

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTOTHE GOVERNING COUNCIL**CONFIDENTIAL**REPORT NUMBER 98 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARDFebruary 27th, 1986

To the Academic Affairs Committee,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a hearing on Thursday, February 27th, 1986 at 2:00 p.m. in Room 201, School of Graduate Studies, 65 St. George Street at which the following were present:

Professor J. B. Dunlop (In the Chair)	Professor J. T. Mayhall
Mr. M. Evans	Mrs. Joanne Uyede
Professor F. Flahiff	
Professor P. W. Fox	Ms. Dominique Petersen, Governing Council Secretariat

In Attendance:

Mr. L.
Mr. Tim Mosely, Downtown Legal Services
Mrs. G. Curri, Scarborough College

THE FOLLOWING ITEM IS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

At a meeting on February 27th, 1986 the Academic Appeals Board heard the appeal of Mr. L. from a decision of the Sub-committee on Academic Appeals of Scarborough College dismissing his appeal from the decision of the Sub-Committee on Standing refusing his request to be allowed to write a special examination in-ECOB11F. The decision of the Board is that the appeal should be allowed.

The basis of the appellant's petition to the Sub-Committee on Standing was illness during the regular examination in ECOB11F. The petition was supported by a certificate from the appellant's physician describing a chest condition which was causing him to have bouts of coughing and which required treatment with medication. A later certificate from the same physician described the condition as "tonsillar and upper respiratory infection which was significant enough to interfere with his attendance in class." The ECOB11F examination was on the afternoon of December 12th, 1984 and the appellant had written successfully an examination in computer science in the morning. Both the Sub-Committee on Standing and the Subcommittee on Academic Appeals found this to be significant. The Subcommittee on Academic Appeals "noted, unfavourably to your case, that you had shown a certain selectivity about which examinations to write on the day in question".

The appellant's oral testimony was that he had not felt well in the morning either, had spoken to both examiners, had managed to write computer science but had felt much worse by the end of that examination and so had gone to see his physician. In the view of the Board the appellant was justified in requesting consideration in the circumstances. The evidence established illness sufficiently serious to justify his decision not to write ECOB11F. The fact that he had been able to write an examination in the morning did not rebut this conclusion. Thus the Board's decision is that the appellant should be allowed to write an examination in ECOB11F at a reasonably convenient time.

Appeal allowed.

Secretary
March 5th, 1986

Chairman

