

CONFIDENTIAL

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 30 OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC APPEALS

To the Academic Affairs Committee,
University of Toronto.

Your Subcommittee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, April 6th, 1977 at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Faculty of Pharmacy, at which the following were present:

Professor J.B. Dunlop (In the Chair)	Professor J.W. Meakin
Mrs. Frances Barten	Professor G.A. Reid
Professor J. Michael Bliss	Mr. Robert Snell
Professor W.E. Grasham	Mr. David Vaskevitch
Professor A.M. Hunt	Miss M. Salter, Secretary

In Attendance:

Mr. C.	Professor J.B. Robinson
and Counsel Mr. F.L. Sharp	Faculty of Pharmacy
Borden & Elliot	
Dean W.E. Alexander	
Faculty of Pharmacy	

THE FOLLOWING ITEM IS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN CLOSED SESSION

1. Mr. C.

At its meeting on Wednesday, April 6th, 1977 the Subcommittee on Academic Appeals considered the appeal of Mr. C. from a decision of the Committee on Applications and Memorials of the Faculty of Pharmacy denying Mr. C.'s appeal against his failure in the third year in 1975-76, refusing his request to be admitted to fourth year, but recommending that he be re-admitted to the third year in 1976-77 with exemption in a number of courses. Mr. C. asked the Subcommittee to (a) advance him to fourth year Pharmacy, (b) re-admit him to third year Pharmacy on a part-time basis to repeat only the two courses he had failed in 1976, or (c) re-admit him to third year Pharmacy to repeat the two courses he failed and to take a certain number of fourth year courses. The decision of the Subcommittee is that the appeal should be dismissed and that Mr. C. be required to repeat the third year on the basis recommended in the decision of the Committee on Applications and Memorials.

Mr. C. first entered the University of Toronto in 1964 as a medical student, successfully completing two pre-medical and two medical years. In the second medical year he suffered a severe nervous breakdown and was granted agrotat standing. In his third medical year he suffered a relapse, failed the year and was required to withdraw. In 1969-70 he was admitted to the fourth year of the Life Sciences course in the Faculty of Arts and Science and obtained his Bachelor of Science Degree in June 1970. In 1971 he was admitted to the third year of Pharmacy but due to further illness which resulted in his hospitalization for three months he had to withdraw from the course. He entered the third year again in 1975 and, as had been the case in 1971, was exempted from Pharmacy 381 (Biochemistry), Pharmacology 361 and Physiology 360 on the strength of the credit he had received for similar courses in the Faculty of Medicine. On the other hand, he was required to take Pharmacy 211 (Pharmaceutics I), a second year course.

Mr. C.'s course load thus consisted of Pathology 371S, Pharmacy 300S (Jurisprudence), Pharmacy 306 (Medical Chemistry I), Pharmacy 312 (Pharmaceutics II), Pharmacy 343F (Professional Practice II), and Pharmacy 211 (Pharmaceutics I).

I. Mr. C. (Cont'd)

His course load was thus lighter than usual but there was a partial timetable conflict in the spring term between the second year course, Pharmacy 211, and Pathology 371S. The Pathology lectures were from 2 - 4 p.m. on Monday and the initial hour conflicted with Pharmacy 211. The lab in Pharmacy 211 conflicted with Pharmacy 306 and Mr. C. had to miss part of the lab. Mr. C. was formally advised to attend the Pathology lectures and to make arrangements to obtain the notes in the lectures he would miss in Pharmacy 211. A member of the teaching staff had agreed to go over the material, after Mr. C. had adequately studied it, on a monthly basis.

In June 1976 Mr. C. failed Pharmacy 211 and Pharmacy 312. In his other courses he obtained two C's and two D's. The overall result was a failure of third year which Mr. C. appealed. He sought, in the alternative, leave to repeat third year. The Committee on Applications and Memorials, having concluded that the appeal against failure should be denied, recommended to the Committee on Admissions and Selection that Mr. C. be re-admitted to third year with the following programme: Pharmacy 211, Pharmacy 312, Pharmacy 381, Pharmacology 361, Physiology 360. This recommendation was accepted by the Committee on Admissions and Selection. Thus, Mr. C. was again being given a reduced course load but on this occasion was being excused from repeating those courses he had passed in 1975-76 and required instead to take the courses from which he had previously been exempted. The explanation for this decision was that so much time had elapsed since Mr. C. had obtained his credits in the Faculty of Medicine it would be preferable for him to "update" his knowledge in these subjects rather than repeat work of the previous year in which he had obtained passes.

Mr. C.'s appeal was based essentially on two grounds: (1) that the conflict between Pharmacy 211 and Pathology 371S was partly responsible for his failure in Pharmacy 211 and, since Pharmacy 211 was a pre-requisite for Pharmacy 312, led to his failure in that subject as well; (2) that his psychiatric problems constituted extenuating circumstances. The conflict in courses was clearly undesirable. It was evidently unavoidable as well. The Subcommittee was told by Dean Alexander that every effort was made to avoid conflicts but that when subjects from more than one year are involved in a programme, conflicts sometimes occur. Evidence and argument were directed to the difficulty created for Mr. C. by the conflict and by alleged inadequacies in the additional assistance made available to him. Mr. C. felt that the faculty member whose assistance had been offered was not as co-operative in assisting him as he should have been. It is the Subcommittee's view that the onus in such circumstances is not altogether on the faculty member and the Subcommittee was not convinced that Mr. C. had made a very substantial effort to solicit the promised assistance. Evidence and argument were also directed to the question of Mr. C.'s capacity to be a successful pharmacist. What the evidence did not disclose, however, was that Mr. C. had acquired the necessary proficiency in the subjects of the third year to be allowed to proceed to the fourth year. Even leaving out of account the courses in which he failed, Mr. C.'s average was below the required 60%.

The Subcommittee is altogether sympathetic to Mr. C.'s difficulties. It does not wish to cast any doubt on his capacity to obtain the required proficiency. In the Subcommittee's view the Faculty has given sympathetic treatment to Mr. C. as well. However, neither difficulties created by timetabling, nor extenuating circumstances can substitute for essential academic background. Nor can the Subcommittee disagree with the decision of the Committee on Applications and Memorials to recommend a programme requiring Mr. C. to include the subjects from which he had previously been exempted. Dean Alexander stated that although the Faculty had readily granted these exemptions in 1971, it had done so with much greater reluctance in 1975 and had not been prepared to do so in 1976. The Subcommittee on Academic Appeals saw no basis for disputing the judgment thus exercised.

Mr. C. began to repeat the third year in 1976-77 but, upon his decision to appeal his prior failure, withdrew. It would seem reasonable to the Subcommittee that if he should still wish to pursue his course that he now take the third year programme prescribed for 1976-77 by the Committee on Admissions and Selection.

REPORT NUMBER 30 OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC APPEALS - April 6th, 1977

I. Mr. C. (Cont'd)

YOUR SUBCOMMITTEE AGREED

THAT the appeal of Mr. C.
from a decision of the Committee on
Applications and Memorials of the
Faculty of Pharmacy be denied.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Secretary
April 21st, 1977

Chairman

