

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty filed on May 3, 2021,

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 –

S [REDACTED] O [REDACTED]

REASONS FOR DECISION

Hearing Date: July 8, 2021, via Zoom

Members of the Panel:

Mr. R.S.M. Woods, Chair
Professor Gabriele D’Eleuterio, Faculty Panel Member
Mr. Alex Erikson, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

Ms. Lily Harmer, Assistant Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP
Ms. Kimberly Dias, Representative for the Student, Downtown Legal Services

Hearing Secretary:

Ms. Carmelle Salomon-Labbé, Associate Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances

In Attendance:

S [REDACTED] O [REDACTED]

The Charges

1. On May 3, 2021, the University of Toronto (the “University”) laid the following charges (the “Charges”) against S [REDACTED] O [REDACTED] (the “Student”) under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995* (the “Code”):

- 1 On or about December 11, 2020, you knowingly used or possessed an unauthorized aid or aids or obtained unauthorized assistance in a final exam in MGT2205H: Advanced Financial Accounting (the “Course”), contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the *Code*.
- 2 On or about December 11, 2020, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in question 1 of Test 2 that you wrote in the Course, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.
- 3 In addition, and in the alternative, 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 Test 2 in the Course.

The Hearing

2. The Tribunal heard the Charges on July 8, 2021 by video conference over Zoom due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The University was represented by counsel at the hearing as was the Student. The Student also attended the hearing.

Merits of the Charges

Evidence and Submissions

3. At the outset of the hearing, counsel for the University advised the Tribunal that the parties had come to an agreement on an agreed statement of facts (the “Agreed Statement of Facts”), a copy of which is attached as Schedule A to these reasons.

4. Based on the evidence contained in the Agreed Statement of Facts, counsel for the University submitted that the Tribunal should find the Student guilty of the first and second offences outlined in the Charges. Counsel indicated that if the Tribunal found the Student guilty

of those two offences, the University would withdraw the third charge. Counsel for the Student agreed with the submissions of counsel for the University, submitting that the Tribunal should find her client guilty of the first two charges.

Decision on the Merits

5. As set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Student is an international student from Nigeria. She has been enrolled in the School of Graduate Studies at the University since the fall of 2019. To date, she has completed 15.25 credits towards a Master of Management and Professional Accounting degree and continues to take courses at the University.

6. According to a note from a doctor at UTM Health & Counselling Centre appended to the Agreed Statement of Facts, as of the fall of 2020, the Student had been diagnosed with a number of medical conditions, including obstructive sleep apnea, prediabetes and adjustment disorder. The Student was undergoing investigations for leg swelling and was experiencing marked daytime sleepiness, suspected to be secondary to her obstructive sleep apnea.

7. In the 2020 Fall academic term the Student enrolled in MGT2205H Advanced Financial Accounting (the “Course”); a course taught by Professor Eckhard Schumann. Students in the Course were required to write two tests, which were each worth 20% of the mark for the Course. The tests were to be written remotely. The Course syllabus specified that the tests were “open book and individual and no collaboration will be allowed.”

8. The test in issue in this proceeding was the second of the two tests (“Test 2”). Professor Schumann had created six versions of Test 2. The questions, and therefore the answers to those questions, were different in the different versions.

9. Professor Schumann made Test 2 available to students between 9:00 a.m. and 12:15 p.m. on December 11, 2020. Students were expected to upload their answers to the five questions in Test 2 onto Quercus by 12:15 p.m. on December 11, 2020, in the form of an Excel file for certain questions and a Word file for other questions.

10. The front cover of Test 2 specifically reminded students that the test was an individual test and that students were not allowed to disclose or discuss the content or nature of the test with

anyone else. Students were required to sign a statement on the first page of the test confirming that they were not using any unauthorized aids and that it was an academic offence to do so that could result in academic discipline.

11. The Student has admitted in the Agreed Statement of Facts that when she came to the end of Test 2, she panicked because she did not have time to finish her answer to the first question (“Question 1”) on the test. At the time, the Student was under stress. She was isolated from her family in Nigeria where there had been security issues which frightened the Student. She was also worried about the financial consequences of failing the Course.

