

VICTORIAN INSTITUTE OF TEACHING
DECISION AND REASONS OF THE FORMAL HEARING

NUMBER: 0013

REGISTERED TEACHER: PAL

PANEL MEMBERS:

Janet Sherry	Chairperson
Robert Bertagnolio	Registered Teacher
Kay Bodna	Panel Member

TEACHER REPRESENTATION: The teacher was represented by Mr Geoff Wilson (26 July 2004) and Mr Mark Champion (23 August 2004).

COUNSEL ASSISTING THE PANEL: Mr Peter Harris, Counsel Assisting

DATES OF HEARING: 26 July 2004 and 23 August 2004

DECISION OF THE PANEL:

On 24 February 2005 the Panel determined that the teacher remain registered as a teacher.

EFFECT OF THE DECISION

The effect of the determination is that the teacher retains his registration as a teacher under the Act.

REASONS

BACKGROUND

On 31 December 2002 the *Victorian Institute of Teaching Act 2001* (the Act) was proclaimed in full. On that date most teachers in Victorian schools were deemed registered as teachers. The teacher was deemed registered pursuant to section 91(1) of the Act because he was registered with the Registered Schools Board under section 37 of the *Education Act 1958* immediately before the Act was proclaimed.

On 7 May 2003 the Victorian Institute of Teaching received a complaint dated 1 May 2003 from the Complainant against the teacher. At its meeting on 12 May 2004 the Disciplinary Proceedings Committee, a subcommittee of the Institute Council, decided that this matter should be referred to a formal hearing. A Notice of Formal Hearing was sent to the teacher on 22 June 2004.

The Notice of Formal Hearing set out the following allegations as evidence of possible serious misconduct and/or lack of fitness to teach:

1. During 1999 while studying at the Australian Catholic University (ACU) the teacher met the Complainant, a student. He began making telephone calls to the Complainant and harassing her at classes and at other times. The University requested the teacher cease all contact with the Complainant and that he undergo counselling.
2. In October 2002 the Complainant received nuisance telephone calls late at night and these continued nearly every night for 6 months.
3. In November 2002 Telstra traced these telephone calls to the teacher's telephone number and sent him a warning letter. However, the telephone calls continued nearly every night.
4. In March 2003 another trace was placed on the complainant's telephone. The teacher was sent another warning letter by Telstra in relation to the calls.
5. In April 2003 the Magistrate issued an Interim Intervention Order against the teacher to stop him from contacting the complainant. This Order was made final on 7 May 2003.
6. The telephone calls caused the complainant and her family (husband and children) to live in fear of the teacher.
7. On 3 February 2004 the teacher was found guilty of the offence, stalking pursuant to section 21A of the *Crimes Act 1958* and placed on a Community Based Order for a period of 12 months.

THE ISSUES

The issues to be determined in this matter are whether the teacher's conduct amounts to serious misconduct and/or a lack of fitness to teach and if so, what is the appropriate penalty.

THE LAW

The Disciplinary Proceedings are set out in Part 4 of the Act. Sections 26 of that Part provides:

If the Institute is informed that a registered teacher has been convicted or found guilty of an indictable offence other than a sexual offence, the Institute must conduct an inquiry under this Part into the registered teacher's fitness to teach.

Section 26 provides:

(1) The Institute may in accordance with this Part inquire into any information it receives under section 27 or 28 or any complaint that provides evidence of the serious incompetence of a registered teacher, serious misconduct of a registered teacher or that a registered teacher is unfit to be a teacher.

The terms *serious misconduct* and *fitness to teach* are not defined in the Act. The Panel is aware of case law regarding disciplinary proceedings in other jurisdictions which refers to the term *fit and proper person* and *professional misconduct*. The Panel has had regard to those cases and other case law on disciplinary matters to decide what is meant by these terms.

According to the High Court, the purposes of disciplinary proceedings in relation to a profession are:

- to protect the public;
- to maintain proper standards of conduct for the profession; and
- to protect the reputation of that profession.

A conviction for a criminal offence does not of itself mean that a teacher's registration will be cancelled. As the High Court pointed out in *Ziems v The Prothonotary of the Supreme Court of N.S.W.* (1957) 97 CLR 279, the registration authority must determine the facts that lead to the conviction before deciding whether a person should be disqualified from being a member of their profession. The role of the registration authority is not to punish the person. This has been done by the court. The conviction is of secondary importance. What is of significance is the circumstances which lead to the conviction. Many convictions would result in the disapproval of the public and colleagues but this does not mean that the teacher is not fit to teach.

