

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

IN THE MATTER OF charges of academic dishonesty filed on May 26, 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 am. S.O. 1978, c. 88

B E T W E E N:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

- and -

J [REDACTED] Y [REDACTED]

Reasons for Decision

Hearing Date: July 18, 2023, via Zoom

Members of the Panel:

Cheryl Woodin, Chair
Dr. Pascal van Lieshout, Faculty Panel Member
Karim Waness, 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:

Samanthe Huang, Coordinator & Hearing Secretary, Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances

Not in Attendance:

J [REDACTED] Y [REDACTED]

Introduction

1. The Trial Division of the University Tribunal was convened on July 18, 2023, by Zoom, to consider charges of academic dishonesty (the “Charges”) brought by the University of Toronto (the “University”) against J ██████ Y ██████ (the “Student”) under the University of Toronto’s *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 2019* (the “Code”).

Preliminary Issue: Proceeding in the absence of the Student.

2. The hearing was commenced at 9:45 a.m. on July 18, 2023. The Student did not attend the hearing by Zoom and was not represented. Assistant Discipline Counsel advised that neither the Student nor a representative of the Student had responded to the Notice of Electronic Hearing.
3. Assistant Discipline Counsel requested that the Panel proceed in the absence of the Student and made submissions to support this request.
4. The onus of proof is on the University to establish that it provided the Student with reasonable notice of the hearing in accordance with the University Tribunal’s *Rules of Practice and Procedure* (“Rules”).
5. The University filed evidence from two witnesses to support service: Andrew Wagg (“Mr. Wagg”), a Manager, Incident Response, at Information Security, Information Technology Services at the University; and Kimberly Blake, a legal assistant at the law firm of Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP. These witnesses provided their evidence by way of affidavits which were accepted by the Panel pursuant to

Rule 70 of the Rules. Mr. Wagg also answered questions posed by the Panel during the course of the hearing.

6. The relevant substance of the evidence of these two witnesses is as follows.

Evidence of Ms. Blake, legal assistant at Paliare Roland, Assistant Discipline Counsel to University of Toronto

7. Both the University of Toronto Mississauga (“UTM”) itself and Assistant Discipline Counsel to the University made several attempts to contact the Student using contact information (including phone number, email address, mailing address and permanent address) that was available from the University’s Repository of Student Information (“ROSI”).
8. The Student had, at one point, actively used this email account to correspond with his Professor. He remains a student at the University as he has not withdrawn though he is not currently paying tuition. He was last enrolled in courses during the summer of 2021.
9. From February 14, 2022, to March 2, 2022, UTM attempted to schedule a meeting between the Student and a Dean’s Designate for Academic Integrity to discuss the allegations of academic misconduct using the email address available for the Student in ROSI.
10. On May 26, 2022, the Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances (the “ADFG Office”) served the Student with a letter regarding the charges that were filed against him, together with copies of the charges, the *Code of Behaviour on*

Academic Matters, the *Rules of Practice and Procedure* and a pamphlet for Downtown Legal Services, again by email.

11. On August 31, 2022, Ms. Lie sent the Student an email to introduce herself. Ms. Lie advised that important documents and correspondence would be sent to the Student's email address. On March 27, 2023, Ms. Lie emailed the Student a disclosure letter and a disclosure brief (together with another copy of the charges).
12. On April 26, 2023, Ms. Lie emailed the Student about scheduling a hearing date. Ms. Lie advised that if she did not hear back by May 3, 2023, she would request a hearing date be scheduled. The Student did not respond. On May 5, 2023, Ms. Lie emailed the Student advising that she would request a hearing be scheduled for July 18, 2023 at 9:45 a.m. and the ADFG Office served the Student with a Notice of Electronic Hearing for that date. The email from the ADFG Office advised the Student that the hearing would be conducted using the Zoom videoconferencing platform and provided the Student with the coordinates to access the videoconference. A Revised Notice of Electronic Hearing was served on July 12, 2023.
13. On July 11, 2023, Joseph Berger, an associate lawyer at Paliare Roland working with Ms. Lie, emailed the Student a copy of the affidavits of the Provost's witnesses upon which the University would rely.
14. No responses or any "bounce back" messages were received.