12. The Student admits that in those circumstances she used the login information and password for Quercus of another student (“S.C.”) to access that student’s answers to Test 2. S.C. had provided the Student with S.C.’s login information and password in April 2020 to allow the Student to access certain materials in a different course.

13. The Student admits that she copied S.C.’s answer to Question 1, and then, after making some minor changes, added it to the answers she had prepared for Test 2, which she then submitted to Quercus. She admits that she did this despite knowing that this was contrary to the prohibition against collaboration and the use of unauthorized assistance and unauthorized aids for any part of Test 2, and that she did not turn her mind to the consequences this might have for S.C.

14. S.C. was not aware that the Student had used S.C.’s login information and password to access S.C.’s answers to Test 2, or that the Student had submitted S.C.’s answer to Question 1 as if it were her own answer.

15. When grading the answers his students had submitted for Test 2, Professor Schumann noticed that the Student’s answer for Question 1 of Test 2 was nearly identical to that of S.C. The two answers used the same formatting and the same abbreviations. Moreover, the Student’s answers to Question 1 were the same as S.C.’s answers. That should not have been the case because the Student and S.C. had received different versions of Test 2. The Student had written version 4 of Test 2 while S.C. had written version 1 of the test.

16. The Student admits that in using S.C.’s login information and password to access S.C.’s answers to Test 2 and to specifically copy S.C.’s answers to Question 1 of Test 2 the Student:

- (a) used or possessed aid or aids or obtained unauthorized assistances in Test 2, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the *Code*;
- (b) represented the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, and the work of another person as her own in Question 1 of Test 2, committing plagiarism contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*; and
- (c) 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*.

17. Based on the facts and admissions set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts, we find the Student guilty of the first two offences in the Charges. The University has therefore withdrawn the third charge.

Sanction

Evidence and Submissions on Sanction

18. Neither the University nor the Student adduced any further evidence during the sanction phase of the hearing, relying on the facts set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts.

19. The University and the Student made a joint submission on penalty, asking us to make an order that the Student receive a final grade of zero in the Course, be suspended from the University for a period of two years from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2023, that a notation of the sanction be placed on the Student's academic record and transcript from the date of our order to July 8, 2024, and that the Tribunal report the case to the Provost for publication of a notice of the Tribunal's decision and the sanction imposed in the University newspapers, with the name of the Student withheld.

20. Counsel for the University submitted that the proposed sanction was appropriate in all of the circumstances. In terms of mitigating factors, counsel noted that the Student admitted the offence from the outset and had immediately made it clear that S.C. had not been involved in the matter. This was the Student's first offence and she had cooperated throughout the investigation. There was evidence that the Student was under great stress and that the offences were not

premeditated and deliberate, but were something less formal, more like looking at someone else's answers over their shoulder. On the other hand, the offences were serious and had the potential to adversely affect an innocent third party.

21. Counsel for the University pointed us to a number of previous decisions which, she submitted, indicated that the type of penalty typically imposed for the offences for which the Student had been found guilty included a mark of zero in the course and a suspension ranging from a low of about two years and a high of three and one-half years, and a notation on the Student's record for about one year longer than the suspension. She also noted that in previous cases the Tribunal had ruled that it would only reject a joint submission on penalty in circumstances in which giving it effect would be contrary to the public interest or would bring the administration of justice into disrepute. The Tribunal panel must determine if the outcome falls within a reasonable range of outcomes, recognizing the institutional value, efficiency and importance of outcomes achieved through joint submissions. The panel's role was not to determine if it would impose the same penalty as that proposed by the parties. See *University of Toronto v. D.L.* (Case No. 1090, March 4, 2021,).