Proof of a conviction does not prove a person is unfit because it does not allow the registration authority to assess the person's character or reputation. An assessment can only be made when some knowledge of the underlying facts are known. The question for the Panel is not whether the teacher has been convicted but rather whether the teacher's conduct shows that they are not fit to teach.

The Panel must be justified in holding out a teacher as being fit to be trusted with the duties and responsibilities of being a teacher. Whether a person is a fit and proper person to be a teacher will depend upon the minimum standards demanded by the teaching profession given the particular responsibilities and duties placed on teachers. It is the profession itself that sets the standard.

An inquiry into a person's fitness to teach will be concerned with the person's character. However the Panel must only consider matters that are relevant to the teaching profession. A teacher's fitness is tested at the time of the Panel hearing not at the time the offence occurred.

As the Supreme Court noted in *Siguenza v Secretary, Department of Infrastructure* [2002] VSC 46 *unfitness may be demonstrated by conduct totally unconnected with any such employment or employment at all*. That is, the conduct resulting in the offence does not have to be connected to a teacher's professional responsibilities for the conduct to indicate unfitness to teach. The High Court noted:

Furthermore, even where it does not involve professional misconduct, a person's behaviour may demonstrate qualities of a kind that require a conclusion that a person is not a fit and proper person to practise.

A Solicitor v The Council of the Law Society of New South Wales [2004] HCA 1

The approach of the Panel to a case of personal misconduct is different from a case of professional misconduct. In the statutory context a finding of professional misconduct may result in a penalty being imposed that is not cancellation of the teacher's registration. For personal misconduct the Panel will analyse the teacher's conduct to see whether it demonstrates some character defect that illustrates that the person is not fit to teach and thus their registration should be cancelled (see *Hughes and Vale Pty Ltd v The State of New South Wales (No 2)* (1955) 93 CLR 127).

As stated in *Siguenza* a person who is fit to teach must show that they possess the knowledge to carry out their duties and responsibilities, and that they possess *sufficient moral integrity and rectitude of character as to permit him to be safely accredited to the public, without further inquiry, as a person to be entrusted with the sort of work which the licence entails*.

In *Burgess v Board of Teacher Registration Queensland* [2003] QDC 159 the Queensland District Court stated that *any behaviour found to be inappropriate for a teacher is relevant to the ultimate question of fitness to be a teacher. The weight to be attached to that behaviour was a matter for the Board to determine*. The persistence of the inappropriate behaviour was relevant to a finding of unfitness to teach. A teacher's conduct should not impair *the standards of the profession to which the community entrusts the immensely important task of educating young children and adolescents*.

The standard of proof that applies in disciplinary proceedings is the *balance of probabilities*. The appropriate standard of proof that applies in civil matters was considered in *Briginshaw v Briginshaw* (1938) 60 CLR 336 where the High Court said that the ordinary standard of proof applied *subject only to the rule of prudence that any tribunal should act with much care and caution before finding that a serious allegation ... is established*.

And later:

The seriousness of an allegation made, the inherent unlikelihood of an occurrence of a given description, or the gravity of the consequences flowing from a particular finding are considerations which must affect the answer to the question whether the issue has been proved to the reasonable satisfaction of the tribunal.

The observations of the High Court have been followed in numerous decisions of the courts and in particular in relation to disciplinary proceedings (see *Barwick v Law Society of New South Wales* [2000] HCA 2, and *Murphy v The Bar Association of NSW* [2001] NSWSC 1191).

