

THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty made on May 12, 2022,

AND IN THE MATTER OF the University of Toronto *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 2019,*

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

B E T W E E N:

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

J [REDACTED] X [REDACTED]

REASONS FOR DECISION

Hearing Date: February 28, 2023, via Zoom

Members of the Panel:

Douglas F. Harrison, Chair

Dr. Pascal van Lieshout, Faculty Panel Member

Harvi Karatha, Student Panel Member

Appearances:

Tina Lie, Assistant Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP

Joseph Berger, Co-Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP

Hearing Secretary:

Nusaiba Khan, Quasi-Judicial Administrative Assistant, Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances

Not in Attendance:

J [REDACTED] X [REDACTED]

Charges and Hearing

1. The Trial Division of the University Tribunal held a hearing by videoconference on February 28, 2023, to address the following charges brought by the University of Toronto (the “University”) against J [REDACTED] X [REDACTED] (the “Student”) under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 2019* (the “Code”), which were set out in a letter to the Student dated May 12, 2022:

- a. On or about November 18, 2020, you knowingly represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in Test 2 in MAT133Y1 (the “Course”), contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the Code.
- b. In the alternative, on or about November 18, 2020, you knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with Test 2 in the Course, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the Code.
- c. In the further alternative, on or about November 18, 2020, 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 in connection with Test 2 in the Course, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the Code.

Particulars of the offences charged are as follows:

1. At all material times you were a student enrolled at the University of Toronto Faculty of Arts & Science.
2. In Fall 2020 and Winter 2021, you enrolled in MAT133Y1 (Calculus and Linear Algebra for Commerce).
3. Students in the Course were evaluated on the basis of, among other things, 6 tests worth a combined 35% (with the lowest score dropped).
4. Test 2 was administered online during a 24-hour period on November 17-18, 2020. The second part of the test consisted of a series of written response questions. Students were permitted to consult the course materials but were not permitted to

communicate with one another or to get outside help, including through the use of websites or online forums.

5. On or about November 18, 2020, you submitted Test 2 in the Course.
6. You submitted Test 2:
 - (a) to obtain academic credit;
 - (b) knowing that it contained ideas, expressions of ideas or work which were not your own, but were the ideas, expressions of ideas or work of others, including the author of an answer that was posted on Chegg.com, which is a website that allows subscribers to post questions on the site and to view questions and answers posted on the site (the “Chegg Source”); and
 - (c) knowing that you did not properly reference the ideas, expressions of ideas or work that you drew from the Chegg Source or from others.
7. You knew that the Chegg Source was not an authorized source to which you were allowed to refer in completing Test 2.
8. You knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in Test 2 from the Chegg Source or from others.
9. You knowingly submitted Test 2 with the intention that the University of Toronto rely on it as containing your own ideas or work in considering the appropriate academic credit to be assigned to your work.

Service

2. The Student did not attend the hearing. In order to proceed with the hearing in the Student’s absence, the Tribunal therefore had to determine if reasonable notice was given to the Student, as required by s. 6 of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.22 (“SPPA”) and by rule 17 of the University Tribunal’s *Rules of Practice and Procedure* (“Rules”).

3. On the issue of service, counsel for the University presented affidavit evidence from Kimberly Blake and Andrew Wagg. This evidence, as outlined below, demonstrated that all relevant materials in this matter were delivered to the Student via email to the Student's contact email address as recorded in the University's Repository of Student Information ("ROSI").

4. Delivery by email to a student's email address as recorded in ROSI is permitted and is considered valid service for a hearing before this Tribunal by virtue of rule 13(c) of the Rules. It is not necessary to physically deliver materials to effect valid service. Pursuant to the University's *Policy on Official Correspondence with Students* ("Policy"), the University and its divisions may use email for delivering official correspondence to students. This Policy also directs that students are responsible for maintaining and advising the University of their current email address through ROSI. There is a link to the Policy on the webpage that provides a link to the login for student email accounts.

