freschi of the University of Sao Paulo entitled “Nitric oxide and phytohormone interactions: current status and perspectives”. Again, counsel for the Student did not challenge this evidence when cross-examining Professor Fulthorpe.

23. Vice-Dean De Nil gave evidence about his meetings with the Student after Professor Fulthorpe identified the issues with the Research Statement and the two essays. He testified that he met with her in October 2016. He went over the process with her to ensure that she understood her rights. He reviewed the evidence he had. He highlighted the main sections the University considered to have been plagiarized and invited her to comment. Vice-Dean De Nil indicated that the Student admitted to plagiarizing all three documents. In the case of the Research Statement, she told him that it was outside of her field of expertise so, in order to appear more knowledgeable, she decided to take information from other sources. In the case of the essays, she said the information was all common knowledge so references were not required.

24. Vice-Dean De Nil stated that he decided to refer the case to the Tribunal because of its seriousness, involving three papers and two courses. The fact that one incident involved a scholarship was significant to him because had the issue not been discovered it might have led to someone else not obtaining something they should have obtained.

25. On cross-examination, Vice-Dean De Nil agreed that the Student had told him that she had not intentionally plagiarized anything. He could not recall any language issue, but said that he believed the Student told him that English was not her first language. At no point did he believe that she had trouble understanding him. On re-examination, he indicated that someone in the Doctor of Philosophy programme would be expected to have a significantly strong level of English language ability to be able to handle the academic requirements.

26. For her part, in her evidence, the Student did not give evidence about how the Research Statement, the EES1128 Essay and the EES2200 Essay came to include the work of other people. Instead, she gave evidence about marital problems that she had had with her husband before coming to Canada and her eventual divorce. She also testified about her proficiency in English. She testified that she thought that she had complied with the applicable guidelines, and that no one had ever complained before about her writing. She stated that she had not received

any formal training in writing in English at a scientific level. On cross-examination she admitted that many of the papers on her curriculum vitae had been written in English and that the level of English she gave on her curriculum vitae, C2, was a high level.

Submissions

27. Counsel for the University submitted that the Student was clearly guilty of the charges against her. She reviewed the three documents, pointing out those portions that were taken from the works of others. For his part, in his submissions counsel for the Student suggested issues with the English language may have contributed to her actions, but failed to offer a reasonable explanation of how an academic could have conceived that she could include material written by others in her papers without making clear that it was the work of someone else.

Findings

28. Based on the evidence before us, the Student is guilty of the charges that she represented as her own the works of others in each of the Research Statement, the EES1128 Essay and the EES2200 Essay.

29. About one third of the Research Statement was taken verbatim from the works of others. The primary source was an article entitled “Green Roofs as Urban Ecosystems: Ecological Structures, Functions, and Services” published in BioScience magazine in November 2007, but the Student also took statements from four other sources. In the Research Statement, the Student did not identify any of these verbatim statements as the work of others.

30. Almost half of the EES1128 Essay was taken verbatim from the work of others. For example, the following five paragraphs in the paper were each taken verbatim from articles or books written by others:

In the early steps of symbiosis, a diverse array of compounds is excluded in the rhizosphere, including flavonoids, isoflavonoids, and non-flavonoid inducers. These compounds are chemoattractants for rhizobia (Caetano-Anolle's et al. 1988; Dharmatike & Bauer, 1992), influence bacterial growth, and induce the expression of nodulation genes (nod genes) (Peters et al., Hungria & Stacey,

1997). As a result of nod genes expression, biosynthesis of specific lipochitin oligosaccharides called nodulation factors (Nod factors or LCOs) occurs (Lerouge et al., 1990).

The 450-million-yr-old arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) symbiosis is among the world's most widespread mutualisms and is formed by c. 65% of all known land species (Wang & Qui, 2006). The extraradical mycelium (ERM) of the fungus forms an extensive network in the soil and provides the host plant with access to nutrient resources beyond the root depletion zone. The ERM of the AM fungus takes up phosphorus (P), nitrogen (N), sulfur and various trace elements from the soil, and transfers these nutrients to the intraradical mycelium (IRM), where the nutrients are exchanged for carbon (C) from the host (Marschner & Dell, 1994; Smith et al., 2009).