22. In her helpful submissions, counsel for the Student began by noting that her client had from the outset admitted guilt and cooperated with the University. Counsel emphasized that the Student was taking responsibility for her actions. Counsel noted the reference in the Agreed Statement of Facts to the stress the Student was under at the time of the offences. She submitted that the Student was emotionally distressed as a result of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting lack of contact she had had with her family in Nigeria. The unprecedented security situation in Nigeria only added to the stress the Student was under at the time she committed the offences. Counsel also noted that the Student had been diagnosed as suffering from sleep apnea at the time of the offences which may have contributed to her poor decisions at the time.

23. Counsel for the Student pointed out that this was the Student's first offence and that the consequences for the Student of the proposed sanction would be very significant. As a result of the suspension, the Student would not receive her degree for another two years, making it more difficult for her to gain employment. In addition, as an international student in Canada on a student visa, once the Student's current classes ended, she might have to leave Canada.

24. Counsel for the Student also explained the rationale for having the suspension start on September 1, 2021 rather than immediately. Counsel told the Tribunal that the Student was currently attending courses at the University. By having the suspension start as of September 1, 2021, the Student would be able to register for a replacement course and complete the course work required for her to earn the degree she was pursuing.

25. Counsel for the Student closed her submissions by reiterating counsel for the University's comments on the Tribunal's limited role in cases involving a joint submission on penalty. In counsel's submission, joint submissions on penalty were entitled to a high degree of deference and should only be disregarded in very rare cases.

Decision on Sanction

26. We agree that in cases where the University and the student have reached an agreement on penalty our role is not to decide on the penalty we might impose in our discretion based on the evidence before us, but rather to determine whether the proposed penalty falls within a reasonable range of outcomes. In our opinion, the proposed sanction falls squarely within the range of reasonable outcomes based on the evidence before us.

27. Based on the cases counsel brought to our attention, the Tribunal has imposed a sanction of a course mark of zero and a suspension ranging from a low of two years to a high of three and one-half years for the type of offences for which the Student has been found guilty. Some of the cases at the low end of that range involved spur of the moment actions. For example, in *University of Toronto v. Y.Y.* (Case No. 851, March 1, 2017, (Sanction)) the student was suspended for two years for looking at the test paper of the student sitting next to her. Similarly, in *University of Toronto v. R.A.* (Case No. 738, January 15, 2015,) the Tribunal suspended the student for 22 months. The evidence in that case was that the student had injured her hand before the mid-term examination. To help the student to write the examination the professor lent the student the professor's laptop computer. The student then used the computer to obtain answers to questions on the examination from the internet. Other cases have involved planned conduct, but by a student with no record of prior academic offences. For example, in *University of Toronto v. G.Z.* (Case No. 1004, February 26, 2020,)), the student had written mathematical formulae on the palm of his left hand. He had no record of any prior academic offence. He received a two-year suspension.

28. In contrast, the cases at the high end of the range have tended to involve students, sometimes with a record of prior academic offences, taking premeditated actions to give themselves an advantage. For example, in *University of Toronto v M.S.D.* (Case No. 1047, July 21, 2020 (Sanction)), the student brought an unauthorized aid sheet into an examination. He had previously been found guilty of two prior academic offences, one involving plagiarism and one involving possessing a cell phone while writing his final examination. Although the Tribunal imposed a slightly lesser period of suspension in the context of unique circumstances and a joint submission on penalty, it concluded that a three-year suspension was the usual penalty in similar cases. Similarly, in *University of Toronto v. Q.Y.* (Case No. 860, November 30, 2016,) the student was found in possession of a cell phone during the mid-term examination. She admitted using it during the examination. She had a record of three prior academic offences. The Tribunal accepted a joint submission on penalty under which she was suspended for a period of three and one-half years.

29. This case involves an unplanned act of panic rather than a planned and premeditated effort to give oneself an advantage and as such the proposed two-year suspension is consistent with the sanction imposed in similar cases as therefore is within the range of reasonable outcomes. While the fact that the Student is a graduate student rather than an undergraduate makes her offences that much more serious than those committed by the undergraduates in the cases brought to our attention, we do not believe that her graduate student status renders those cases inapplicable. In any case, the Student's prompt acknowledgment of her transgressions and cooperation with the investigation and discipline process mitigate any concerns we might have otherwise had.