5. In the present case, an email was sent to the Student's email address (as recorded in ROSI) on December 17, 2020, by Ava Danialy, the Mathematics Department Chair's representative for academic misconduct in MAT133. In this email, Ms. Danialy said it had come to her attention that the Student had allegedly committed an academic offence during MAT133 Test 2, which had been administered online on November 17-18, 2020. In particular, Ms. Danialy said that the Student's MAT133 Test 2 submission contained work that bore a significant resemblance to solutions found in a second source, either another student's exam or on Chegg.com. She said two instructors agreed that this resemblance was significant enough to constitute "strong evidence" of the Student either having committed an act of plagiarism or having obtained unauthorized aid during the test, both of which are academic offences.

6. Ms. Danialy further advised the Student in her December 17, 2020 email that it was not possible to withdraw from the Course and the Student would be reinstated in the Course if they did so. Ms. Danialy said that before any sanction could be imposed, the Student was entitled to an opportunity to discuss the allegations with a member of the Course staff. The Student also had the option of admitting to the offence and foregoing a meeting. In the event the Student chose the latter option, the email contained a statement that the Student could cut and paste into a responding email, admitting the offence and declaring that the Student was prepared to accept the sanction of

a mark of zero for the test. Ms. Danialy asked the Student to respond by December 23, 2020, failing which the matter would be forwarded to the Associate Chair of the Department of Mathematics or the Office of Student Academic Integrity.

7. The following day, December 18, 2020, Ms. Danialy sent a follow-up email to the Student, correcting a typo in the admission statement, to clarify the reference to the specific test.

8. On January 20, 2021, the Student replied by email to Ms. Danialy, from the Student's email address as recorded in ROSI. The Student acknowledged receipt of Ms. Danialy's email, apologizing for not having checked their emails over the holiday period. The Student denied cheating and said, "At the beginning of this semester, I found it more and more difficult to learn math, so I gave up this course last week." In addition, the Student asked, "What can I do for this situation", given they had already dropped the course.

9. On January 27, 2021, the MAT 133 Administrative Team emailed the Student, "strongly" suggesting that the Student book an appointment with the registrar to discuss the situation of having dropped the Course while proceeding with a case in academic integrity. The emailed was signed off with, "If you wish to book a meeting to discuss your case, kindly let us know."

10. From September 16, 2021, to March 28, 2022, the Student Academic Integrity Office of the University's Faculty of Arts and Science ("SAI") sent four emails to the Student's ROSI email account, attempting to schedule a meeting between the Student and the Dean's Designate for Academic Integrity, to discuss the allegation of academic misconduct at issue. SAI did not receive a response from the Student. On April 11, 2022, SAI sent the Student a letter by email, informing them that their file was being sent to the Vice-Provost for resolution, with the recommendation that charges be laid and the Student's case be heard by the University's Tribunal.

11. On May 12, 2022, the Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life sent an email to the Student's ROSI email address, serving the Student with a copy of a letter from Professor Heather Boon, who was then the University's Vice-Provost, Faculty & Academic Life, attaching the charges. On the same day, the Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances ("ADFG") sent an email to the Student's ROSI email account, serving the Student with a letter regarding the

charges filed, together with copies of the charges, the Code, the Rules, and a pamphlet for Downtown Legal Services.

12. Emails were sent to the Student, to their ROSI email account, by Tina Lie, a partner with Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP (“Paliare Roland”), who acts as Assistant Discipline Counsel to the University, as follows:

- a. May 17, 2022, introducing Ms. Lie to the Student and advising that important documents and correspondence would be sent in future to the Student’s contact email address;
- b. June 19, 2022, attaching a disclosure letter and a link to a PDF of the University’s Disclosure Brief;
- c. September 21, 2022, proposing dates for the hearing of this matter, asking the Student to respond by September 28, 2022, regarding their availability, advising that the hearing would proceed electronically via videoconference unless the Student requested otherwise, and inviting the Student to contact Ms. Lie to discuss the case; and
- d. December 19, 2022, noting that Ms. Lie had not heard from the Student, and advising that the hearing for this matter would be scheduled for Tuesday, February 28, 2023 at 9:45 am.

