

CONFIDENTIAL

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 84 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD

January 25th, 1985

To the Academic Affairs Committee,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a hearing on Friday, January 25th, 1985 at 2:00 p.m. in Room 23, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Professor J. B. Dunlop (In the Chair) | Professor Kenneth G. McNeill |
| Professor William Callahan | Ms. Michelle Meyer |
| Professor W. H. Francombe | |
| Professor John T. Mayhall | Ms. I. Macpherson, Secretary |

In Attendance

Mr. *R.*
Mrs. G. Curri, Registrar, Scarborough College

At a meeting on Friday, January 25th, 1985, the Academic Appeals Board heard the appeal of Mr. *R.* from a decision of the Subcommittee on Academic Appeals of Scarborough College refusing his request to have a three-year suspension deferred based on the improvement in his marks in the 1983-84 academic year. The decision of the Board is that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr. *R.* entered Scarborough College in 1980. In four full-year courses that year his record was three F's and a D-. Under Scarborough's regulations on standing

Students shall be placed on probation who have attempted two and one-half courses in the College and have a cumulative GPA of less than 1.50.

Thus the appellant, whose GPA was .175, was placed on probation.

In the following academic year in four and one-half courses he obtained one F, two E's, a D- and a D. According to the regulations

Students who are on probation shall be liable for suspension or refusal of further registration if:

- they have attempted at least two full courses (or equivalent) since most recently having been placed on probation; and if
- they still have a cumulative GPA of less than 1.50.

- (a) a probationary GPA shall be calculated for such students, being the GPA of all courses taken since the student was most recently placed on probation.
- (b) where the probationary GPA is 2.00 or better, the student may continue on probation.
- (c) where the probationary GPA is less than 2.00, the student will incur suspension or refusal of further registration.
 - students who have incurred no previous suspension will be suspended for one year.
 - students who have previously incurred (at worst) a one year suspension will be suspended for three years.
 - students who have previously incurred a three year suspension will be refused further registration in the College.

REPORT NUMBER 84 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD - January 25th, 1985

As the appellant's cumulative GPA was only slightly better than .5 and his probationary GPA below .9, he was suspended for a year.

Students returning from suspension are placed on probation again. The appellant returned in the summer session of 1983, taking one course, in which he achieved a grade of C-. In the winter session of 1983 he took four courses, achieving a B, a C, a D+ and a D. Thus his sessional GPA was 1.83 and his probationary GPA (which included the summer course) was 1.80. His cumulative GPA was .90. Not having achieved either a cumulative GPA of 1.50 or a probationary GPA of 2.00 he was thus subject to a three-year suspension.

The appellant testified that his attitude had changed, that he had worked hard and tried to improve his marks and that he believed that his marks had improved greatly. He said that he was committed to improving his GPA to an acceptable level and to obtaining a university degree. If he were allowed to continue taking courses, he said, he knew that he could continue to improve his marks. The fact remains, however, that in accordance with approved regulations of Scarborough College he is not entitled to proceed. The Board has no authority to ignore these regulations. It could, of course, take account of extenuating circumstances such as illness, just as the Scarborough Subcommittee could have done. However, the only evidence in this category related to the appellant's first year during which he was affected for a period of six weeks in the fall by a throat illness. This was taken into account to a certain extent in determination of the basis on which his final assessment would be made in that year. Additional weight was attached to his final examinations to allow him to catch up and get the full benefit of having done so. The Board did not see any way in which it could attach any further significance to this evidence to the appellant's current advantage.

Although the Board is sympathetic to the appellant's desire to succeed and hopes it will continue, it nevertheless could not allow the appeal.

Appeal dismissed.

Secretary
March 1st, 1985

Chairman