

CONFIDENTIAL

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 44 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD

To the Academic Affairs Committee,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Friday, October 13th, 1978 at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Galbraith Building, at which the following were present:

Professor J.B. Dunlop (In the Chair)
Ms. Beverley A. Batten
Professor W.E. Grasham
Professor Merrijoy Kelner

Professor Peter H. Salus
Professor Victor G. Smith
Mr. David Tennenhouse
Miss M. Salter, Secretary

In Attendance:

Miss F
and Counsel, Mr. Barry Swadron, Q.C.,
assisted by Mr. Marvin Shiffman

Dean A.R. Ten Cate
Faculty of Dentistry

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN CLOSED SESSION

THE FOLLOWING ITEM IS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

1. Miss F.

At its meeting on Friday, October 13th, 1978 the Academic Appeals Board heard an appeal by Miss F. against a decision of the Appeals Committee of the Faculty of Dentistry refusing her petition to be allowed to continue her studies. The appellant had failed the course in Restorative Dentistry during her first year and had also failed the supplementary examination. She was required to discontinue her studies in the Faculty. The decision of the Board is that the appeal should be dismissed.

The appellant's work in the academic or didactic aspects of the course and the first year programme generally was altogether satisfactory. As sometimes happens, however, to students who are academically fully capable, the appellant was unable to satisfy the practical clinical component involving psycho-motor skills. The Faculty requires a student to achieve 60% in the practical as well as the written work in order to pass Restorative Dentistry. This fact is made clear to students and their progress in practical work is monitored systematically throughout the year. In accordance with Faculty practice it was brought to the appellant's attention by a report in February that she was failing in the practical component and that improvement was needed. Also in accordance with Faculty practice she was interviewed in April and informed that she was not achieving a passing average, that a high priority should be placed on study and practice for the remaining term work and tests in the course and that the course co-ordinator and instructors were available for additional help if desired. She was also told that unless there were a marked improvement in her performance she would not succeed in passing the course in Restorative Dentistry. The Faculty practices in this regard, it should be said, are conscientious and helpful.

It was the appellant's contention, however, that she had performed poorly on one of her term tests because of illness. Had she done better she might have passed the course. She did not make this the subject of a petition although she testified that she brought it to the attention of the instructors at the time. In its reasons for decision the Appeals Committee of the Faculty observed that the appellant "ought to have known to report the situation if you believed it might have been a factor in your marks". Appellant's counsel pointed out to the Board that the Faculty calendar, while dealing with requirements in this respect for final examinations does not give information as to appropriate procedures regarding term tests. Even if the appellant's illness should have been allowed for, however, the remedy this

REPORT NUMBER 44 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD - October 13th, 1978

1. Miss F. (Cont'd)

Board would likely have considered would have been an opportunity to undergo a further test of her psycho-motor skills. In being given the opportunity to take the supplemental examination the appellant was given ample additional opportunity to demonstrate those psycho-motor skills.

It was alleged by the appellant that the supplemental examination was too long and too demanding but the Dean of the Faculty gave his opinion that this was not the case. On all the evidence the Board was not persuaded that there was anything untoward in the supplemental examination and therefore must support the Faculty's conclusion that the appellant has failed to demonstrate, after having had ample opportunity, that she possesses the necessary psycho-motor skills to justify allowing her to proceed in a profession where such skills are of great importance. This is certainly no reflection on the appellant's ability generally.

The appeal is dismissed.

Secretary
November 10th, 1978

Chairman