13. On December 19, 2022, the ADFG Office served the Student, via the Student’s email address in ROSI, with the Notice of Electronic Hearing for a hearing on February 28, 2023, at 9:45 a.m. (the “Notice”), together with copies of the ADFG Office’s May 12, 2022, letter regarding the charges and enclosures. The email from the ADFG Office also included the coordinates to access the Zoom videoconferencing platform for the hearing.

14. On February 17, 2023, Joseph Berger, a lawyer at Paliare Roland working with Ms. Lie, emailed the Student, providing the Student with the affidavit evidence of the Provost’s witnesses, and asking if the Student intended to conduct cross-examinations.

15. Neither Ms. Lie nor Mr. Berger received any correspondence from the Student. In addition, neither of them received a bounce back message indicating that their email messages to the Student could not be delivered.

16. At the request of Ms. Lie, on February 17, 2023, Andrew Wagg, Manager, Incident Response, Information Security, at the University's Information Technology Services, checked the last time someone had accessed the Student's university email account (the contact email in ROSI). Mr. Wagg determined that the last time was August 29, 2021, at 11:42 p.m. (Toronto time).

17. In addition to their email address, students are required to provide a current telephone number and mailing address in ROSI. On November 22 and 28, 2022, and on January 9, 2023, Kimberly Blake, a legal assistant at Paliare Roland who works with Ms. Lie, attempted to call the Student at the phone number the Student provided in ROSI. On all three occasions, the calls went to a recording that indicated the number was "not equipped for incoming service" and to "check the number and try again".

18. On February 1, 2023, Paliare Roland arranged for a courier to deliver a package to the Student at the Student's mailing address in ROSI, on Carlton Street in Toronto. The package contained a letter from Ms. Lie, a copy of the charges and the Notice of Electronic Hearing (together with the Zoom coordinates). The courier company returned the package to Paliare Roland the same day along with a notification that the person at the address did not know the addressee and the package should be returned to the sender.

19. As of February 22, 2023, no communication had been received by Paliare Roland from the Student.

20. The Tribunal convened on the morning of February 28, 2023, in accordance with the Notice. Initially, those who attempted to use the Zoom coordinates provided by ADFG Office were unable to access the virtual hearing room. At 9:36 a.m., revised Zoom coordinates were sent by email to those involved, including the Student at their contact email address in ROSI. Receipt of this email was confirmed by Diane Pacheco, Academic Integrity & Petitions Specialist, Student Academic Integrity Office of the Faculty of Arts and Science, who was copied on that email. The

Tribunal then waited 15 minutes to allow the Student or a representative of the Student to sign in to the hearing. After that time, neither the Student nor a representative appeared.

21. Following submissions from the University's counsel, the Tribunal concluded that even with the late change of Zoom coordinates, it was reasonable to proceed in the Student's absence. Had the Student been motivated to attend, which was not actually apparent from the Student's behaviour, since early 2021, of ignoring all emails from the University and Paliare Roland, the Student would have reasonably contacted the ADFG Office upon determining that they were having difficulty logging in to the videoconference. Or, the Student would have checked their email account, and thereby seen the email that was sent at 9:36 a.m. Any student who was motivated to appear at the hearing would also have been motivated to figure out how to connect into it after not being able to do so initially. The Tribunal therefore concluded that the Student had received reasonable notice of the hearing and of the charges, and ordered that the hearing proceed in their absence, as permitted by s. 7(3) of the SPPA and rule 21 of the Rules.

Facts

22. In support of the charges, counsel for the University tendered an affidavit from Cindy Blois, an Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream, in the Department of Mathematics, the contents of which are described below. As noted above, a copy of this affidavit was emailed to the Student by Mr. Berger on February 17, 2023. Ms. Blois was in attendance during the hearing and addressed questions from the University's counsel.

23. In the fall of 2020, the Student was a student in MAT133Y: Calculus and Linear Algebra for Commerce (as defined above, the "Course"). The Course ran through the Fall 2020 and Winter 2021 terms. Ms. Blois was one of five instructors and was the course coordinator for the Course. The Course was designed for students with an interest in business and economics, in order to provide the mathematical foundation needed for their studies and to work towards a business career. The Course focussed on topics in linear algebra, differential calculus and integral calculus in one and two variables, and their applications in business and economics.

