

VICTORIAN INSTITUTE OF TEACHING
DECISION AND REASONS OF THE FORMAL HEARING

NUMBER: 348358 **Hearing Number** 0341

REGISTERED TEACHER: Eric Edward LINDBERG

PANEL MEMBERS: Gail McHardy, Chairperson
Sue Buckley, Registered Teacher
Sean Baker, Panel Member

ATTENDANCE: The teacher attended the Formal Hearing and was self-represented.
Cara O'Shanassy (VIT SOLICITOR), Instructing Solicitor on behalf of the Victorian Institute of Teaching.

DATE OF HEARING: 9 October 2019

DATE OF DECISION: 10 February 2020

DETERMINATION UNDER SECTION 2.6.46(2) OF THE *EDUCATION AND TRAINING REFORM ACT 2006*:

On 10 February 2020, the Panel decided to cancel the registration of the teacher from 10 February 2020.

REASONS

BACKGROUND

The teacher has been provisionally registered with the Victorian Institute of Teaching (the Institute) since 1 June 2016.

The teacher commenced employment as a classroom teacher at the school on 18 April 2017. He was employed on a fixed term contract to 23 January 2018.

On 21 June 2017, the Institute received notification from the Department of Education that they had taken action in relation to the alleged serious misconduct and/or lack of fitness to teach of the teacher.

On 21 June 2017, of the teacher's registration as a teacher was suspended on an interim basis pursuant to section 2.6.28 of the Act.

The interim suspension of the teacher's registration has been reviewed at least every 30 days as required by 2.6.28E of the Act.

The matter was referred to the Professional Conduct Committee (the Committee) of the Institute on 25 July 2018 and the Committee decided to refer the matter to a formal hearing.

THE ALLEGATIONS

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

DISCIPLINARY ALLEGATIONS

Allegation 1 - Serious misconduct, being a substantial departure from the standards that a member of the public or members of the teaching profession are entitled to expect of a reasonably competent teacher, by failing to treat his learners with courtesy and dignity and/or failing to maintain a safe learning environment in that:

- (a) on about 2 June 2017, the teacher yelled at and physically pushed two male Year 8 students towards an outside door in a public area in the school; and or
- (b) on about 9 June 2017, the teacher:
 - (i) made offensive remarks to and about a group of Year 9 students; and or
 - (ii) walked one of the students backwards into the back wall of the gymnasium in a physically imposing manner; and or
 - (iii) prodded one or more of the students in the shoulder with his finger.

Allegation 2 - Serious misconduct, being a substantial departure from the standards that a member of the public or members of the teaching profession are entitled to expect of a reasonably competent teacher, by failing to demonstrate collegiality in that:

- (a) on about 11 May 2017, at the conclusion of his Year 7 mathematics class, the teacher verbally and physically intimidated a teacher of the school, including raising a large dictionary over his head and thrusting it in her direction; and or

- (b) on about 17 May 2017, the teacher verbally and or physically intimidated a colleague by standing over her in an imposing manner and using words to the effect “If I ever hear you speak to me like that again in my class, I will do everything in my power to make sure you are dismissed. Do you hear me?”

Allegation 3 - The teacher’s conduct between about 11 May 2017 and 2 June 2017 constituted a pattern of conduct, which demonstrates that he is not fit to teach.

THE EVIDENCE & DISCUSSION

The teacher was not present at the scheduled time for commencement of the hearing in this matter. Counsel Assisting informed the Panel the teacher had indicated to the Institute he would be appearing before the Panel but had not arrived by the scheduled time of commencement, 10:00am.

The Panel agreed to stand down while Counsel Assisting made enquiries of the teacher to seek his whereabouts.

Counsel Assisting subsequently advised the Panel that she had been unable to reach the teacher by telephone. She advised however, that the teacher had left a voicemail message with the Institute explaining he had mistaken the time due to reading an incorrect clock and was in transit to the Institute. The Panel agreed they would adjourn and resume on his arrival.

The Panel subsequently resumed at 11:05am on the arrival of the teacher.

The teacher advised the Panel that he did not have legal representation and that he had not requested any of the witnesses to appear.

The Panel outlined the nature of the proceedings and provided guidance as appropriate to ensure the principles of natural justice were adhered to and confirmed with the teacher that he had received the relevant documentation for the hearing.

