

University of Toronto TORONTO ONTARIO M5S 1A1

Appealed:
1992/93-13

University Tribunal

November 6th, 1992

BY REGISTERED MAIL

PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL

Ms W.

Willowdale, Ontario

Dear Ms W.

At its hearing on November 5th, 1992, the University Tribunal considered the following charges against you:

1. that in or about April, 1992 you did intentionally forge or in any other way alter or falsify academic records or you did circulate, alter or make use of such forged, altered or falsified records, namely a note dated April 21, 1992 purportedly from Professor Thompson and your second term test in ECO 328Y contrary to Section B.I.1.3(a) of the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters.
2. that in or about April, 1992, you made additions to your ECO 328Y second term test and submitted a forged note with the intent to falsify or alter your academic record, being your course results for ECO 328Y, contrary to Sections B.I.1.3(a) and B.II.2 of the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters.

In particular, on April 21, 1992, you submitted a note dated April 21, 1992, to Professor Indart which purported to be signed by Professor Thompson and which stated that your mark on the second term test had been changed to 13 out of 17. In addition, you submitted your second term test with additions to the test on the first page which purported to have been written by Professor Thompson. Neither the note nor the additions to the test were in fact written by Professor Thompson. Your mark on the second term test had not in fact been changed to 13 out of 17.

. . . /2

I am writing to formally advise you of the decision of the Tribunal with respect to these charges. The jury has found you guilty of the charges and has imposed the following sanctions:


- grade of 'O' in ECO 328Y.
- suspension for a period of three years from the University.
- that the suspension and the reason for it be recorded on your academic transcript for four years.
- that the decision and sanctions imposed be reported to the Vice-President and Provost for publication in the University newspapers, with the name of the student withheld.

In reaching its decision, the jury stated: "The jury was convinced that this was a premeditated attempt to change her academic grade on this course and recognizing that this was the second conviction of this type regarded it as a very serious offense against the Academic Code and was deserving of an appropriate penalty."

"We consider that this behaviour is clearly contrary to the views expressed in the exhibits presented by the defense, and whilst we accept that Ms W. has a learning disability we do not believe that it played any role in the commission of this offense."

Information concerning rights of appeal may be found in Section C.III of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. The deadline for filing an appeal by you or by the University is November 27th, 1992.

Yours truly,



Lynn Snowden
Secretary
University Tribunal

c.c.: C.A. Keith
L.R. Rothstein
D. Press
S. Bartkiw
D. Cook
J. Foley