30. The fact that the Student's suspension will not start until some months after the issuance of our order does not take the proposed penalty outside of the reasonable range of outcomes. Such orders, although rare, are not unknown. In our view, postponing the suspension to allow the Student to complete the other courses she needs to complete her degree is reasonable in this case where the Student has no record of any prior academic offences, has admitted her offences, and has cooperated with the University.

Order

31. For the reasons set out above, the Tribunal therefore orders that:

- (a) the Student be found guilty of:
 - (i) one count of the academic offence of using or possessing an unauthorized aid, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the *Code*, and
 - (i) one count of plagiarism, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.
- (b) the Student be given a final grade of zero in the Course;
- (c) the Student be suspended from the University for a period of two years from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2023;
- (d) the sanction be noted on the Student's academic record and transcript for a period of three years from the date of the Tribunal's order to July 8, 2024;
- (e) the case be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the Tribunal's decision and the sanctions imposed, with the Student's name withheld.

Dated: September 21, 2021

Original signed by: _____

Mr. Seumas Woods, Chair

On behalf of the Panel

SCHEDULE A

THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty filed on May 3, 2021,

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.
1978, c. 88

B E T W E E N:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

S [REDACTED] O [REDACTED] ([REDACTED])

AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. This matter arises out of charges of academic misconduct filed on May 3, 2021 (“Charges”) by the Provost of the University of Toronto (the “Provost” and the “University”) under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* (the “Code”). The Provost and S [REDACTED] O [REDACTED] (the “Student”) have prepared this Agreed Statement of Facts (“ASF”) and a Joint Book of Documents (“JBD”). The Provost and the Student agree that:

- a. each document contained in the JBD may be admitted into evidence for all purposes, including for the truth of the document’s contents (unless otherwise indicated in this ASF), without further need to prove the document; and

- b. if a document indicates that it was sent or received by someone, that is *prima facie* proof that the document was sent and received as indicated (unless otherwise indicated in this ASF).
2. The Student admits that she received a copy of the Charges, which are included in the JBD at **Tab 1**.
3. The Student admits that she received a copy of the Notice of Electronic Hearing in this matter and that she has received reasonable notice of this hearing. A copy of the Notice of Electronic Hearing is included in the JBD at **Tab 2**.
- A. The Student's Academic History**
4. The Student's academic record is included in the JBD at **Tab 3**.
5. The Student has been enrolled in the School of Graduate Studies at the University since the Fall of 2019. She has completed 15.25 credits towards a Master of Management and Professional Accounting degree.
6. In the 2020 Fall academic term, the Student was enrolled in MGT2205H: Advanced Financial Accounting, which was taught by Professor Eckhard Schumann. A copy of the syllabus for the Course is included in the JBD at **Tab 4**.
7. Students in the Course were required to write two tests, Test 1 on October 19, 2020, and Test 2 on December 11, 2020. Each test was worth 20% of the Course mark. Both were written remotely. The Course syllabus (at page 5) advised students that they would be required to upload their written tests to Quercus at an appointed time, and that they were "open book and individual and no collaboration will be allowed".
8. The Course syllabus addressed academic integrity in some detail (at page 6): Academic integrity represents a set of morals relating to honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage in our learning environment.

Students should note that cheating, plagiarizing, and usage of unauthorized electronic devices are considered academic offences and **will not be tolerated**.

Moving to remote learning and online courses, students are expected to adhere to the [Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters](#) regardless of the course delivery method. Students should maintain the same academic honesty and integrity that they would in a classroom setting. Potential academic offences in a digital context include, but are not limited to:

- Accessing unauthorized resources (search engines, chat rooms, Reddit, etc.) for assessments.
- Using technological aids (e.g. software) beyond what is listed as permitted in an assessment.
- Posting test, essay, or exam questions to message boards or social media.
- Creating, accessing, and sharing assessment questions and answers in virtual “course groups.”
- Working collaboratively, in-person or online, with others on assessments that are expected to be completed individually.