Counsel Assisting advised the Panel that there was a supplementary affidavit from the Principal of the school. A copy was provided to the teacher who advised the Panel that he had already received a copy.

On reading the affidavit the teacher said that it was “dotting the i’s and crossing the t’s and that it contained “no additional information”.

The teacher indicated he was refuting all the allegations.

Counsel Assisting then outlined the allegations as set out in the Notice of Formal Hearing and submitted the Hearing Book to be reference VIT1.

Counsel Assisting advised the Panel that the VIT were relying on the documentary evidence which had been provided and also submitted that the Panel should view the available CCTV footage of the incidents the subject of the allegations.

The available CCTV footage of the incidents was viewed by the Panel in sequence after each incident was outlined by Counsel Assisting.

The teacher was provided with the opportunity to respond to each of the allegations. The teacher's responses were given under affirmation.

The teacher questioned the order in which the allegations were being presented and stated his preference for them to be given chronologically.

The teacher claimed that he is an innocent victim of a deliberate and premeditated conspiracy orchestrated by the school principal to expunge him from the school.

The teacher contested each of the allegations at the hearing and chose to give evidence under affirmation and subject himself to cross-examination.

The Panel outlines the allegations and the responses of the teacher in the order which they appear in the outline, and are set out below.

Allegation (1a)

The teacher interrupted Counsel Assisting while she was outlining Allegation (1a), to deny the allegation. Panel Chair reminded the teacher that the Panel expected courtesy to be extended toward each party. The Panel assured him that it would provide him with an opportunity to respond once Counsel Assisting had finished her submission.

The teacher claimed he tried to shoo the two boys away, trying to brush them away towards the canteen where they were going anyway. He said that he did not place his hands on or make contact with them and he did not push them.

The teacher submitted that the evidence given by the two boys was that they wanted to ask him a question about digital technology. He claimed that this evidence was a "complete fabrication". Rather, he said that they had wanted to eavesdrop on his conversation with another teacher in order to "see what mischief they could make". The teacher claimed if an expert were to analyse the video it would show that he did not make contact with the two boys. The teacher described the two boys to the Panel as "mischievous twerps" and disruptive students.

In contrast to the teacher's evidence, both boys said that they wanted to ask him a question about digital technology and so stood to one side while he was talking to the other teacher. The teacher saw them, he turned, told them to "get out" and then pushed them towards the outside door. Student 1 said the teacher used "medium strength" when pushing him and Student 2 stated the teacher shoved him in the middle of the chest. Both teachers 1 and 2 stated in their witness statements that the teacher physically pushed both boys.

The Panel considers that the footage supports the evidence provided by the students and is inconsistent with the version of events given by the teacher. This together with the affidavit evidence from the students and teachers 1 and 2, substantiates the allegation is proven the teacher failed to treat his learners with courtesy and dignity and/or failed to maintain a safe learning environment. The Panel concluded that the teacher yelled at and physically pushed two male Year 8 students towards an outside door in a public area in the school in front of other students and teacher colleagues.

Allegation (1b)

Counsel Assisting explained there was no CCTV footage for the events giving rise to allegation (1b).

The teacher asked the Panel members if they had they read all of the affidavits, with particular focus to the handwritten affidavits. The Panel members confirmed that they had done so.

The teacher claimed that he opened the gymnasium during morning recess to let a group of boys play sport. He claimed that a group of girls had entered the gymnasium after he had done so. They were not meant to be there. Shortly after they entered, they began screaming at the group of boys. The teacher said he told them to leave, after which they verbally abused him and made racist remarks. The teacher claimed that they made these remarks to him because they see it as a 'hot button' to label him and see if they can get a reaction.

The teacher submitted that the evidence about this incident is completely concocted, that it was rehearsed and "the product of collusion".

The teacher strongly denied the allegation that he failed to treat his learners with courtesy and dignity and/or failed to maintain a safe learning environment with respect to the gymnasium incident. The teacher disputed the students' claims he was racist and claimed that they were screaming in the gymnasium. The students stated in their witness statements that the teacher shouted at them and explained that they had asked him to stop yelling and to step back. In their witness statements they also expressed of not feeling safe if the teacher returned as a result of his behaviour towards them.

The Panel noted that there was consistency in the evidence of the students.