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED

1. Witness statements by:

- The Complainant dated 2 May 2003

- a Police Officer dated 17 July 2003
 - a Professor
2. VIT Complaint Form completed by the Complainant dated 1 May 2003
 3. Facsimile dated 14 April 2003 to Victoria Police from Telstra
 4. Facsimile dated 31 March 2003 to Victoria Police from Telstra
 5. Letter dated 20 March 2003 to the teacher from Telstra
 6. Letter dated 27 November 2002 to the teacher from Telstra
 7. Letter to the teacher from the ACU
 8. Court Orders
 - Magistrates Court 3 February 2004
 - Magistrates Court (Family Violence) Interim Intervention Order made on 30 April 2003
 - Magistrates Court (Family Violence) Intervention Order made on 7 May 2003
 9. Police Brief
 - Magistrates' Court documents
 - Letter Victoria Police dated 8 September 2003
 - Brief Head in the name of the teacher
 - Leap Victoria Police – Intent to summons report
 - Charge and Summons
 - Summary of Charges
 - Charge sequence and result of charge report
 - Witness list
 - Exhibit list
 10. Chronology of events (presented by Counsel assisting)
 11. Psychiatric Report from the Psychiatrist, dated 19 August 2004
 12. Psychiatric Report from the Psychiatrist, dated 3 November 2004
 13. Criminal Record Check for the teacher, dated 30 October 2004
 14. Letter from the complainant to the Victorian Institute of Teaching dated 17 July 2004
 15. References for the teacher from the following:
 - Assistant Principal, School 1, dated 17 June 2004
 - Principal, School 2, dated 15 October 2003
 - Principal, School 3, 6 November 2002
 - Assistant Principal, School 4, dated 14 November 2002
 - Coordinator, School 5, 2 June 2004
 - Principal, School 5, July 2004
 16. Letter from Principal School 6, to Darrell Fraser, Deputy Secretary, Office of School Education, dated 20 July 2004.
 17. The teacher's psychiatrist was requested to answer further queries by letter from the Institute of Teaching dated 11 October 2004, and this was provided on 3 November 2004.

THE EVIDENCE

The Panel heard evidence under oath or affirmation from:

- The Complainant (26 July 2004)
- Pro-Vice Chancellor, La Trobe University, Bendigo and former Head of School of Education, Australian Catholic University (26 July 2004)
- The teacher (23 August 2004)
- Principal, School 6 (23 August 2004)
- Principal School 5 (23 August 2004)
- Teacher and colleague of the teacher (23 August 2004)

Allegations 1 – 7, as set out above and in the Notice of Formal Hearing are not in dispute.

In Semester 1, 1999 the teacher and the complainant met at the Australian Catholic University (ACU) where they were both undertaking a Graduate Diploma in Education. The complainant told the Panel that there were about 50 – 60 students enrolled and that during the first few weeks she sat with the teacher two or three times. She stated that at this time she noticed nothing untoward in his behaviour. During the first few months of the semester the teacher made telephone calls to the complainant. Initially these were to discuss work but later he persistently asked her about her children and asked for pictures of them, both over the telephone and face to face, and became angry when she declined. He also complained that the complainant would not always sit with him in class. The telephone calls at home increased in frequency, despite the complainant constantly asking him to desist. The complainant gave evidence that the teacher was abusive and verbally violent during the telephone calls causing her fear for her safety, and that of her three children (11, 12 and 19 years). She also gave evidence that the teacher had physically confronted her outside the Library at ACU.

The teacher's behaviour towards the complainant and other female students was the subject of complaint to the Professor. The Professor gave evidence that in November 1999, he had spoken to the teacher and made it clear that his actions and approaches to the complainant and other female students were ambiguous to people and that they were not to continue. He sent the teacher for counselling which was completed. The counselling was "designed to increase [the teacher's] awareness of appropriate mechanisms for communicating with people and women in particular, and to develop more self-awareness of the impact that [he] may have on people at particular times". The Professor stated that in his opinion, the most benign view of the teacher's behaviour was that he lacked social skills. He considered the teacher should have learned from experience and that any repetition would suggest that he was not suitable to teach in a school.

The complainant gave evidence that from November 1999 until October 2002 there were no further calls but in October the calls resumed, almost every night and sometimes three or four times a night with the caller hanging up as soon as the phone was answered or not saying anything. In November 2002 Telstra placed a trace on the phone at the complainant's request. Telstra informed the complainant that they had sent a warning letter to the caller and that the calls were all from one number. The trace was discontinued in December. The calls did not cease and at the end of January 2003 the complainant was forced to leave the phone off the hook at night. The complainant stated that this had adversely affected her husband's business which operated from home and made it difficult for her to maintain contact with her elderly parents. The phone calls then began in the

afternoon and the trace was resumed in February and was still in place at the time the complainant gave evidence. The complainant stated that she and her family suffered deep distress, constant concern and fear for a period of six months.

