

CONFIDENTIAL

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 38 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD

To the Academic Affairs Committee,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Monday,  
March 20th, 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 J.D. Duffy  
Professor A.M. Hunt  
Professor George A. Reid

Professor Peter H. Salus  
Mr. Michael E. Treacy  
Mr. David Tennenhouse  
Miss M. Salter, Secretary

In Attendance:

Miss M.  
and Counsel Ms. Joan Moody

Mr. W.D. Neelands  
Registrar  
Trinity College

Mrs. Z.  
representing Mr. Z.

Professor W.D. London.  
Associate Dean  
Faculty of Education

Professor D.J. Long  
Faculty of Education

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN CLOSED SESSION

1. Miss M.

At its meeting on March 20th, 1978 the Academic Appeals Board heard the appeal of Miss M. from a decision of the Sub-Committee on Academic Appeals refusing her request that a one year suspension from studies in the Faculty of Arts and Science be lifted. In essence, the basis of the appeal was that there were extenuating circumstances that should be considered. Evidence was also directed to circumstances under which the appellant was evaluated in one particular course, Sociology 203Y. The Board's decision is that the appellant's failing mark in Sociology should be removed from her transcript. Whether or not this should lead to the removal of the appellant's suspension is not clear to the Board since it may have been based on her general record which, in the Board's view, could not be overlooked, even though the circumstances in which she pursued her studies were not ideal. If the Faculty suspended the appellant solely because of her mark in Soc 203Y, then presumably it would remove the suspension as a result of the Board's decision. If, however, the Faculty would have suspended her in any event, that decision would be bound to stand.

The Board's decision that Sociology 203Y should be removed from the appellant's transcript was based on uncontradicted evidence that the instructor's evaluation was based entirely on a single essay, contrary to departmental policy. This was contrary, as well, to the guidelines on grading practices approved by the Governing Council on June 17th, 1976 and while divisions were entitled under these guidelines to develop their own policies this, evidently, was not such a case. Furthermore, the professor, having informed the appellant that the outline of the essay which she proposed to write was inadequate, provided the appellant with no further guidance.

REPORT NUMBER 38 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD - March 20th, 19782. Mr. Z.

At its meeting on Monday, March 20th, 1978 the Academic Appeals Board considered the appeal of Mr. Z. against a decision of the Divisional Appeals Committee of the Faculty of Education denying his appeal for standing on the Technical Proficiency Examinations (Theory and Practical) in Fine Art. Failure to obtain standing prevents him from being recommended for an Interim Vocational Certificate Type "B".

Mr. Z. did not appear at the hearing but was represented by Mrs. Z. Notwithstanding her extremely able and articulate presentation, however, the decision of the Board is that the appeal should be dismissed.

The appellant failed the examinations. The appeal was based essentially on two points; that there was overwhelming alternative evidence of technical proficiency that, in effect, made the examination superfluous and that the failure of the examination was due to emotional pressure. The appellant is an established artist. He has taught. He has received praise from various sources for his work and his teaching. No doubt it is difficult for a person who has been away from the examination system for a substantial number of years to become once again acclimatized to its difficulties and pressures. However, it is not open to the Academic Appeals Board to dispense with the requirement of an examination in technical proficiency which is imposed by the Ministry of Education and the course of action recommended in the circumstances by the Faculty of Education seems eminently fair. A memorandum dated August 8th, 1977 from the Chairman of Technical/Industrial Arts to the Associate Dean of the Faculty says that the appellant was informed that supplementary examinations "would be arranged in such a way as to reduce the attendant stress as much as possible e.g., we would schedule the 2, 3-hour theory examinations on separate days. I also told him that he would be given credit for the sculpting that he carried out successfully on his first attempt with the hope that this too would reduce the stress".

The Board assumes that the Faculty would still be prepared to follow this plan in allowing the appellant to attempt the examinations again. This disposition of the problem seems appropriate.

Secretary  
May 23rd, 1978

Chairman