

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 13 OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC APPEALS

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Subcommittee reports that it held a meeting on March 25th, 1975, at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Faculty of Pharmacy, 19 Russell Street, which was adjourned to March 31st, at 5:00 p.m. in the Office of the Governing Council, at which the following were present:

Professor J.B. Dunlop (In the Chair)	Professor J.A. Sawyer
Mr. J.E. Creelman	Mr. C. Ian P. Tate
Mrs. A. Dick	Professor A.M. Wall
Professor V.E. Graham	Miss M. Salter (Secretary)
Professor M. Grapko	

In Attendance:

Dean B. Etkin
Faculty of Applied Science
and Engineering

Mr. H.
and Counsel, Mr. George Vesely,
Campus Legal Assistance Centre

Professor B. Forrin
Department of Psychology,
Scarborough College

Professor J.D. King,
Associate Dean, Scarborough College

Mr. J.A. Gow,
Assistant Dean and Faculty
Secretary, Faculty of Applied
Science and Engineering

Mr. S.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

Mr. H.

Mr. H., a student in the second year at Scarborough College, appealed concerning a mark of 49 which he had received in an Introductory Psychology course in 1973-74. The mark was the result of a series of three multiple choice examinations which had been marked by computer. He submitted that in the case of borderline marks such as this, there should be some interpretation of the mark by the professor responsible for the course.

The Committee was informed that although the scoring had been by computer, the final mark had resulted from a careful assessment of the scores by the course instructors. It was their judgment that Mr. H. had clearly failed, but not by a great deal. They felt that the mark of 49 was a realistic estimate of his performance and that it would have done him a disservice to have given him a mark of 45.

After consideration of the documentary and oral evidence, the Subcommittee concluded that the mark of 49 which Mr. H. had received represented a clear judgment that he had not performed satisfactorily in the course. However, the Subcommittee noted that a mark of 49 is open to misinterpretation by the recipient.

YOUR SUBCOMMITTEE AGREED

THAT the appeal of Mr. H. concerning a mark of 49 which he had received in an introductory Psychology course, PSYA01Y be denied.

Mr. S.

Mr. S, a student in the fourth year of the Engineering Science programme in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering appealed against a decision of the Committee on Examinations of the Faculty refusing his petition to be allowed to complete the current academic year without penalty and to take a summer course in lieu of the elective which he had failed in the fall term.

Mr. S. had been on probation during the fall term because he had not achieved an average of 60% in the work of the previous spring term. In his fall term elective, he received a mark of 25 which resulted in an average of less than 60%. According to the regulations of the Faculty, this meant that he had failed to remove himself from probation, must withdraw, apply for re-admission, and repeat the work of the fourth year. He had appealed this decision unsuccessfully to the Committee on Examinations, then to the Ombudsman Committee. On the advice of the latter committee, however, the Examination Committee decided that Mr. S. should be permitted to continue in his laboratory course because he was engaged in a project with two other students and it was felt that his withdrawal would be a hardship for these students.

After hearing the documentary and oral evidence, the Subcommittee concluded that there were no extenuating circumstances which would permit it to relieve against the application of the regulations of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. The Subcommittee endorsed the decision of the Committee on Examinations that Mr. S. be permitted to continue in his laboratory course and felt that if he continued he should receive some consideration since his participation would be of benefit to other students. It therefore agreed that upon successful completion of the course he should be allowed to re-enroll with a reduction in his course load from the normal 48 units per term to 40 units per term, the minimum allowed under Faculty regulations.

YOUR SUBCOMMITTEE AGREED

- 1) THAT the appeal of Mr. S. be denied and that the decision of the Committee on Examinations of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering that he be permitted to continue in course AER409S be endorsed.
- 2) THAT if Mr. S. successfully completes course AER409S, he be permitted to re-enroll in the fall with a course load of 40 units per term.

The meetings adjourned at 6:15 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. respectively.

Secretary
April 22, 1975

Chairman