



University of Toronto TORONTO ONTARIO

University Tribunal

SENT BY REGISTERED MAIL

November 30, 1995

CONFIDENTIAL

Appealed:

1995/96-08

Mr. E

Toronto, Ontario

Dear Mr. E

At its hearing held on November 28th, 1995, the Trial Division of the University Tribunal considered the following charges against you:

THAT on or about March 29th, 1995, you intentionally counselled another member, namely Professor Harold Ohlendorf, to commit or be a party to an offence under the Code, namely, to intentionally evaluate academic work by you by reference to a criterion that does not relate to its merit contrary to Sections B.I.2(c) and B.II.1.(iv) of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters.

THAT on or about March 29th, 1995 you attempted to forge or falsify an academic record, namely your results in HUM B56S contrary to Sections B.II.2 and B.I.3 of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters; and

THAT on or about March 29th, 1995, you attempted to obtain unauthorized assistance in the final examination and in connection with academic work in HUM B56S contrary to Sections B.II.2 and B.I.1.(b) of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters.

In particular, in the spring of 1995 you were a student in HUM B56S, Modern German Prose, a course taught by Professor Ohlendorf. On March 29th, 1995, you attended at his office, and attempted to persuade him to permit you to forego writing a term paper and the final examination in the course in return for the sum of \$1,000.00. Professor Ohlendorf rejected your offer.

I am writing to confirm the decision of the Tribunal with respect to these charges. The panel accepted your guilty plea. It found you guilty of charges #2 and #3, and charge #1 as it relates to Section B.II.1(iv), but not to Section B.I.2.(c) of the Code.

The panel recommends the following sanction:

- that you be expelled from the University of Toronto for academic misconduct.

The panel gave the following reasons for its decision:

"Primarily our reason is that we consider the nature of the offence and the circumstances of its commission to be the most serious of all offences to which we have been referred. The attempted bribery of Professor Ohlendorf, whether or not a criminal offence, is undoubtedly an act that strikes at the fundamental relationship of trust that must exist in the University. It was an attempt to involve another member of the University community in an act of corruption.

As to its commission,, it clearly required some preparation and planning and was carried out in circumstances which there was no doubt in our mind about Mr. E ' intention to follow through. We are cognizant of the severe consequences of the penalty and, while we accept that Mr. E is genuinely remorseful, we can find nothing in the extenuating circumstances that can result in anything less than expulsion, having regard to the overriding need to protect the integrity of the University and its institutions in the face of this admitted conduct.

we also find it bizarre that the result of these events and penalty will be that Mr. E. will not in fact obtain a degree although he may have had sufficient credits to otherwise have obtained his degree prior to the offence.

In the circumstances, we are not prepared to award the costs of the hearing against Mr. E , although he was ready to accept that penalty."

The Tribunal is reporting the case to the Provost for publication in the University newspapers, with your name withheld.

Information concerning rights of appeal may be found in Section C.III of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. The deadline for filing an appeal by you or by the University is January 9th, 1996.

Yours truly,



Lynn Snowden
Secretary
University Tribunal

LDS/l
Enclosure

cc: R. Slaght
L. Rothstein
M. Cuddy-Keane
A. Sedra
P. Gooch