

CONFIDENTIAL

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 39 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD

To the Academic Affairs Committee,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday,  
March 29th, 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 M.J. Kelner

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

In Attendance:

Mr. R  
and Counsel Mr. O.H.T. Rudzik

Professor S.B. Chandler  
Chairman  
Department of Italian Studies

Mr. Peter White  
Assistant Secretary  
School of Graduate Studies

THE FOLLOWING ITEM IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN CLOSED SESSION

1. Time Limit for Launching Appeals

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS

THAT an appeal to the Academic Appeals Board shall, except in exceptional circumstances, be commenced by filing a notice of appeal with the Secretary of the Board no later than six months after the decision from which the appeal is being taken has been communicated in writing to the appellant.

THE FOLLOWING ITEM IS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

2. Mr. R

At its meeting on March 29th, 1978, the Academic Appeals Board considered the appeal of Mr. R against a decision of the Applications and Memorials Committee of the School of Graduate Studies dismissing his appeal against the termination of his doctoral candidacy by the Department of Italian Studies. The decision of the Board is that the appeal should be dismissed.

The appellant had failed to obtain the necessary standing on two occasions in paper II: Romance Philology. The first occasion was in April of 1975 and the appellant presented evidence to the Board concerning difficulties of various sorts that he was experiencing at the time: family, medical and academic. However, the only relief that the Board could grant based on these factors would be an opportunity to write the paper again and this opportunity has already been given to the appellant by the Department.

On the second occasion of writing the appellant had difficulties again. The Board's view, however, is that the examination was a normal one and the difficulties, which were partly a result of his own misjudgment, were ones which he ought to have been able to avoid or overcome.

REPORT NUMBER 39 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD - March 29th, 1978

2. Mr. R. (Cont'd)

In short, the Department made a negative professional judgment of the candidate's capabilities. The evidence disclosed neither extenuating circumstances nor any departure from rules or procedural requirements which would justify a refusal to accept this judgment as final.

Secretary  
May 23rd, 1978

Chairman