

CONFIDENTIAL

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 37 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD

To the Academic Affairs Committee,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Monday,
January 30th, 1978 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 Dennis Duffy
Professor W.E. Grasham
Mrs. Frances Jones

Professor A.M. Hunt
Professor Peter H. Salus
Mr. Michael E. Treacy
Miss Marie Salter, Secretary

In Attendance:

Mr. W.
and Counsel Mr. Charles Taylor

Professor W. Grierson
School of Architecture

Professor B.L. van Ginkel
Director
School of Architecture

Professor David Siasm
School of Architecture

Professor Carmen Corneil
School of Architecture

THE FOLLOWING ITEM IS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN CLOSED SESSION

1. Mr. W.

At its meeting on Monday, January 30th, 1978, the Academic Appeals Board heard the appeal of Mr. W. against a decision of the Admissions and Appeal Committee of the School of Architecture upholding the conclusion of the Fourth Year staff and the School Review Committee that Mr. W. had failed his fourth year and should be required to repeat it. The decision of the Academic Appeals Board is that the appeal should be dismissed.

The grounds of the appeal were that "the School of Architecture failed to use adequate and fair procedures in evaluating my work and informing me of my progress during the year." The appellant alleged that he had not been given appropriate help, had received "no adequate feedback", had not been informed of his standing during the year, especially before the official withdrawal date and had been given only three progress reports and a final report. The appellant asserted that he "had demonstrated a lot of work and enthusiasm" and deserved a passing grade.

The evidence disclosed that the appellant had been assessed in accordance with normal procedures of the School of Architecture and that the reports given during the course of the year made it clear that the appellant's work was not up to standard. There was no reason to doubt either the fairness or the accuracy of these assessments.

The appellant offered in evidence letters from graduates of the School critical of the School's teaching and evaluation methods. Although representatives of the School did not object to the reception of such evidence, the Board was unable to attach significance to it. Even if the criticisms be justified - and the Board is in no position to form an opinion on this question - it is the view of the Board that issues raised by general criticisms of approved methods must ordinarily be resolved by legislative rather than adjudicative action.

Secretary
March 22nd, 1978

Chairman