The Panel considered the students to be witnesses of credibility and rejected the suggestion put by the teacher that the evidence was concocted. The Panel concluded that the student's evidence was reliable.

The teacher submitted that the Principal collected the statements from the students as part of her "conspiracy" and also that the Principal directed a teacher to collect the statements. As evidenced by the student statements the students reported the incident to teacher 3 after recess on that same day.

The teacher also claimed that the Principal became aware of the gymnasium incident because he informed her of it at the meeting when he was directed to work from home, which was on 5 June. Evidence before the Panel shows that teacher 3 had reported the incident to the Principal on 3 June 2017, the day after the students reported the incident to him.

The Panel concluded that there is no evidence to support the teacher's assertion that the evidence was concocted, or that it was collected at the behest of the Principal.

The teacher himself provided evidence of the communication from teacher 3 to the Principal in his post panel submission. A copy of the email communication confirms Saturday 3 June 2017 is the date when the Principal was informed and by teacher 3.

The Panel determined that the allegation is proven.

Allegation (2a)

Based on the teacher's evidence and the exhibits CB01 and DWS-05 the Panel noted that the teachers' workstation at this school is located in an open plan area, surrounded by classrooms without walls. The teacher said that he was conducting a Year 7 mathematics class. This is confirmed by the CCTV footage (exhibit CQ01).

Teacher 4 who reported and witnessed the incident explained in her statement she could hear the first 30 minutes of the lesson and how the teacher was explaining new behavioural rules to the students.

She explained that all teachers are audible in the open plan space and in particular this teacher, as he spoke in a loud voice and often yelled at the students.

In her email statement to the school leadership staff she raises her concerns about the significant yelling by the teacher and how the lesson was very disorganised. She also claimed that there was more lecturing than actual teaching.

When her colleague approached the teacher about his class conduct she said the teacher became very upset and commenced yelling at both of them and, did not allow them to communicate their concerns, continually interrupting them before thrusting the dictionary towards her.

She outlined how the teacher's behaviour during the incident was patronising and made her feel uncomfortable.

The teacher gave evidence in response to allegation (2a). He referred to the evidence in the Hearing Book and how he viewed the CCTV footage in regard to the incident. He denied the claims made by the two teachers.

The teacher explained how he viewed his actions shown on the CCTV footage. By using the Hearing Book as a prop he proceeded to demonstrate to the Panel how he retrieved, raised and returned the dictionary to the shelf.

Neither in his submissions nor by his presentation before the Panel did the teacher express regret or remorse for this behaviour towards his colleague for this physical and public display of frustration in the workplace. He insisted he only held the dictionary up because the partition of the workstation was head height (on a number of occasions the teacher referred to the workstation as a "slit trench").

He explained what led to the dictionary incident. He was explaining a maths "trick" relating to fractions to the whole class and said he expected they ALL were able to do the task. Then a student loudly said "Even the dumb ones Sir?" The teacher said he turned his microphone off, walked over to the student and explained the offensive meaning of the word "dumb" in a very soft voice so that only those 1-2 metres away could hear. The teacher claimed another student who he referred to as the "class clown" yelled behind his back "Are you calling the deaf kids dumb sir?"

He said that it was this that caused teacher 4 to stand up at her workstation. The teacher described her waiving her arms, semaphoring and yelling - "Nooooo!".

He could see that she was “hysterical” and so stopped his class to retrieve a dictionary from the teacher workstation nearby to the class. Teacher 4 was 8 metres away from where he was teaching and the teacher denies her claim she could of heard his explanation to the student, rather she had only heard the student’s question to him.

The Panel accepts the Institute did not allege that the teacher made offensive use of the word “dumb” or that he explained the definition of “dumb” to students in an inappropriate manner.

Rather, the disciplinary allegation made against the teacher relates to his response to another teacher colleague.

It is alleged that he failed to demonstrate collegiality by verbally and physically intimidating another teacher by raising a large dictionary over his head and thrusting it towards her at the teacher workstation.

The teacher claimed that when he returned to his desk after class both teachers 4 and 5 were waiting for him. He claimed that teacher 5 got up and started to “berate” him. He told teacher 5 that he didn’t do anything wrong.

The teacher claimed that he picked the dictionary up and was going to pass it over the partition - he said he was being theatrical and never had any intention to throw it at teacher 5.