15. Further attempts to contact the Student were made by telephone using the number that was listed in ROSI, as well as by attempting courier delivery of information regarding this hearing to the street address listed in ROSI. Neither of these efforts was successful. Neither the telephone number nor the street address for the Student were correct.

Evidence of Mr. Wagg, Manager, Incident Response, Information Security, Information Technology Services

16. Information Technology Services is responsible for management of the email accounts used by students.
17. Mr. Wagg determined that the last time there was activity on the email account ██████████.y██████████@mail.utoronto.ca was on December 27, 2022 at 3:25 a.m., local Toronto time. Mr. Wagg confirmed that someone would have entered his email account and password at that time though we do not have any more information about what activity occurred at that time. While the audit log also showed regular log-ons to this email account, with the last one occurring on July 7, 2023, at 9:28 a.m., no additional activity was recorded at those times. The log-on activity may be indicative of automated log-ons or email forwarding activity.
18. The University requested that the Tribunal proceed with this hearing in the absence of the Student.
19. The *Statutory Powers Procedure Act* (the “Act”), at sections 6(1) and 7(3) states:

6(1) The parties to a proceeding shall be given reasonable notice of a hearing by the tribunal.” ...

[...]

7(3) “Where notice of an electronic hearing has been given to a party to a proceeding in accordance with [the Act] and the party neither acts under clause 6 (5) (c), if applicable, nor participates in the hearing in accordance with the notice, the tribunal may proceed without the party’s participation and the party is not entitled to any further notice in the proceeding.

20. According to the Rules, service can be completed “by e-mailing a copy of the document to the student’s e-mail address contained in ROSI”... “and service shall be effective on the day the document is sent by e-mail”.
21. A notice of an electronic hearing must include the date, time, place and purpose of the hearing; a reference to the statutory authority under which the hearing will be held; information about the manner in which the hearing will be held; and a statement that if a person does not attend the hearing, the Panel may proceed in the person’s absence.
22. Where notice of an electronic hearing has been given to a person and that person does not attend the hearing, the Panel may proceed with the hearing in the party’s absence.
23. The University’s *Policy on Official Correspondence with Students* (the “Policy”), expressly states that “[s]tudents are responsible for maintaining and advising the University, on ... ROSI, of a current and valid postal address as well as the address for a University-issued [email] account”, and are “expected to monitor and retrieve their mail... on a frequent and consistent basis... Failure to do so may result in a student missing important information and will not be considered an acceptable rationale for failing to receive official correspondence from the University.”

24. The onus of proof is on the University to demonstrate that it provided a student with reasonable notice of the hearing.
25. While there is no evidence of actual notice, the University made considerable efforts to contact the Student and the Panel agrees that the University took the steps it was required to under the Rules.
26. The evidence shows the Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life, and the ADFG Office, sent the Student individual and separate correspondence serving him with the charges against him.
27. Ms. Lie sent her first email as Assistant Discipline Counsel to the University of Toronto, to the Student on August 31, 2022. The evidence shows the last time someone entered his email and password, accessing his University of Toronto e-mail account was on December 27, 2022. This confirmed access occurring seven (7) months after receiving the initial service emails references above.
28. The evidence shows that the ADFG Office and Ms. Lie continued to make attempts to contact the Student via email, telephone and via courier on multiple occasions.
29. As set out in the Policy, it is the responsibility of a student to ensure the telephone, email and mailing address in ROSI are current. It is also the responsibility of a student to ensure they are receiving all communications from the University by accessing the University of Toronto email account, or opting to forward their University of Toronto e-mail account to their personal account, if necessary. There

is no way to know if the Student has forwarded his University of Toronto email account in this case.

30. In light of the evidence and the submissions of Assistant Discipline Counsel, the Panel was satisfied that the Student had been given reasonable notice of the hearing in compliance with the Act and the Rules. The Panel decided to hear the case in the absence of the Student.

The Charges and Particulars

31. The Charges and Particulars alleged against the Student are as follows:

Charges relating to ENG110H5F 2020(9)

- 1) On or about December 7, 2020, the Student knowingly represented as his own the idea or expression of an idea, and/or the work of another in respect of an essay that the Student submitted in ENG110H5F 2020(9) ("ENG 110"), contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.
- 2) In the alternative, to the charge above, on or about December 7, 2020, the Student 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 the Course, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the *Code*.