_____ All suspected cases of academic dishonesty will be investigated following procedures outlined in the [Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters](#). If you have questions or concerns about what constitutes appropriate academic behaviour or appropriate research and citation methods, you are expected to seek out additional

information on academic integrity from your instructor or from other [institutional resources](#).

9. Test 2 was available between 9:00 a.m. and 12:15 p.m. on December 11, 2020. The front cover of Test 2 contained the following reminder, in bold capital letters:

THIS IS AN INDIVIDUAL EXAMINATION. YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED TO COLLABORATE WITH ANYONE ELSE OR USE ANY AIDS OTHER THAN THE CPA HANDBOOK, THE DENSMORE COMPETENCY MAP NOTES, AND CLASS NOTES. YOU ARE NOT ALLOWED TO DISCLOSE OR DISCUSS THE CONTENT OR NATURE OF THIS EXAM WITH ANYONE ELSE.

10. Students were required to sign a statement on the first page of Test 2 called “Non-Disclosure & Acknowledgement”, confirming that no unauthorized aids were used, and that to do so is an academic offence that could result in academic discipline. A copy of the Non-Disclosure & Acknowledgement statement signed by the Student is included in the JBD at **Tab 5**.

11. Students were expected to upload their Test 2 answers to Quercus by 12:15 p.m. on December 11, 2020, in the form of an Excel file for certain questions and a Word file for other questions depending on the format required.

12. Professor Schumann created six versions of Test 2. The Student was given version 4 of Test 2. A copy of Version 4 of Test 2 is included in the JBD at **Tab 6**.

13. Question 1 of Test 2 required students to calculate certain financial information based on a factual scenario. There were a number of ways that students could format their answers. Professor Schumann did not provide a standard format or layout.

14. At 12:14 p.m., the Student uploaded her Excel and Word files. A copy of the front page of the Student’s submission, with the 12:14 p.m. time stamp, and the files uploaded by the Student for Test 2, are included in the JBD at **Tabs 7 and 8**.

15. While grading the submissions for Test 2, Professor Schumann noticed that the Student's answer for Question 1 of Test 2 was nearly identical to the answer of S.C., another student in the Course. A copy of the files uploaded by S.C. for Test 2 is included in the JBD at **Tab 9**.

16. S.C. had written Version 1 of Test 2. S.C.'s answers for Version 1 of Test 2 were uploaded on December 11, 2020, at 12:09 p.m. A screenshot of S.C.'s front page with the 12:09 p.m. time stamp is included in the JBD at **Tab 10**.

17. Question 1 of Version 1 contained different financial and other data from the data used in Question 1 of Version 4, so that the correct answers were different for each. The Student's answer to Question 1 using the Version 4 data should therefore not have been nearly identical to the answer given by S.C. to her Question 1 using the Version 1 data. A copy of Version 1 of Test 2 is included in the JBD at **Tab 11**.

18. The Student's answer to Question 1 appeared to respond to Question 1 as it appeared in Version 1, and not to Question 1 in Version 4 of Test 2. Professor Schumann noted that the only differences between the Student's answer and the answer given by S.C. were minor cosmetic changes. In all other respects, the answers were identical, including the formatting used. A copy of a spreadsheet prepared by Professor Schumann comparing the Student's answer to Question 1 is included in the JBD at **Tab 12**.

19. Professor Schumann's comparison of the Student's answer to Question 1 with S.C.'s answer to her Question 1 also revealed some abnormal abbreviations and formatting which are the same in each. These include:

- a. Both students abbreviated "Shareholders" as "SHs" throughout the answers, which Professor Schumann found very unusual.
- b. Both students sometimes abbreviated the word "subsidiary" as "subsid" and alternatively as "S" in the same places.