The dictionary was estimated by the teacher (correspondence dated 30 May 2017) to have weighed approximately 6.5kg.

He told the Panel that he could see that both wanted to have an argument. He was not prepared to have an argument because of previous interactions at the school.

Teachers 4 and 5 claimed in their statements that he became upset and began yelling when they tried to explain to him that they understood the dual meaning of the word “dumb” but he interrupted and did not allow them to talk; that’s when he proceeded to pick up a dictionary from his workstation and thrust it in teacher 5’s direction over the workstation partition.

Teacher 5 stated that she asked him not to wave the dictionary at her, but he cut her off, putting the dictionary down before “storming off,” physically upset.

The Panel noted that teacher 5 states in her affidavit that the teacher was angry and that she felt that his gesture in raising the dictionary above his head was a threatening gesture although she was not concerned that he would throw the dictionary towards her.

Both teachers 4 and 5’s statements are supported by the CCTV footage.

The footage shows the teacher speaking in an animated manner with hand gesturing and head movement as he converses with teacher 5 across the partition and with teacher 4 after he raises the dictionary. The footage confirms the teacher is demonstrating his frustration towards his colleagues and that other staff and students are present at the workstation while this incident is unfolding.

While denying the allegations, the teacher blamed teachers 4 and 5 for the incident, saying that teacher 4 behaved “hysterically” and interrupted his class, which he says was unacceptable.

When the teacher was cross examined by Counsel Assisting about this particular allegation the teacher expressed strongly to the Panel that the incident was the catalyst for the “conspiracy against him” and “they were not interested in anything I was offering, no interest at all”.

The teacher also claimed that teacher 5 reported the incident to the Principal and made a complaint so that the Principal could amass evidence against him to get rid of him. He claimed the incidents were “spurious and fabricated”.

At no stage throughout this discussion of the evidence of this incident did the teacher concede that he had acted in an inappropriate manner or display remorse for his conduct.

During the course of the evidence the teacher did inform the panel that he did struggle with student classroom behavior and outlined steps and resources he had applied and purchased to address this.

The teacher brought shopping bags full of the resource examples to the hearing which he informed the panel was to demonstrate what he had acquired and used while working at the school to be a good maths teacher.

While describing this he made reference to the maths department team, expressing his dissatisfaction with one of the senior maths teachers (who was his supervisor) and outlined a number of issues he had in the maths department as a result.

In the course of this evidence he referred to his supervisor colleague in a derogatory manner by calling him a “incompetent nincompoop”.

In his submission he restated this reference about his colleague but at the same time claiming “Of course, I never called him an “incompetent nincompoop” to his face or behind his back. I never ever bothered to disparage him to anyone.

The Panel concluded that the CCTV footage, showed a series of events consistent with the evidence by teachers 4 and 5. The Panel find the allegation proven.

Furthermore, information provided by the teacher himself substantiates a lack of collegiality to the expected standards of the profession.

Allegation (2b)

The Panel viewed the relevant CCTV footage. There were a total of four clips provided to the Panel.

In his evidence, the teacher admitted that he took the teacher outside the classroom and gave her a “dressing down”.

He says this was because she interrupted his class and undermined his credibility.

He says this was done in the heat of the moment and that he may have said that he would have her dismissed, but that this was inappropriate and he would reject that now.

He said “I should never have said that. If I did say that it was completely wrong”.

In his written submission filed at the conclusion of the hearing submission the teacher elaborated in more detail with “Because she spoke to me in such a contemptuous and condescending manner I instantly reacted and hastily took her outside the classroom and gave her a “dressing down” for a few “seconds”.

I regret the fact that in the “heat of the moment” I threatened to have her dismissed. That was entirely wrong and beyond my powers. However, I believe the rest of my response was entirely justified”.

The teacher also described this same teacher as “tough as old boots” and acknowledged “Unfortunately, I let her have it, in the presence of some students and their teacher”.

An education support staff member witnessed the teacher escorting teacher 7 out of the classroom and through a sliding door. The support staff member saw the teacher and teacher 7 stop just on the other side of the glass door and “while standing inches from teacher 7, the teacher began to berate her loudly.” The support staff member claimed “I saw him shaking his hand and pointing at her face in a forceful and aggressive manner. I heard him say words to the effect that: “If I ever hear you speak to me like that again in my class, I will do everything in my power to make sure you are dismissed. Do you hear me?” The support staff member says she noticed that teacher 7 “stood still as though frozen” while the teacher yelled at her, and then heard her say “yep”.