Charges relating to MAT232H5 2021(5)

32. The following charges relate to two different fact patterns. Charge 5 is in the alternative to charges 3 and 4.

- 3) On or about June 5, 2021, the Student knowingly possessed an unauthorized aid or obtained unauthorized assistance in respect of Assignment 1 in MAT232H5, 2021(5) ("MAT 232"), contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the *Code*.
- 4) On or about August 19, 2021, the Student knowingly possessed an unauthorized aid or obtained unauthorized assistance during the final examination in MAT 232, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the *Code*.
- 5) In the alternative to charges (3) and (4), the Student 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 coursework in MAT 232, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the *Code*.

The particulars for charges 1 and 2 are as follows:

33. In Fall 2020, the Student enrolled in the ENG 110 Course, which was taught by Professor Chester Scoville.
34. On December 7, 2020, the Student submitted an essay, which was worth 30% of the final grade in the ENG 110 Course.
35. The Student knowingly included in the essay verbatim and nearly verbatim text from sources without appropriate attribution.
36. In connection with the essay, the Student knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty, or misconduct in order to obtain an academic advantage.

The particulars for charges 3, 4, 5 are as follows:

37. On or about June 5, 2021, the Student knowingly possessed an unauthorized aid or obtained unauthorized assistance in respect of Assignment 1 in MAT232H5, 2021(5) ("MAT 232"), contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the Code.
38. In Summer 2021, the Student enrolled in MAT 232, which was taught by Professor Ehsaan Hossain.
39. On June 5, 2021, the Student submitted his answer to Assignment 1, which was worth 5% of the final grade in MAT 232. The Student knew that he was required to write up his own solution independently and that the Student was not permitted to copy someone else's solution or to copy from a solution manual or website. In completing Assignment 1, the Student knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance from one or more other persons from an external website.
40. On August 19, 2021, the Student submitted his answers to the final examination, which was worth 34% of the grade in MAT 232. The Student knew that he was required to complete the final examination independently and that the Student was not permitted to discuss the examination with anyone, or to access or copy solutions from other persons or websites. In completing the final examination, the Student knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance from one or more other persons or from an external website.
41. In connection with each of Assignment 1 and the final examination, the Student knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty, or misconduct in order to obtain an academic advantage in MAT 232.

Summary of Evidence:

42. The University submitted the affidavit evidence of three witnesses: Professor Chester Scoville (“Professor Scoville”), affirmed on July 11, 2023; Professor Ehsaan Hossain (“Professor Hossain”), affirmed on July 7, 2023; and Lisa Devereaux (“Ms. Devereaux”), affirmed on July 10, 2023, all of which were accepted by the Panel pursuant to rule 70 of the Rules.

The Evidence in Relation to ENG 110 Charges

43. Professor Scoville is an Associate Professor in the Department of English and Drama, at UTM. In the Fall 2020, he was the instructor for the course ENG110H5F: Narrative (the “Course”).
44. The Student was enrolled in the Course.
45. Students in the Course were evaluated based on the results of tutorial participation, an academic integrity quiz, a short response assignment, a close reading exercise, a close reading quiz, and a final paper.
46. Students in the Course were told about the importance of academic integrity. Under the heading “Academic Integrity”, the course outline provided a link to the University of Toronto’s *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* and noted that students were expected to adhere to it.
47. Student were required to submit a Final Paper in the Course (the “Final Paper”) on December 7, 2020. The Final Paper was required to be five to seven pages in

length and explore a narrative concept in two texts. It had a marking weight of 30% of the final grade in the course.

48. The Student submitted his Final Paper on December 7, 2020. The Teaching Assistant marking the Student's Final Paper flagged it for review because some of the text included in the Student's Final Paper appeared dissimilar from the work previously submitted by the Student in the Course.
49. Professor Scoville reviewed the Student's Final Paper and found that it included passages that appeared verbatim or virtually verbatim on three online sources which were not cited anywhere in the Student's Final Paper.
50. Professor Scoville met with the Student to discuss an allegation of plagiarism in the Final Paper. The matter was then forwarded to UTM's Department of English and Drama and ultimately to the Office of the Vice Principal Academic and Dean at UTM.

