

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 133 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS COMMITTEE

APRIL 4th. 1990

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a hearing on Wednesday, April 4th, 1990 in the Falconer Room, Simcoe Hall at which the following were present:

Professor J. B. Dunlop (Chairman)  
Professor D. Craig  
Mr. D. Power  
Professor J. Reibetanz  
Mr. A. Waugh

Ms C. Turnbull, Acting Secretary

In Attendance:

Mr. *J.*  
Professor E. Irwin

At a meeting on April 4th, 1990 the Academic Appeals Committee heard the appeal of *Mr. J.* from a decision of the Subcommittee on Academic Appeals of Scarborough College refusing his request for late withdrawal from PSYB65F without academic penalty. His petition had previously been turned down by the Sub-committee on Standing. The appellant had been assigned a grade of "F". The decision of the Committee is that the appeal must be refused.

The appellant was admitted to Scarborough College as a degree student in 1988 on the basis of his performance at Pan-American University, Edinburg, Texas and Dallas Community College, Dallas, Texas. His program was psychology. In the winter session he took three fall-term courses, all in psychology, and achieved "C" and "C-" and an "E". His Grade Point Average was 1.33. He was thus on probation, needing to raise the Cumulative Average to 1.5 or his Sessional Average to 1.7 to avoid suspension. He took one full-year course at the summer session and achieved a "C-" which only raised his Cumulative Average to 1.48 but constituted a 1.7 sessional GPA.

In the current winter session, the appellant took four fall-term courses. His results were a "B-", a "D-" and two "F"s, one in PSYB45F and one in PSYB65F. He petitioned for late withdrawal from PSYB45F, as well as PSYB65F, and that part of his petition was granted on the basis that no graded work had been returned to him prior to the deadline for withdrawal as required by the Grading Practices Policy. In PSYB65F, however, he had received the result of the first part of the term test amounting to 35 per cent of the final grade. Thus he had a basis for judging his progress and likelihood of success. Both the Sub-committee on Standing and the Subcommittee on Academic Appeals took the view that there had been ample opportunity for the appellant to decide to withdraw by the deadline and that he had offered no acceptable reason for failing to do so. The reason he gave for not petitioning by the deadline was the imminence of the second part of the term test on which he had hoped to do better.

**REPORT NUMBER 133 OF THE ACADEMIC APPEALS COMMITTEE - APRIL 4TH,  
1990**

The appellant had not written the final examination in PSYB65F, he said, because his application to withdraw was then pending and he thought he did not have to write. This manifests an apparent belief that his application was assured of success which was wholly unfounded. He had advanced no persuasive reason for allowing the deadline to pass and had been given no assurance on the subject whatsoever. On the contrary, it is the Committee's understanding that petitioners are warned orally to continue the course work until a decision is reached since a petition might be refused. There would appear to us to be some merit in putting such warnings in writing. Needless to say, if there had been any doubt about the appellant's prospect of passing PSYB65F, this removed it and assured his failure. Nor can this singular misapprehension become the basis for a successful appeal.

The appeal is dismissed.

Secretary  
May 11th, 1990

Chairman