The support staff member says the conversation was “very visible... and very audible”. There were students in two classes nearby and she noticed that that the students were looking around at where they were standing. She further says that “I felt embarrassed and unsettled that I had walked into it and I noticed that the students were unsettled by it too. Some of the students... asked me to the effect that: “Why is he yelling at her? What’s going on?”

The teacher openly admitted to the main elements of allegation (2b). The CCTV footage supports the evidence given and the Panel finds that the allegation is proven.

In his evidence the teacher demonstrated limited remorse for his conduct related to this incident and sought to justify his actions.

When a Panel member questioned the teacher about any future teaching challenges he answered that “He would only be a day labourer (casual relief teacher) and if the environment was not acceptable, he would leave or not return. If he saw anything bad, he would not intervene but would report it.”

FINDINGS

The Panel concluded that the allegations are proven.

While the teacher disputes many of the allegations his evidence is not supported by the CCTV and his own account of the incidents is unreliable. By contrast the other witnesses have provided accounts which are supported by other witnesses and the CCTV footage.

The teacher alleges that the evidence is concocted and that there was a conspiracy to fabricate grounds for his removal. No evidence was provided to support this allegation and the panel rejects it.

SERIOUS MISCONDUCT

The Panel must now consider whether the allegations as proven amount to serious misconduct.

Although the phrase is used in section 2.6.46 of the Act, ‘serious misconduct’ is not defined in the Act. Its meaning must be derived from the statutory context in which the inquiry was established as well as any relevant case law.

The statutory context in which the inquiry was established is that contained in the Act, the purpose of which, by section 1.1.1 is to reform the law relating to education and training in Victoria by providing for a high standard of education and training for all Victorians.

By section 1.1.1(2), the Act makes provision for the recognition and regulation of the teaching profession.

One of the principles underlying the enactment of the Act is that all Victorians should have access to high quality education. The Act makes education for persons under a particular age compulsory.

In order to achieve a high quality of education a number of steps were taken including the establishment of the Government Teaching Service, the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority and by Part 2.6, the Victorian Institute of Teaching (the Institute).

The functions of the Institute are contained in section 2.6.3 and they are in part, to recognise and regulate members of the teaching profession.

One of functions of the Institute, as set out in section 2.6.3 of the Act, is to develop, maintain and promote a code of conduct for the teaching profession. In line with this, the Institute published “The Victorian Teaching Profession Code of Conduct and The Victorian Teaching Profession Code of Ethics” (the Code of Conduct and Code of Ethics’ respectively) in 2008.

The expressed purpose of the Code is: to promote the adherence to the values teachers see as underpinning their profession; to provide a set of principles to guide teachers in their everyday conduct and assist them to solve ethical dilemmas; to affirm the public accountability of the teaching profession; and to promote public confidence in the teaching profession.

Misconduct is defined in section 2.6.1 of the Act as:

misconduct, in relation to a teacher or an early childhood teacher, includes—
(a) conduct of the teacher or early childhood teacher occurring in connection with the practice of teaching that is of a lesser standard than a member of the public or members of the teaching profession are entitled to expect from a reasonably proficient teacher;

As such, misconduct, in the context of the Act, can be seen in light of the Codes of Conduct.

Part of the professional conduct expected of teachers is the recognition that collegiality is an integral part of the work of teachers (principle 1.8 in the code of conduct). The principle recognises that teachers demonstrate collegiality by, among other things, teaching each other with courtesy and respect, and using appropriate forums for constructive debate on professional matters.

Teachers must also treat their learners with courtesy and dignity by, among other things, modelling and engaging in respectful and impartial language and protecting learners from intimidation, embarrassment, humiliation or harm (principle 1.2 in the code of conduct) and interact with learners without displaying bias or preference (principle 1.4 in the code of conduct).