The Evidence in Relation to MAT 232 Charges

51. Professor Hossain is an Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream in the Department of Mathematical and Computational Sciences at UTM. In Summer 2021, he was the instructor for the course MAT232H5Y: Calculus of Several Variables (the "Course").
52. The Student was enrolled in the Course.

53. Students in the Course were evaluated based on the results of eleven quizzes (with grades counted from the best 10 quiz results counting towards each student's mark), four written assignments, three term tests and a final exam.
54. Students in the Course were told about the importance of academic integrity. Under the heading "Academic Integrity" (on page 3), the course outline noted that honesty and fairness are fundamental to the University of Toronto's mission. The course outline specified that plagiarism is a form of academic fraud and is treated very seriously. Students were provided with a link to a document entitled "How not to plagiarize" and told they were expected to read it. Students were also advised that they were expected to be familiar with the University of Toronto's *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* and advised where they could access it.

Assignment 1

55. Assignment 1 in the Course ("Assignment 1") was due on May 29, 2021, at 11:59 p.m. It was worth 5% of the Student's grade. Students submitted their answers to Assignment 1 using an online platform called "Crowdmark". Assignment 1 consisted of two problem questions.
56. On June 5, 2021, the Student submitted their answers to Assignment 1. The Student's Assignment 1 answers were flagged by a Teaching Assistant for being suspiciously similar to the Assignment 1 submissions of four other students in the Course, L.L., H.L., Y.X., and X.W.

57. Professor Hossein reviewed the Student's Assignment 1, and that of the four other students, L.L., H.L., Y.X., and X.W., and identified many suspicious similarities in their Assignment 1 submissions, particularly in respect of questions 1(c), and 2(a), (b) and (c). By way of example, the students had solved the problems using the same steps and in the same order and with the same level of detail even though they could have been answered in different ways and presented their answers in similar ways. The students had also skipped the same steps, in the same places, in ways that were different from how other members of the class had approached the work. In some cases, the students had also used terminology that Professor Hossein had not used in class and which he found to be distinctive and unusual.
58. Professor Hossein determined that the degree of similarities between the students' answers made it unlikely the similarities were merely coincidental.
59. Ms. Devereaux is the Director of Academic Success and Integrity, Office of the Vice Principal Academic and Dean, at UTM. She gave evidence that in addition to the Student, students L.L., H.L., X.W. and Y.X. in MAT 232 (referred to by their initials) were alleged to have committed academic misconduct and that all of the academic discipline matters involving these students, with the exception of H.L., had resolved because the students had admitted to using an "unauthorized aid".
60. This was the second academic offence for all three students. All three students were given a sanction of a grade of zero in MAT 232, a suspension from attending the University of Toronto for a period of four months, and a notation of the sanction on their academic record for 24 months.

The Final Exam

61. The Final Exam in MAT 232 (the “Final Exam”) was distributed online on August 19, 2021 from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. Students submitted their answers using “Crowdmark”.
62. The Student submitted his answers to the Final Exam on August 19, 2021 and received a grade of 27/40.
63. In grading the Student’s Final Exam answers, Professor Hossein noticed similarities between the Final Exam answers to Question 5 submitted by the Student and another student in the Course, Y.W.
64. Question 5 on the Final Exam was worth a total of 6 points. The Student received a grade of 4.5/6 on Question 5 of the Final exam. Y.W. received a grade of 5/6 on Question 5 of the Final exam.
65. Professor Hossain considered similarities between the Student’s Final Exam answers to Question 5 and Y.W.’s Final Exam answers to Question 5 to be suspicious for the reasons that: (i) both students used the term “range”; the use of this term is unusual and Professor Hossein would not have expected to see this term used in the answer; and (ii) the first line identified in the blue square in both students’ answers showed a particular mathematical expression which both students used in an identical manner, which is highly unusual and distinctive.
66. In addition, certain portions of both students’ exam answers were virtually identical in that the algebraic steps the students used were the same, in the same order,

and presented in the same way, even though there were multiple ways the question could be approached.

