

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTOTHE GOVERNING COUNCILREPORT NUMBER 95 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARDOctober 16th, 1985

To the Academic Affairs Committee,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a hearing on Wednesday, October 16th, 1985 at 3:15 in the Board Room, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor J. B. Dunlop (In the Chair)	Mrs. J. R. Randall
Professor W. J. Callahan	Professor J. G. Slater
Professor J. H. Galloway	
Mrs. J. Nagy	Ms. Irene Macpherson, Secretary

In Attendance:

Mrs. G. Curri, Registrar, Scarborough College
Mr. S.

THE FOLLOWING ITEM IS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

At a meeting on October 16th, 1985 the Academic Appeals Board heard the appeal of MR. S. from a decision of the Sub-Committee on Academic Appeals of Scarborough College upholding the refusal to defer his three-year suspension. The decision of the Board is that the appeal must be dismissed.

The appellant, a visa student, entered Scarborough College after having done Ontario Grade 13 at International College in Toronto. This school is no longer in operation and at the time of the appellant's attendance its standards were being questioned. Nevertheless, the appellant was admitted to the University on the basis of an average of 63%. In the 1980 winter session he took three courses, failing two and obtaining a grade of D in the third. His GPA, both sessional and cumulative, was .53. In the 1981 winter session he took four courses with slightly better results: two D's, a D+ and a failure. With a sessional GPA of .90 and a cumulative GPA of .74 he was placed on academic probation. Following the winter session of 1982 when he achieved a C, a D+ and a failure on three courses he was suspended for one year. Although his sessional GPA had improved to 1.20 and his cumulative GPA to .88, he was a long way short of the cumulative GPA of 1.5 which would have put him back in good standing or the sessional GPA of 2.0 which would have allowed him to continue on probation.

After serving his one year suspension the appellant returned for the 1984 winter session taking one full-year course and four half-year courses. His results were three D's, a C- and a C. His sessional GPA continued to improve, reaching 1.28. His cumulative GPA rose to .97. Nevertheless, he was still far short of the required 1.5 cumulative that would have put him in good standing or the 2.0 sessional that would have allowed him to continue on probation. He was suspended for three years as prescribed by Scarborough College.

While the appellant had nine of the fifteen credits needed for a degree he only had two courses at a C- grade or better out of the eight that would be necessary to graduate.

The gist of the appellant's appeal was that he was improving and that given one more chance he was convinced he could make the grade. He stressed the consequences for him of suspension. As a visa student he would be required to leave the country and return to his home in Malaysia. He said that there would be no hope of him continuing at the University of Toronto at the end of that time because of financial barriers.

REPORT NUMBER 95 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD - October 16th, 1985

The Board could not help but feel enormous sympathy for the appellant in the circumstances. However, as the Board has held on a number of previous occasions, it has neither the inclination nor the jurisdiction to apply different standards to students who may have difficulty in returning. It appears to the Board that it was no favour to the appellant to admit him to the University and that it might have been wise to urge him not to pursue what appears to be a task beyond his capacity. While the Board agrees with the appellant that his work has improved it could not see any reason to suppose that, given one more chance, he could make the grade.

The appeal is dismissed.

Secretary
October 29th, 1985

Chairman