24. Students' final grades in the Course were evaluated based on the results of homework, lecture preparation, projects, meeting and presentations, tests, and a final assessment. Throughout the Course there were a total of six tests. Results from a student's five best test scores (worth 7% each) were counted towards their final grade.

25. The outline for the Course indicated, under the heading "Academic Integrity" on page 16, that students were expected to read and abide by the Code. The outline provided specific examples of academic offences under the Code, including looking at another student's work during a test, communicating with another student in the Course during a test, communicating with anyone about test content during a test, using unauthorized materials or online resources such as Chegg.com during a test, and copying solutions from another source and submitting them as your own.

26. On November 17-18, 2020, students in the Course wrote Test 2, which was administered online. It was available beginning at 8 pm on November 17, 2020, and was required to be submitted by 8 pm on November 18, 2020. The test had two sections: 10 multiple choice questions and five written response questions. The test information and study guide advised students that they were prohibited from communicating with other students in the Course, getting outside help from anyone, accessing or posting on so-called "tutoring websites" like Chegg.com, or using solution templates, tutoring services, online forums or a search engine.

27. On or about November 18, 2020, the Student submitted her answers to the test. The Student signed the academic integrity statement at the end of the written responses part of the test, affirming that the Student knew the Code and did not cheat.

28. After the test had been distributed to the students in the Course, the instructors and teaching assistants found questions and answers from the test posted on Chegg.com. This is a subscription-based website that allows students to post problems and obtain answers from so-called experts. Subscribers can access questions posted by others to the site, and the answers given.

29. In reviewing the Student's answer to Question 3(b) in the written response portion of the test, Ms. Blois stated that it was determined that the Student's answer was very similar to the

answer to that question that was posted on Chegg.com. In particular, Ms. Blois found the similarities suspicious because:

- a. The Student's answer was virtually identical to the Chegg.com answer;
- b. Both the Student's answer and the Chegg.com answer made almost all the same choices for the symbol they used to represent multiplication on each line – a dot on one line, an “x” on another and no symbol at all on a third (i.e., just a number adjacent to parentheses);
- c. Both the Student's answer and the Chegg.com answer rounded $10/3$ to 3.33, and also rounded the final answer to the same single decimal point;
- d. The concept of elasticity was not taught in the Course, yet both the Student's answer and the Chegg.com answer used it to solve this question; and
- e. Both the Student's answer and the Chegg.com answer used a lowercase “e” to represent elasticity, which was an unconventional choice, given the use of lowercase “e” for Euler's number and its use in business and economics to represent compound interest.

30. With respect to item 4 in the above paragraph, Ms. Blois noted that of over 1,000 students in the Course who wrote this test, only 36 used the concept of elasticity to solve Question 3(b), and of those 36, 29 were suspected of having copied from a Chegg.com solution, due to the extent of the similarities of their answers with the Chegg.com answer (the remaining 7 were not similar enough to conclude that they had been copied). In Ms. Blois' view, the similarities between the Student's answer and the Chegg.com answer were unlikely to have been coincidental.

31. During examination by Mr. Berger, Ms. Blois explained that the Department of Mathematics has a Chegg.com subscription for the purpose of checking whether test questions and answers are posted there. For this test, the Course's administrative staff pulled screen shots of all of the test questions from Chegg.com during the test period or shortly after the test ended.

32. The Student received a grade of 0.5 out of 3 on Question 3(b), a mark of 21.5 out of 30 on the written responses part of the test, and a total mark of 35.5 out of 50 on the entire test.

33. Ms. Blois also noted that, to her knowledge, despite the offer by the Mathematics Department in its January 27, 2021 email, referenced in paragraph 9, above, to meet with the Student, no instructor's meeting was held for the Student. During the hearing, Ms. Pacheco confirmed that the Student was still a student in good standing at the University.

Finding on Charges

34. The Student was charged under s. B.I.1(d) of the Code, by which it is an offence to knowingly represent as one's own, any idea or expression of an idea or work of another in any academic examination or term test or in connection with any other form of academic work, i.e., to commit plagiarism.