Studies have recognized the improvement in plant biomass and nodulation by co-inoculation of rhizobia with PGPR. However, the ability of co-inoculant PGPR depends on the inoculant strain's inherent potential and effectiveness/specificity to certain plant species, cultivar and genotype, composition of root exudates of host plant, cell density of applied inocula/optimal inoculation dose, temperature variation, and interaction of applied inocula with rhizosphere microflora predominant in the particular crop (Medina et al., 2003; El-Sawy et al., 2006; Remans et al., 2008; Mishra et al., 2009; Fox et al., 2011).

Azospirillum, a free living N₂ fixer and a PGPR, has been recognized for its ability to improve nodulation and biomass of legumes as a co-inoculant of rhizobia (Roseline et al., 2008). Improved rhizobial infection, nodule formation and N₂ fixation activity as a result of the combined inoculation with *Azospirillum* and *Rhizobium* via the enhanced production of plant hormones and siderophores and enhancement of total mineral uptake have been claimed as a mechanism for growth and biomass enhancement of various legumes (Wani et al., 2007; Dardenelli et al., 2008; Cassan et al., 2009).

Another promising avenue to optimize plant growth is through managing interactions between plant growth-promoting bacteria (PGPB), AM fungi and the *Rhizobium*-legume symbiosis Mycorrhizal fungi that are known to form associations with more than 80 % of plant species often enhance nutrient and water uptake. PGPB are able to increase AM fungal development by affecting root colonization as well as by enhancing plant N and P uptake (Richardson et al., 2009). Production of EPS by PGPB significantly enhances the attachment of bacteria to mycorrhizal roots and AM fungal structures that influence the movement of bacteria in the rhizosphere (Bianciotto et al., 2001). Soil microbes (PGR and *Rhizobia*) are able to enhance the amounts of root exudates resulting in the activation of AM hyphae and hence higher rate of root colonization (Barea et al., 2005).

31. The first paragraph comes from *Microbes for Legume Improvement* edited by Mohammad Sahir Khan and others. The second is the opening paragraph of an article by Carl R. Felbaum and others entitled “Fungal nutrient allocation in common mycorrhizal networks is regulated by the carbon source strength of individual host plants” published in the journal *New Phytologist* in 2014. The third, fourth and fifth paragraphs are from pages 215 to 216 of *Plant Microbes Symbiosis: Applied Facets* edited by Naveen Kumar Arora.

32. Almost all of the EES2200 Essay was taken from the works of others. From the bulk of the essay’s second paragraph:

It [Nitric oxide] was found to play a crucial role in plant growth and development, starting from germination to flowering, ripening of fruit and senescence of organs. Also, in case of environmental stress hazard caused by both abiotic and biotic factors, enhanced NO generation is observed in different plant species and organs. This review is focused mainly on the essential role of NO-plant hormones signalling network

which is taken verbatim from the abstract to an article by Magdalena Arasimowicz and others in the journal *Plant Science* entitled “Nitric oxide as a bioactive signalling molecule in plant stress responses”, to the essay’s concluding paragraph:

Finally, we must remain open-minded to conceive increasingly complex NO-phytohormone interconnection nodes since new targets of NO-dependent PTMs

and other upstream and downstream elements of NO signaling cascades will likely be identified in the future. At the same time, more complete pictures mechanistically explaining how multiple plant hormones may simultaneously interact with NO to control specific plant responses might also emerge, very likely leading to exciting new models of NO-phyto hormone interaction networks.

which is taken verbatim from the concluding paragraph of the Freschi Article, the essay is little more than a collection of unattributed statements from papers written by others. Most of the essay comes from the Freschi Article.

33. As noted, the Student provided us with little explanation of how what was supposed to be her work came to include so much material from others. She admitted to Vice-Dean De Nil that the Research Statement and the two essays contained the work of others. She told him that she did not think she had to provide references because the material she had included was common knowledge. At points in her evidence, she appeared to suggest that it resulted from the fact that English was not her first language, or from the fact that no one had ever complained about her writing before.

34. None of this explains or justifies the Student's attempt to pass off as her own the work of others. Based on our review of it, the plagiarized material goes far beyond statements of general knowledge; it is in large part the result of the author or authors own research and analysis. We reject the argument that this was a language issue. Using the work of others has nothing to do with the fact that the Student's first language is not English.