- c. Both students sometimes abbreviated the word “preferred” as “PFD” in the same places.
 - d. Cell E67 from the Student’s answer and the corresponding cell M12 from S.C.’s answer contain the value “0”. There is no reason for that number to be there. The same applies to cells F68, C72 and D72 (the Student) and cells N13, K17 and L17 (S.C.).
 - e. All the numbers in both answers are formatted as “Custom”, except cell C25 which is formatted as “General”.
20. For illustrative purposes, a copy of Test 2, Question 1, submitted by another student (J.A.) which uses different formatting is included in the JBD at **Tab 13**.
21. Quercus indicates that the Student viewed her submission of her answers for Test 2 at 12:34 p.m. At 12:37 p.m., she added the following comment: “please disregard excel titled question 1. Answer is on the word document”, as reflected at Tab 7.
22. At 12:40 p.m., the Student sent an email to Professor Schumann informing him that she had uploaded the wrong Excel sheet but made a note on Quercus to disregard one of the Excel tabs. The Student met with Professor Schumann twice via Zoom on December 16, 2020 to discuss Test 2. A copy of email correspondence between the Student and Professor Schumann about her Test 2 is included in the JBD at **Tab 14**.
23. The Student attended a meeting with the Dean’s Designate on February 18, 2021. She acknowledges that the Dean’s Designate provided her with the Dean’s warning contained in the *Code*. At that time, the Student explained that:
- a. S.C. had previously provided her login and password for Quercus to the Student in April 2020 to give the Student access to certain materials in a different course.
 - b. The Student panicked at the end of Test 2, as she did not have time to finish Question 1, so she logged into Quercus using S.C.’s login and password and

accessed S.C.'s answer for Question 1. The Student copied S.C.'s answer for question 1, made some very minor changes, and added it to her own Excel file which she submitted at 12:14 p.m. on December 11, 2020.

c. S.C. was not aware that the Student used S.C.'s login and password to access S.C.'s Test 2 answers during Test 2, or that she had copied and submitted S.C.'s answer to Question 1 as if it was the Student's own answer.

d. The Student was under stress during the semester, experiencing isolation from her family in Nigeria where frightening security issues were happening, and worried about the cost associated with failing the Course. A copy of an email from the Student which she sent following the meeting that further explained these issues is included in the JBD at **Tab 15**.

24. The Student subsequently provided a medical note dated March 2, 2021 from the UTM Health & Counselling Centre listing diagnoses for obstructive sleep apnea leading to "marked daytime sleepiness", as well as prediabetes, polycystic ovary syndrome, and adjustment disorder, for which she was being assessed and receiving treatment. A copy of the medical note is included in the JBD at **Tab 16**.

B. Admissions

25. The Student admits that during Test 2 on December 11, 2020 she knowingly:

a. improperly used S.C.'s private login and password information to access S.C.'s answers for Test 2, without the knowledge of or authorization from S.C.;

b. copied and used S.C.'s answer to Question 1 in her own answer to Question 1, despite knowing that this was contrary to the prohibition against collaboration and the use of unauthorized assistance and unauthorized aids for any part of Test 2, and did not turn her mind to the consequences this might have for S.C.;

c. submitted her answers to Test 2 which contained the answer to Question 1 that she had copied from S.C. as if it was her own answer, without any indication that it was not; and

d. did all of the above in an effort to avoid failing MGT2205H: Advanced Financial Accounting.

26. The Student admits that in using S.C.'s private login and password to access her answers to Test 2 and to specifically copy S.C.'s answer to Question 1, she knowingly:

a. used or possessed an unauthorized aid or aids or obtained unauthorized assistance in Test 2, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the *Code*;

b. represented the ideas of another person, the expression of the ideas of another person, and the work of another person as her own in Question 1 of Test 2, committing plagiarism contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*; and

c. 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*.

27. The Student acknowledges that she is signing this ASF freely and voluntarily, knowing of the potential consequences she faces, and does so with the advice of counsel.

Date: _____

S [REDACTED] Q [REDACTED]

Date: _____

Lily Harmer, Assistant Discipline Counsel,
University of Toronto