35. In addition, the Student was charged, in the alternative, under s. B.I.1(b) of the Code, by which it is an offence to use or possess an unauthorized aid or aids or obtain unauthorized assistance in any academic examination or term test or in connection with any other form of academic work.

36. The Student was also charged, in the further alternative, under section B.I.3(b) of the Code, by which it is an offence to engage in any 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.

37. The Student knew that they were not permitted to collaborate with other students during the test and that they were not permitted to consult Chegg.com for assistance with answers.

38. Having considered the evidence of Ms. Blois, and in particular the unusual and idiosyncratic similarities between the Student's answer to Question 3(b) of Test 2 and the Chegg.com answer, having regard in particular to the symbols used and the reference to elasticity, which was not taught in the Course, the Tribunal finds that on a balance of probabilities, the Student violated the Code by copying the answer to Question 3(b) from Chegg.com (or from another student who had copied from that website) and presenting it as her own work by submitting it as part of her test answers.

39. Accordingly, the Tribunal finds that the Student did commit the offence of knowingly representing as one's own, an idea or expression of an idea or work or another in Test 2 of the Course, contrary to s. B.I.1(d) of the Code.

40. Upon these findings, Counsel for the University advised that the University was withdrawing the two alternative charges, as set out in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the charges (see paragraphs 1, 35 and 36, above).

Sanction

41. Section C.II.(B) of the Code sets out that the Tribunal may impose a range of sanctions on a student who has been convicted under the Code, ranging from an oral reprimand to a five-year suspension or, more severely, a recommendation to the President of expulsion or to Governing Council of cancellation of a degree. The Tribunal may also order that any sanction it imposes be recorded on the student's academic record and transcript for a period of time and may also report any case to the Provost, who may publish a notice of the decision and sanction in the University newspapers, with the name of the student withheld.

42. The Code also contains, in Appendix "C", the Provost's Guidance on Sanctions, section B.8(b) of which provides, "absent exceptional circumstances, the Provost will request that the Tribunal: ... suspend a student for two years for any offence involving academic dishonesty, where a student has not committed any prior offences".

43. In this instance, the University sought an Order that the Student receive a final grade of zero in the Course and a two-year suspension, along with a notation on the Student's record and transcript for three years and a report to the Provost for publication with the Student's name withheld.

44. This request was in part based on sanctions handed down by the Tribunal in previous cases, the Provost's Guidance on Sanctions (but which are not binding on this Tribunal), and on the factors laid down by this Tribunal in *University of Toronto and Mr. C* (Case No. 1976/77-3, November 5, 1976) ("*Mr. C*").

45. The reasons for decision in *Mr. C.* set out factors that a tribunal should consider when imposing a sanction:

- a. The character of the person charged;
- b. The likelihood of a repetition of the offence;
- c. The nature of the offence committed;
- d. Any extenuating circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence;
- e. The detriment to the University occasioned by the offence; and
- f. The need to deter others from committing a similar offence.

46. With respect to factors (a) and (d), character and extenuating circumstances, respectively, there was no evidence one way or the other before the Tribunal. The Student did not participate in the process beyond their initial responding email in January 2021, in which the Student denied cheating but gave no explanation for the similarities to the Chegg.com answer, as detailed above. There is no evidence of remorse or insight, no evidence of a willingness to take responsibility for their actions and no evidence of a willingness to learn from their mistakes. The onus was on the Student to put forward mitigating evidence and none was presented.

47. With respect to factor (b), likelihood of repetition, the Student was in the Fall term of first year at the time of the test. The Student did not enroll in the Winter term and has not enrolled at the University since. There is no evidence of a pattern of misconduct but also nothing to show that the Student has learned from their mistake or that they appreciate its gravity. Again, there is no evidence of remorse or insight on the Student's part.

48. With respect to factors (c), (e) and (f), the nature of the offence, the detriment to the University and the need for deterrence, respectively, copying answers from another, improper source onto an exam, as the Student has committed, is an extremely serious offence that harms the institution and the academic process. It is a serious breach of academic integrity and can be seen as an attempt to defraud the University. Regrettably, the move to online assessments during the

pandemic led to an increase in instances of students making use of resources like Chegg.com and attempting to pass off as their own work, material they had taken from such websites. Even as we move away from the protocols imposed during the pandemic, online assessment will continue to be part of the curricula and the temptation among students to use Chegg.com and its ilk will remain. Therefore, the associated penalty must act as general deterrent against this behaviour.