35. We do not accept the suggestion that merely because no one had ever complained about her writing means that the Student was unaware that she could not legitimately present the thoughts and words of others as her own. The Student had written, or been part of a group writing, published academic works long before she came to the University. We reject any suggestion that she was not aware that she could not pass on the work of others as her own.

36. Based on the evidence before us, we therefore conclude that the Student did represent as her own idea or expression of an idea or work of another in each of the EES1128 Essay, the EES2200 Essay and the Research Statement, and is therefore guilty of the first three charges against her. As noted earlier, given that conclusion, the University withdrew the fourth charge.

Penalty

Evidence

37. We heard evidence from the Student relating to penalty when the hearing reconvened on July 18, 2017. The Student testified that she had never been systematically educated in scientific writing. She said that her mistake was that she had not read the instructions governing papers when she came to the University. That mistake built up when no one checked her first paper. According to the Student, if someone had properly checked the paper, then she would not have been before us.

38. The Student acknowledged that what she had done was wrong, but asked us to consider her circumstances. At the time she wrote the essays and the Research Statement, she was in the midst of the break-up of her marriage. She was an only child and had had to admit to her family that she had failed on every level. She pointed out that our decision would affect her professional life, her finances and access to medical care in Canada, as well as her ability to remain in the country. She asked us to consider the whole picture and the person behind it, noting that she had dedicated her life to progress and been a straight A student. She knew five languages. She had worked in six different laboratories in Europe and China. She had joined a writing group at the University and thought that given the chance would be able to provide services to others to help them avoid doing what she had done.

39. During the Student's evidence there was some mention of an accident and her having taken a leave from her program. On cross examination, the Student agreed that the accident came after she had written the two essays and the Research Statement. She also admitted that apart from the period of time during which she was on leave, she had continued to receive the Connaught Scholarship monies.

Submissions

40. Counsel for the University submitted that we should make an order:

- (a) recording a final grade of 0 in each of EES1128 (Fall 2014) and EES2200 (Fall 2014);

- (b) immediately suspending the Student for a period of up to five years;
- (c) recommending that the Student be expelled from the University;
- (d) permanently recording the sanction on Ms. K [REDACTED]'s academic record; and
- (e) that this case shall be reported to the Provost for publication.

41. Counsel described the Student's plagiarism as egregious. The EES1128 Essay was plagiarized and an even more significant portion of the EES2200 Essay was taken from other source documents. The Research Statement involved taking someone else's work and presenting it as her own. This was fundamentally problematic.

42. Counsel noted that the Student was a doctoral student and an experienced scientist. She had a very lengthy list of publications. She noted the Student's evidence about no one checking her paper for plagiarism, submitting that the comment demonstrated that the Student was not taking responsibility for her actions, not something one would expect in someone asking for a second chance. Counsel acknowledged that the Student had suffered some setbacks in her life, but submitted that this was not uncommon.

43. Counsel for the University submitted that the penalty she was requesting was in line with the penalty imposed in other cases in which the Tribunal found very serious misconduct, providing us with a series of cases in support of that submission.

44. Counsel for the Student submitted that instead of recommending expulsion we should suspend his client. He argued that suspension was the appropriate penalty bearing in mind that: the Student had no previous record of academic dishonesty; there was an issue with respect to the Student's proficiency with the English language which constituted a barrier to her ability to write in English; the Student's appreciation of the seriousness of the findings against her, and willingness to improve; and, the Student's personal circumstances, including the breakdown of her marriage and the consequences of any sanction on her immigration status.

Findings

45. This Tribunal has set out the factors to be considered in imposing sanctions on students in a number of cases. One such case is *The University of Toronto v N. A (Case No.: 661, February 29, 2012)* where the Tribunal described the factors this way:

31 The Factors to be considered when determining penalty are well established:

- (i) the character of the person charged;
- (ii) the likelihood of a repetition of the offence;
- (iii) the nature of the offence committed;
- (iv) any extenuating circumstances surrounding commission of the offence;
- (v) the detriment to the University occasioned by the offence;
- (vi) the need to deter others from committing a similar offence.