The Panel heard evidence from the teacher with respect to a difficult childhood spent overseas including the loss of both parents. The teacher, sponsored by his uncle, came to Australia in 1968 and completed his schooling here, completing as BSc in 1990. Between 1988 and 1990 he received some counselling for what he described as unhappiness, low self esteem, low morale and not being as involved in activities as he would have liked. At the time he felt the counselling was not helpful and he had no insight into his condition, considering his problems lay with him alone. In 1991 he returned overseas for a period of three and a half years, including 12 months teaching. During this time he sought treatment for depression and was placed on medication, which, he stated, did not help. He still felt his 'condition' was his fault. In 1996 the teacher commenced a teaching qualification. He stated that he was unsuccessful in completing the course because of a failure to hand in assignments, and hyperactivity, which caused a lack of focus and work. In 1998 the teacher commenced a Diploma of Education at the ACU. The teacher told the Panel that in early 1998 he had been advised by a coordinator at the Australian Catholic University to seek professional help with his depression.

In his evidence to the Panel the teacher was equivocal about the significance of the telephone calls in 1999 to the complainant, saying some were inappropriate and some were not. He acknowledged that he was attracted to the complainant and that he was insistent that she should sit with him during lectures at the Australian Catholic University. The teacher acknowledged that he requested photos of her children in an insistent way, but did not think, then or now, that it was inappropriate. He said that he felt rejected by the complainant and was jealous that she was with other people and not with him.

During questioning, the teacher said that he had resumed the telephone calls to the complainant in 2002 and 2003 to punish her and to hurt her and to let out his pain. In his evidence he also stated that he was suffering a build up of frustration and anger from his lack of assertiveness and resourcefulness, his physical health problems and an inability to gain job interviews. He indicated that he saw his telephone calls to the complainant as an easy way to vent his frustration and anger, particularly as he felt rejected by her. The teacher stated that he now realises he had no right to impose and cause harm, that he was very selfish, and that he now wonders why an innocent person should pay for his anger and that he was sorry he had not had an opportunity to apologise to the complainant but that he now did so. The teacher acknowledged that he had no awareness, at the time, of the amount of pain his behaviour had caused, but was now fully aware of it. When questioned as to why he did not cease calling the complainant in 2002/3, despite warning letters from Telstra, the teacher said that he was not sure whether Telstra was referring to the complainant, as there were other people to whom he was making telephone calls.

In May 1998 the teacher was referred by his local doctor to the Psychiatrist. The teacher gave evidence to the Panel that the Psychiatrist had diagnosed his condition as bi-polar disorder including depression. He stated he felt relieved his condition had been named and he now understood there were reasons for his behaviour. He outlined to the Panel how his psychiatric condition manifested itself and what strategies he now had in place to deal with his behaviour, these included: self-talk; if feeling hurt to call a friend or the Psychiatrist; and to put in place 'nice things to do' to divert himself from the pain in his life. He further stated that he did not believe his inappropriate behaviour would occur in a school setting; he had learned a big lesson and did not want to repeat the same mistakes in life; that he was a caring person but had got it wrong in the past; and that he did not want to continue

[his inappropriate behaviours] as he would not be able to live a good life. The teacher further went on to state that he felt his psychiatric issues were 90% resolved and that he was doing 'his absolute best'. He stated that he was continuing to see the psychiatrist but that he was unsure that he was what he needed and that perhaps a psychologist who would give him 'homework' would be more appropriate.

A psychiatric report from the Psychiatrist, dated 19 August 2004, states that the teacher had been chronically depressed for about ten years prior to 1998 the symptoms of which included lowered self esteem, diminished drive and motivation, poor concentration and suicidal ideation and self denigration. The depression has improved with treatment which involves medication which he takes regularly. The teacher has aspects of his personality which tend to cause difficulties in the way he perceives others with whom he has to interact. He finds it difficult to cope with what he perceives to be rejection and discrimination which tends not only to aggravate his lowered self esteem but to rouse his anger and resentment to the point where he has to retaliate. His depression contributed to his stalking behaviour; the prognosis for his depression is good provided he continues with his treatment. As regards his personality characteristics the prognosis would depend essentially on his ability to engage in intensive psychotherapy and to make the necessary changes in so far as to let his intellectual abilities guide his emotions so as to allow him to respond in a more appropriate and socially acceptable manner. He shows great insight into the negative aspects of his personality and is genuinely concerned about his unacceptable behaviours and is determined to remedy them.