67. The totality of the similarities Professor Hossein observed between the students' answers on this question of the Final Exam made it unlikely that they were merely coincidental.
68. The allegations of academic misconduct against Y.W. were resolved at the divisional level. Y.W. admitted to committing the offence of unauthorized assistance on the Final Exam. This was Y.W.'s second academic offence. Y.W. was given a sanction of a grade of zero in MAT 232, and a notation of the sanction on their academic record until graduation.
69. There were a number of efforts made in February and March 2022 at the Office of the Dean at UTM to attempt to address the allegations of academic misconduct in the courses ENG 110 and MAT 232. The Student did not respond to any of them. The UTM subsequently forwarded this matter to the Office of the Vice Provost.

Decision of the Tribunal

70. The University must establish on a balance of probabilities through clear and convincing evidence that an academic offence has been committed by the Student.
71. In this case the Tribunal is satisfied that there is clear and convincing evidence in respect of charge 1, meaning that on or about December 7, 2020, the Student knowingly represented as his own the idea or expression of an idea, and/or the

work of another in respect of an essay that the Student submitted in ENG 110, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*.

72. Specifically, the evidence establishes that the Student was made aware that it would be an academic offence to represent the work of someone else as his own. In this case, the wording of significant passages of his Final Paper were essentially identical to sources that were clearly not cited in the Student's work. The Panel reviewed these particular passages, which were replicated in the affidavit evidence of Professor Scoville, and determined that there was simply no ambiguity in respect of the evidence presented regarding this offence. Specific and significant passages containing the ideas of others were incorporated by the Student into his own work without attribution.
73. The Tribunal is also satisfied that there is clear and convincing evidence in respect of charge 4, meaning that on or about August 19, 2021, the Student knowingly possessed an unauthorized aid or obtained unauthorized assistance during the final examination in MAT 232, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the *Code*.
74. The Tribunal is not satisfied that there is clear and convincing evidence in respect of charge 3 relating to allegations with respect to the assignment that was submitted on June 5, 2021.
75. While in the case of both the Final Exam and Assignment 1 there was evidence that the Student had produced answers which appeared very similar to answers produced by another student or students in the MAT 232 course, in the case of Assignment 1 the Tribunal finds that the answers in issue could have been

completed based upon a collaborative approach which was not prohibited by either the course outline or the University of Toronto's *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* and which was encouraged in at least part of the Course Outline.

76. Professor Hossein gave evidence that, based on the similarities in answers provided by four students, he concluded that “either all five students had collaborated as a group on Assignment 1 or had all independently received the same work from some common source (such as an online source or a private tutor)”.
77. Group collaboration on assignments is not prohibited by the Course Outline. Instead, it says as follows:

Collaboration with peers. You are encouraged to work together on the material related to the course, including discussing the assignment problems. However, you must write up your own solutions independently. It is an academic offence to copy someone's solution, or to let someone copy yours. It is an academic offence to copy from a solution manual or a website. Please see the links below concerning UTM's code of behaviour and academic honesty.

78. In its submissions to the Panel the University points to the statement that “you must write up your own solutions independently” to say that students may not rely on a single “scribe” to produce answers for four different students.
79. But in this case the answers were not identical – they were instead similar, which suggests that it was not a “one scribe” approach.
80. The Tribunal accepts that it is possible that each of the students copied from a third source. This would be an academic offence which is addressed directly in the

Course Outline, but it is equally possible that the students collaborated and then produced similar, though not identical, solutions. This is not prohibited in the Course Outline. It is encouraged.