32 The Tribunal, in determining the appropriate penalty, should consider various factors in order to find a fit sentence for this offender, for this offence in this community. In doing so, fairness, balance and proportion must be balanced.

33 There should be some measure of uniformity or proportionality so that there should be similar sentences imposed for offences committed in similar circumstances. The sentencing should preserve and ensure fairness by avoiding disproportionate sentences among similar sentencing processes so that there are not wide swings or inconsistencies between like offences and like offenders, recognizing that there is never a like offence or like offender.

34 There should be a range of sentences for offences such as plagiarism with sentences within that range moving up or down within that range depending on aggravating or mitigating circumstances.

46. Reviewing the above factors, while the Student has no prior record of committing any academic offences, and we do not believe there is much likelihood that she would offend again,

the plagiarism here is simply too significant and too pervasive in the Student's work to merit anything other than the most serious sanction available to us.

47. The Student is not an undergraduate student who used the work of another in one paper, she is an experienced doctoral student who has written or contributed to many academic publications. All of the written work before us contained significant elements taken from the work of others and presented as the Student's own work. The fact that the Student presented the work of others as her own not once, not twice, but three times is especially troubling, as is the extent of the plagiarism in the EES2200 Essay and the fact that in submitting the Research Statement the Student was putting forward as her own a project being undertaken by another student in the same lab as her.

48. The Student's personal circumstances, in particular, her marital problems and medical issues, do not excuse her conduct. While we might have had some sympathy were those problems linked directly to a particular incident, in her evidence the Student did not even attempt to link the incidents of plagiarism to them. Instead, she merely mentioned them as part of her personal situation. Similarly, we do not accept the submissions of the Student's counsel that the Student's use of the work of others was somehow linked to her proficiency in the English language. Scholars know they cannot present the work of others as their own regardless of their language.

49. We are also very troubled by the Student's comment that she would not be in this situation had someone properly checked her first paper. While it is certainly unfortunate that none of the Student's supervisors and instructors noticed the plagiarism in the EES1128 Essay, the Student was the one who did not abide by the code of conduct governing her. She cannot avoid responsibility for her actions by simply saying she should have been caught earlier. Her statement leads us to question her acknowledgment that her actions were wrong.

50. Dealing with the last two factors, the Student's actions reflect very poorly on the University, all the more so when one of the written works containing the work of others was part of an application for a scholarship funded by a third party. Other students need to be deterred from such behaviour, a goal that only a very significant penalty will achieve.

51. Based on this Tribunal's previous decisions, immediate suspension and a recommendation to the President of the University that he recommend that the student be expelled is the appropriate penalty where there are multiple incidents of plagiarism by a graduate student, when the improper conduct relates to obtaining some financial benefit, potentially deprives another student of some benefit, or reflects poorly on the University as a whole. See for example: *The University of Toronto v. O.G. (Case No.: 587, April 14, 2010)* in which expulsion was recommended when the student's doctoral thesis contained lengthy, unattributed, verbatim excerpts from secondary sources: *The University of Toronto v. D.D. (Case No.: 593, September 3, 2010)* in which expulsion was recommended where the student's application for an undergraduate research program contained false information and *The University of Toronto v. K.K. (Case No.: November 3, 2009)* in which expulsion was recommended where the student had completely fabricated her involvement in an entire course. This case is similar in the extent of the plagiarism, the fact that one of the documents in issue was an application for a financial award and involved third parties.

52. Taking into account all of the factors listed above, the appropriate is to award the Student final grades of zero in the two courses in which she submitted plagiarized papers, suspend her immediately, and recommend her expulsion from the University.

Finding

53. We therefore made the following order on July 18, 2017;

- a. The Student shall receive a final grade of zero in each of EES1128 (Fall 2014) and EES2200 (Fall 2014);
- b. The Student shall be immediately suspended from the University for a period of up to five years;
- c. the Tribunal recommends to the President of the University that he recommend to the Governing Council that the Student be expelled from the University;

- d. this sanction shall be recorded permanently on the Student's academic record and transcript to the effect that she was sanctioned for academic misconduct;
- e. this case shall be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanctions imposed, with the Student's name withheld.

Dated at Toronto this 6th day of September, 2017



R. Seumas M. Woods, Co-Chair