

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 46 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD

To the Academic Affairs Committee,  
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Friday, December 15th, 1978 at 3:30 p.m. in the Dean's Conference Room, Medical Sciences Building, at which the following were present:

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

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

In Attendance:

Mr. H.

Professor Peter Prangnell  
School of Architecture

Mrs. H.

Professor G.A. Robb  
School of Architecture

Mr. J. Lehto  
School of Architecture

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN CLOSED SESSION

THE FOLLOWING ITEM IS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

1. Mr. H.

At a meeting on December 15th, 1978, the Academic Appeals Board heard the appeal of Mr. H. against a decision of the Appeals and Awards Committee of the School of Architecture upholding the decision of the Examination Committee that the appellant had failed ARC 100S, the first year CORE and would be allowed to repeat it in January, 1979. The decision of the Board is that the appeal should be dismissed.

The appellant's statement of appeal asks that he be given a passing grade. According to this document, he had been misled during the CORE problem exercise into thinking that his work was acceptable. Thus, presumably, he took no remedial steps. At the hearing, however, the appellant said that if he had known earlier in the year that his work was unacceptable he might conceivably have withdrawn rather than fail.

The documentary and oral evidence persuaded the Board that the appellant had received a number of signals that his work was inadequate and needed to be improved. The Board was also convinced that the appellant misread those signals and cannot blame the School for his lack of awareness. Suggestions for improvement were made but seem not to have been understood by the appellant. There was no point, prior to the end of the year, when the appellant could have been told categorically that he was a failure. Thus, in the Board's view, it would be unrealistic to say that if he had been better informed the appellant either might have withdrawn from the course or taken appropriate remedial steps.

The appeal is dismissed.