In a letter dated 3 November 2004 the Psychiatrist stated that the teacher had developed good insight into the nature of his problem and a determination to sort out his problems. Following recent happenings involving the law, the teacher had come to realise the serious consequences that his behaviour is likely to engender and that this in its self is proving beneficial. The teacher is unlikely to re-offend and his condition is not likely to affect his relationship with students.

The teacher was awarded his Diploma of Education in 2000 but has not held an ongoing position since that time. Since the beginning of 2002 he has worked for 16 out of a possible 19 terms at eight schools and as well as being employed as a casual relief teacher.

The Panel heard evidence from the Principal of School 6 that in his time in the school (Terms 2 and 3, 2004) the teacher had sought assistance and guidance – a positive attribute- and had been completely professional, treating people with a high level of respect. He stated that he had not been advised by the teacher of his stalking offence and was made aware of it by the Conduct and Ethics Branch of the Department.

The Panel heard evidence from the Principal, School 5, who stated that he did not know any of the teacher's history in relation to the stalking events when he employed him. He considered that the teacher was entitled to make one mistake and that he did not want to make a judgement. In response to the question about whether knowing that the teacher had made the same mistake in 1999 as in 2002 and 2003 would make a difference to his view, he said that he would have to discuss his understanding of it with the teacher. He said that knowing about the stalking, he considered he could retain a professional relationship with the teacher. He confirmed his written reference, dated July 2004, for the teacher which stated:

- he had worked with the teacher for a period of six months
- the teacher possesses a strong work ethic and adapted extremely quickly to the school community

- The teacher prepared extremely thoroughly for his classes and developed and implemented a variety of teaching strategies and identified and responded to the variety of learning styles and abilities in his classes
- The teacher worked well with the Science staff, was a willing learner, sought advice when required, regularly participated in Key Learning Area discussions and curriculum development activities and was confident in expressing his ideas and views
- The teacher was a popular member of staff due to his friendly and warm personality, his willingness to participate in extra curricular activities and the genuine interest he displayed for the school community
- The teacher has a thorough knowledge of the Science curriculum, a passion for teaching, a willingness and ability to develop his teaching skills and very good interpersonal skills, all of which would have a positive influence in any School.

The Panel heard evidence from the Coordinator at School 5 where he is currently employed. The Coordinator stated to the Panel that she had worked with the teacher from the beginning of Term 2 and that as a colleague he was very professional, made a positive contribution to the professional environment and although she had not observed him teaching he seemed to have an appropriate relationship with students. She went on to state that she had no issues of professional concern with the teacher and that he “hadn’t put a foot wrong”.

DISCUSSION OF THE EVIDENCE

There is no doubt in the mind of the Panel that the teacher’s behaviour, towards the complainant in 1999 and again in 2002/3 caused great personal distress and fear to the complainant and her family over a significant period of time.

The teacher clearly has a history of psychiatric/psychological problems, dating from at least 1988, possibly from his childhood experiences, which have manifested themselves in depression and a range of anti-social behaviours including those leading to the granting of an Intervention Order against him and the finding of guilt for stalking. He received psychiatric treatment from the psychiatrist from May 1998, but despite this, the evidence, including the fact that he continued to make telephone calls even after warnings from Telstra, supports the conclusion that he showed little insight into the nature and impact of his behaviour until some time after his sentence without conviction in 2004. Post his sentence there does seem to be a much greater awareness as to the nature of his conduct.

In giving evidence the teacher was able to describe the manifestations of his psychiatric condition to the Panel and how he currently deals with feelings of hurt and rejection so that he is able to prevent a repetition of his previous conduct. There has been no repetition of the conduct. He has continued treatment with the psychiatrist but expressed some reservations that the psychiatrist was the most appropriate person to assist him with his problems. The psychiatrist provided a written assessment that the teacher ‘shows great insight into the negative aspects of his personality’. The psychiatrist also stated that in his opinion the teacher was unlikely to re-offend.

The teacher now appears to be aware of the impact of his conduct on the complainant and her family and expressed remorse for his actions. He acknowledged that his behaviour was unwelcome and inappropriate and he proffered his apologies to the complainant during the course of his evidence.

