



University of Toronto TORONTO ONTARIO M5S 1A1

University Tribunal

Heard with:

1992/93-02

July 6th, 1992

BY REGISTERED MAIL

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. C.

Thunder Bay, Ontario

Dear Mr. C.

At its hearing on June 30th, 1992, the University Tribunal considered the following charge against you:

1. that on or about June 7, 1991, you submitted for credit in ACC804H parts of Assignment 1 in which you represented as your own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another contrary to Section E.1(a)(ii) of the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1985.

In particular, you represented as your own the idea or expression of ideas or work (hereafter referred to as "work") of Mr. B. (92/93-02) and/or Mr. C. in the memo portion of Assignment 1 on the subjects of Materiality, Validity, and Ownership. In the Audit Plan portion of Assignment 1, you represented as your own the work of Mr. B. (92/93-02), and/or Mr. C., and/or Ms. L., and/or Mr. X.

The jury unanimously found you guilty of the charges and imposed the following sanctions:

- (a) a grade of zero in the course ACC804H;
- (b) that a censure specifying academic misconduct be recorded on your academic transcript for a period of three years;
- (c) that the decision and sanctions imposed be reported to the Provost

for general publication, according to the University's policy, with a special mention of the fact that this offense was committed in a distance education course.

The jury gave the following reasons for its decision: "To come to an appropriate penalty for Mr. C., we had to look at the factors involved and had to look at his lack of interest in these proceedings

difficult time with but from what we gathered he did not seem to show any remorse over what we had convicted him of. One of the major

that the crimes were in effect (underpins all of the reasons and in effect becomes much of Mr. Cadene's penalty."

"We felt that the likelihood of repetition, even though that is hard to put any sort of figure on, given that we didn't expect he would be back at this particular university, but we did feel that it was perhaps somewhat greater than one would expect because of his lack of contrition. In and of itself, the offence was deemed to be fairly minor: one occurrence on a course assignment of 10%. However, given the way it was handled and how Mr. Cadene did not handle it, it became a blatant slap in the face for the University and an obvious case of plagiarism."

"We found no mitigating circumstances. We considered that he could not fly down here or the cost, however, he made no attempt that we could see to even send a letter explaining his action or his lack of actions. We do feel that unless an adequate penalty is meted out that the University would suffer detriment because of his lack of respect for the University and for its proceedings. Finally, we felt that the results should be published."

"We felt that a suspension, given the circumstances and given Mr. Cadene's lack of care for the University would not be an appropriate penalty, and so we have not included that as part of his penalty."

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 July 31st, 1992.

Yours sincerely,



Lynn Snowden
Secretary
University Tribunal

c.c.: N.J. Pepino
L. Rothstein
J.E. Foley
D.B. Cook
S. Isbister