

January 11th, 1989

REGISTERED MAIL

CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. L.

Toronto, Ontario

Dear Mr. L.

At its hearing on Monday, January 9th, 1989 the University Tribunal considered the following charges against you:

- (1) Being a student enrolled in GLGA03S in or about the spring of 1988 you did mutilate library material contrary to Section E.1.(d) of the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters.

In particular, you handed in an assignment in GLGA03S, entitled "Geological Hazards", which contained numerous cut out clippings from periodical publications in and belonging to the Bladen Library, thereby mutilating such publications.

- (2) In or about the winter of 1988 you did make use of forged or altered academic records of the University contrary to Section E.1.(c) of the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters.

In particular you wrote a letter to Oxford Computer Management Limited requesting financial assistance. With that letter, you enclosed your University of Toronto Statements of Results for 1986 and 1987 upon which the grades and C.P.A.s had been forged or altered.

...2/

Based on the evidence presented, the jury found you guilty of both charges and imposed the following sanctions:

- a grade of zero in the course GLCA03S;
- suspension from the University from January 10th, 1989 to August 31st, 1990;
- that the suspension and the reason for it be recorded on your academic record and transcript for the period of the suspension;
- that you not be allowed to apply for graduation with a three-year degree until September 1990;
- denial of privileges to use any University of Toronto library for the period of the suspension; and
- that the decision and sanctions imposed be reported to the Vice-President and Provost for publication in the University newspapers.

The jury gave the following reasons for their decision:

"With regards to the charge of misrepresentation [of your University of Toronto Statements of Results], we believe the Dean's Office and the Division of Humanities of Scarborough College, University of Toronto, mishandled the case when first it came to light. It seems to us that the Dean's Office intended at that time not to press the charge. Only afterwards, in light of the second offence, mutilation, did the Dean's Office re-open the matter. We are distressed that the official representative of the University today has argued that this charge of misrepresentation is the more serious of the two counts. We have taken our view of these proceedings [by Scarborough College] into account when considering the appropriate penalty. Some of us believe the first charge to be more serious than the second; others believe the second more serious than the first. But we all agree that, taken together, they constitute a very serious offence. However, they do not, in our view, justify expulsion."

...3/

Information concerning rights of appeal may be found in Section L of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. The deadline for filing an appeal by you or by the University is February 3rd, 1989.

Yours truly,

Dominique Petersen
Secretary
University Tribunal

DP:dp

cc.: L. Kotylo
K. Chown
K. Feldman
J.E. Foley
D.B. Cook
M.E. Irwin
J. Warden