81. Professor Hossain agreed that a joint solution is possible and that some diversity in answer and genuine collaboration is also possible, though he gave evidence that if he does not see the collaborative process he would assume that the work product is not the result of collaboration.
82. The Tribunal recognizes and agrees that collaboration does not include permitting one student to do the work which others then copy. The Tribunal also recognizes the policy with respect to Academic Integrity provides that “the work that you submit must be your own and cannot contain anyone else’s work or ideas without proper attribution”.
83. In this case though the Tribunal determined that because it was possible on the evidence before us that the students’ similar answers were the product of genuine collaboration and not impermissible copying of a source, greater clarity would be required in the language in the Course Outline regarding the ability to collaborate with one’s peers for the Tribunal to conclude that the Student had committed an academic offence. In order for collaboration to qualify as an academic offence, the Course Outline should have provided that while students are “encouraged to work together on the material related to the course”, if they do so they must disclose or identify that collaboration in their work product. Clarity in regards to how collaboration on assignments and the University’s policy with respect to Academic

Integrity fit together would have resulted in a different outcome in respect of this charge.

84. For these reasons, there is no clear and convincing evidence that the Student committed an offence in relation to Assignment 1.
85. There is, however, no similar ambiguity or doubt in relation to the evidence regarding conduct that occurred in connection with the Final Exam.
86. The unchallenged evidence establishes that the Student and another student in the class produced answers on the Final Exam that were suspiciously similar because they used unusual but identical language, highly unusual and distinctive expressions in an identical manner and followed the same steps in the same order to produce answers when there were multiple ways the answer could be produced.
87. The Final Exam is written individually. Significantly, no collaboration is permitted or encouraged, as was the case for assignments. For these reasons, the Tribunal finds that there is clear and convincing evidence of an offence in relation to the 4th charge arising from the Student's Final Exam.
88. Because charges 1 and 4 were made out, charges 2 and 5 were withdrawn by the University.

The Evidence Related to Penalty

89. Counsel for the University submitted that the proper sanctions to be imposed on the Student should be:

- 1) a final grade of zero in the course ENG110H5F in Fall 2020;
 - 2) a final grade of zero in the course MAT232H5 in Summer 2021;
 - 3) suspension from the University of Toronto for a period of three (3) years from the date of the Tribunal's order;
 - 4) recording of a sanction on the Student's academic record and transcript for a period of four (4) years from the date of the Tribunal's order; and
 - 5) that the case be reported to the Provost, with the Student's name withheld, for publication of a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanctions imposed.
90. The sanctions sought by the University are specifically provided for in the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*. The Panel was referred in particular to Appendix "C" which provides guidance to students facing a hearing at the Tribunal as to what should be expected in terms of penalty. The penalties sought here are exactly what follows from the facts of this matter. This is not a binding document but it does establish the student's reasonable expectations as a matter of fact.
91. The relevant facts with respect to sanction include the nature of the offences (plagiarism – which has a deliberate and intentional element to it) and the fact that there are two separate findings of misconduct.
92. In this case the Student does not have a prior offence, but has committed two separate offences. This is not a "one-time" error in judgment. The Student has not

been responsive to the University's attempts to address any of the allegations before this Tribunal. The University could have prosecuted these two offences separately. It is therefore appropriate to consider this as if the Student had a prior offence.

93. They are also consistent with sanctions that have been ordered in respect of similar fact patterns. To establish this the University provided the Panel with a Book of Authorities containing a number of prior decisions of this Tribunal and a chart summarizing them.
94. This Tribunal has been asked to consider and apply the sentencing factors set out in the *University of Toronto and Mr. C.* (Case No. 1976/77-3, November 5, 1976) and has done so.
95. A more recent application of these factors in a factually similar scenario occurs in *University of Toronto and T.W.* (Case No. 721, October 9, 2014). We have considered that case as well.
96. For the reasons set out above we accept the University's proposal with regards to sanction and have ordered as follows:
 - 1) a final grade of zero in the course ENG110H5F in Fall 2020;
 - 2) a final grade of zero in the course MAT232H5 in Summer 2021;
 - 3) the Student will be suspended from the University of Toronto for a period of three (3) years from the date of the Tribunal's order; and

- 4) A sanction will be recorded on the Student's academic record and transcript for a period of four (4) years from the date of the Tribunal's order.
97. And that the case be reported to the Provost, with the Student's name withheld, for publication of a notice of the decision of the Tribunal and the sanctions imposed.
98. An Order dated July 18, 2023, was signed by the Panel to this effect.

Dated at Toronto this 26th day of February, 2024

Original signed by:

Cheryl Woodin, Chair
On behalf of the Panel