The teacher's conduct did not arise in the course of his professional duties. Evidence from his professional colleagues and employers over the past four years indicate that he is able to competently and professionally carry out the role of a teacher in a variety of school settings. In summary, his professional colleagues provided written and verbal evidence to support the view that he is a competent teacher. This view is supported by the psychiatrist who stated that the teacher's condition was not likely to affect his relationships with his students.

FINDINGS OF FACT

After consideration of all the evidence before it, the Panel made the following findings:

- The teacher made numerous unwanted telephone calls to the complainant during 1999 as a means of retaliating against her perceived rejection and hurtful behaviour towards him
- Telephone calls from the teacher, during 1999, and again during 2002 and 2003, had a serious impact on the complainant and her family
- The teacher was warned about his behaviour towards the complainant by the Professor in 1999 and subsequently attended counselling
- The teacher ceased making telephone calls to the complainant in November 1999
- The teacher made further and numerous telephone calls to the complainant in 2002 and 2003
- The teacher was cautioned to not make telephone calls to the complainant by Telstra, through formal warning letters in both 2002 and 2003
- The teacher commenced seeing the psychiatrist in April 1998 and continues to do so
- The teacher has been diagnosed with bipolar disorder with depression and a personality disorder for which he continues to receive treatment
- In May 2003 an Intervention Order was made in relation to the teacher, effective to 7 May 2005
- In February 2004 the teacher pleaded guilty to one charge of stalking and was sentenced in the Magistrates Court without conviction

CONCLUSION

It is not in issue that on 3 February 2004 the teacher was found guilty of the offence of stalking pursuant to section 21A of the *Crimes Act* 1958 and placed on a Community Based Order for a period of 12 months. One issue for the Panel to decide was whether the teacher's conduct was such that it would be regarded as *disgraceful or dishonourable* by his teaching colleagues and thus he was guilty of serious misconduct. The Panel also had to decide whether the teacher was fit to teach.

The Panel was of the view that the teacher's behaviour would be regarded as dishonourable by members of the teaching profession. However, whether or not his dishonourable behaviour constituted *serious* misconduct depends on the circumstances. The Panel finds that the teacher's conduct was deserving of the strongest disapproval. However, as noted in *Ziems* this does not mean that the teacher's conduct was serious misconduct. For serious misconduct there must be a substantial departure from the accepted standards of the teaching profession. This departure is more likely to be serious if it was within the control of the teacher. The teacher's conduct was a departure from the accepted standards of the teaching profession but the Panel accepted that, to a large extent, it was due to his psychological condition prior to, and at the time, of the offences

and that this significantly impacted on his capacity to control his behaviour. The Panel were also mindful of the evidence provided by the teacher's colleagues and that of the psychiatrist. For these reasons the Panel finds that although the teacher was guilty of misconduct it did not amount to serious misconduct.

The Panel then considered whether the teacher was unfit to teach. A continuing lack of moral responsibility and an absence of insight and understanding of right and wrong in the context of ethical fitness would be a strong indication of unfitness. The Panel weighed up the evidence given by the teacher and that of the psychiatrist and concluded, on the balance of probabilities, that the teacher had gained a deal more insight into his condition and his conduct and had appropriate strategies and professional assistance in place to deal with similar situations should they arise in the future.

The Panel also looked to whether the teacher was genuinely remorseful as to his behaviour towards the complainant. The Panel concluded that the teacher now understands the impact his behaviour had on the complainant and her family and the disproportionate nature of his reactions to the circumstances. His unreserved apology was also noted by the Panel as a measure of his remorse.

The Panel also considered whether the teacher could be trusted with the duties and responsibilities of a teacher. The fact that his misconduct did not directly arise from the practice of his profession, coupled with the evidence of the psychiatrist and that of the teacher's colleagues, led the Panel to conclude that he was capable and competent to carry out his duties as a teacher.

DETERMINATION

The Panel determines that the teacher should retain his registration subject to the condition that he continue to consult with his psychiatrist not less than once every two months to undergo psychiatric treatment for a period of not less than two years from the date of this Order. The evidence that the teacher is to provide to the Institute of his continued treatment is a report prepared by his treating psychiatrist every six months for two years setting out the dates when the teacher has attended for treatment.



Janet Sherry Chairperson



**Per:
Robert Bertagnolio Registered Teacher**

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Janet McK. Shroy". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'J' and 'S'.

Per:
Kay Bodna Panel Member