49. As was noted by this Tribunal in *University of Toronto v. T.J.* (Case No. 1102, November 5, 2021), at para. 11(e), with respect to the need to deter others from committing similar offences (factor (f) in *Mr. C.*):

[C]heating on exams must always be denounced and deterred in order to protect the academic integrity of the University. In today's online world, it is all too easy for students to find new outlets for unauthorized assistance. Students must understand that this kind of misconduct will have serious repercussions, so that they will be dissuaded from the temptation to cheat when under pressure.

50. It is accepted that there is no benchmark or starting point that a Tribunal is meant to apply in sanctioning a student who has been found to have violated the Code. The sanction in a particular case is to be determined based on the circumstances of that case. However, previous decisions of the Discipline Appeals Board and the Trial Division of this Tribunal have found that students must be treated fairly and equitably when being sanctioned, and that there must be a general consistency in the approach of the Tribunal (see *University of Toronto v. B.S.* (Case No. 697, January 17, 2014 (Sanction)), at paragraphs 8-11).

51. Counsel for the University directed the Panel to a number of previous decisions of the University Tribunal on the issue of sanctions in cases of plagiarism and use of unauthorized aids.

52. In *University of Toronto v. K.Z.* (Case No. 1126, September 13, 2021), the student was found to have submitted, in both an online test and an online final exam administered in March 2020, and April 2020, respectively, in a first-year Calculus course, five answers that had been taken from Chegg.com. The Tribunal noted it was not known if the student was a Chegg.com subscriber and also made note of the upheaval associated with the province-wide lockdown during the initial weeks of the pandemic, which may have had a negative impact on the student. The

Tribunal imposed a sanction of a mark of zero in the course, a two-year suspension, and a three-year notation.

53. In *University of Toronto v. Y.L.* (Case No. 1133, November 29, 2021), the student was found to have submitted, in an online final exam administered in April 2020, in a first-year Calculus course, a number of answers that had been taken from Chegg.com. There was no evidence the student was a Chegg.com subscriber. The student did not participate in the proceeding. The Tribunal noted that the events in question, including the hearing, had occurred six months into the global pandemic. The Tribunal concluded that it was appropriate to impose a sanction of a mark of zero in the course, a two-year suspension, and a three-year notation.

54. Finally, in *University of Toronto v. S.L.* (Case No. 1151, November 30, 2021), the student was found to have submitted, in an online final exam administered in April 2020, in a first-year Calculus course, an answer that had been taken from Chegg.com. It was unknown whether the student was a Chegg.com subscriber or had been provided the answer by another student. The Tribunal imposed a sanction of a mark of zero in the course, a two-year suspension, and a three-year notation.

55. In the present case, the Student has no prior record of academic misconduct. However, they have been found to have engaged in a serious breach of academic integrity. The upheaval of the initial weeks of the pandemic were long over by the time the test in question took place, in November 2020. While the fact that they chose not to participate in this process will not be considered an aggravating circumstance, they passed up the opportunity to present evidence of mitigation or extenuating circumstances. The Tribunal accepts that there was no evidence the Student paid for the answers that were submitted on the test. Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, the Tribunal concludes that the sanction requested by the Provost is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances of this case, and, importantly, is generally consistent with prior decisions of this Tribunal.

56. The Tribunal therefore orders that the following sanctions be imposed on the Student:

- a) a final grade of zero in the course MAT133Y1 in Fall 2020 and Winter 2021;

- b) a suspension from the University for a period of two years from February 28, 2023; and
- c) a notation of this sanction on the Student's academic record and transcript for a period of three years from February 28, 2023; and

57. In addition, the Tribunal orders that this case be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanctions imposed, with the name of the Student withheld.

Dated at Toronto, this 15th day of May, 2023.

Original signed by:

Douglas F. Harrison, Chair
On behalf of the Panel