Based on evidence provided by each of the witnesses by way of sworn affidavits, the CCTV footage and the teacher's response to each allegation the Panel found between 11 May 2017 and 2 June 2017, whilst provisionally registered as a teacher, employed at the school, the Teacher:

1. Failed to treat his learners with the courtesy and dignity and/or failed to maintain a safe learning environment in that he:
 - yelled at and physically pushed two male Year 8 students;
 - made offensive remarks to and about a group of Year 9 students;
 - walked one of the Year 9 students backwards into the back wall of the gymnasium in a physically imposing manner; and
 - prodded one or more of the Year 9 students in the shoulder with his finger;
2. Failed to demonstrate collegiality in that he:
 - verbally and physically intimidated a teacher by raising a large dictionary over his head and thrusting it in her direction; and
 - verbally and physically intimidated a colleague by standing over her in an imposing manner in the presence of other staff and students; and
3. Displayed a pattern of conduct, which demonstrates that he is not fit to teach.

The teacher's conduct contravened the code of conduct in a way that would reasonably incur strong reprobation by professional brethren of good repute and competence. The definition of misconduct is clearly met in this matter.

Turning now to whether the misconduct is serious, in *Davidson v Victorian Institute of Teaching*, the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal asked the question "So what is serious misconduct?" In answering the question, the Tribunal said:

“We must look to the ways this phrase is defined in relation to other professions, as there is no definition in the Act. In our view the words must be given their ordinary dictionary meaning, informed by the practice of the teaching profession, and considered in the light of all the circumstances surrounding each of the allegations found approved.”

The Tribunal then referred to *Parr v Nurses Board of Victoria* where Kellam J observed:

“In my view the question of whether or not a nurse has engaged in unprofessional conduct of a serious nature must depend on the facts of each case. Clearly such conduct would not be serious if it was trivial, or of momentary effect only at the time of the commission or omission by which the conduct was so defined. It must be a departure, in a substantial manner, from the standards, which might be reasonably expected of a registered nurse. The departure from such standards must be blameworthy and deserving of more than passing censure.”

The teacher’s conduct in this matter was not trivial or of momentary effect. It involved multiple incidents, which affected multiple people, both colleagues and students. The conduct was serious in nature, involving physical intimidation and aggression and, at its worst, physical contact with students.

The Panel concluded that the conduct the subject of the allegations does amount to serious misconduct.

FITNESS TO TEACH

Fitness to teach is defined in section 2.6.1 of the Act to mean: “whether the character, reputation and conduct of a person are such that the person should be allowed to teach in a school”.

In *Davidson v Victorian Institute of Teaching [2007] VCAT 920*, the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal characterised unfitness as follows: “We take the view that a finding that a teacher is unfit to teach must carry with it a perception that the conduct complained of is of a continuing and persistent nature. It is conduct which throws doubt on how he would conduct himself in the future in the classroom. A teacher may commit a single act of serious misconduct, or a series of such acts, but those acts may be explicable in context and unlikely to recur. A determination that a teacher is unfit to teach appears to us to be a more severe penalty. It carries with it an assessment that the person should not be in a position of authority and trust with children, because his whole approach to teaching and to the children in his care is profoundly and irretrievably flawed. It would often involve consideration of criminal conduct.”

The Tribunal in *Davidson*, further noted that the whole of the teacher’s conduct is relevant to a decision as to whether a teacher is fit to teach.

While the Panel notes the conduct may not involve criminal conduct, the Panel concluded he is nonetheless unfit to practise as a teacher.

The Panel considers that the teacher’s inability to appropriately respond to what are common situations in a school setting is of serious concern. In response to these common situations, the teacher became physically intimidating and aggressive towards colleagues and students.

The teacher did not provide any indication to the Panel in the course of the hearing that he understood the gravity of the allegations, had learned from the events which had occurred, felt any remorse for the effects of his actions or planned to change his behavior in any way. The Panel's conclusions were reinforced by the teacher's closing remarks to the Panel at the formal hearing, where the teacher stated he wanted to retain his teaching registration so he could work as a "day labourer" for some part-time income. This shows scant regard for the principles set out in the code of conduct and falls well short of professional expectations.

CONCLUSION

The Panel concluded that the allegations are proven, that they amount to serious misconduct and the teacher is not fit to practise as a teacher.

The Panel is satisfied that the acts alleged against the Teacher, and found to be substantiated, constitute a substantial departure from the expectations of a member of the teaching profession and determined to cancel his registration.



.....
GAIL McHARDY, CHAIRPERSON



.....
per:
SUE BUCKLEY, REGISTERED TEACHER



.....
per:
SEAN BAKER, LEGAL PRACTITIONER