

**DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE
OF THE ONTARIO COLLEGE OF TEACHERS**

IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario College of Teachers Act, 1996*, and the Regulation (Ontario Regulation 437/97) thereunder;

AND IN THE MATTER OF a discipline proceeding against Susan Mary Clark, a member of the Ontario College of Teachers.

PANEL: Mel Greif, Chair
Tammy Bush
Rosemary Fontaine

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| BETWEEN: |) | Awanish Sinha and |
| |) | Yasmin Nizami, |
| |) | McCarthy Tétrault LLP, |
| |) | for Ontario College of Teachers, |
| ONTARIO COLLEGE OF TEACHERS |) | assisted by Jennifer Robinson, |
| |) | Law Clerk |
| - and - |) | |
| |) | William Markle and |
| SUSAN MARY CLARK |) | Stephanie Carey, |
| (CERTIFICATE # 209427) |) | Markle & Phibbs |
| |) | for Susan Mary Clark |
| |) | |
| |) | Christopher Wirth |
| |) | Stockwoods LLP, |
| |) | Independent Legal Counsel |
| |) | |
| |) | Heard: May 26, 27 & 28, 2009 |

REASONS FOR DECISION

This matter came on for hearing before a panel of the Discipline Committee (the “Committee”) on May 26, 27 & 28, 2009 at the Ontario College of Teachers (“the College”) at Toronto.

A *Notice of Hearing*, dated February 29, 2008 (Exhibit 1) was served on Susan Mary Clark (the “Member”), providing her with notice that the Discipline Committee of the Ontario College of Teachers would meet on March 25, 2008 to set a date for a hearing, and specifying the charges. The Discipline Committee subsequently set May 26, 27 & 28 2009, as the date for the hearing on the merits.

Susan Mary Clark was in attendance at the hearing.

THE ALLEGATIONS

The allegations against Susan Mary Clark in the *Notice of Hearing*, (*Exhibit 1*) dated February 29, 2008, are as follows:

IT IS ALLEGED that Susan Mary Clark is guilty of professional misconduct and/or incompetence as defined in sections 30(2) and (3) of the *Ontario College of Teachers Act, 1996* (the “Act), in that:

- (a) she failed to maintain the standards of the profession, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(5);
- (b) she abused a student or students physically, sexually, verbally, psychologically or emotionally, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(7);
- (c) she failed to comply with the *Act* and the *Education Act*, Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1990, chapter E.2, and specifically section 264(1)(c) thereof or the Regulations made under those Acts, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsections 1(14) and (15);

- (d) she committed acts that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(18);
- (e) she engaged in conduct unbecoming a member, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(19); and
- (f) she displayed a lack of knowledge, skill or judgment of a nature or extent that demonstrates that she is either unfit to carry out her professional responsibilities or that her certificate should be made subject to terms, conditions or limitations.

PARTICULARS OF THESE ALLEGATIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Susan Mary Clark (the “Member”) is a member of the Ontario College of Teachers.
2. At all material times, the Member was employed by the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board (“the Board”) and taught Science at St. Martin Secondary School (“the School”), in Mississauga, Ontario.
3. On or about February 18, 2005, in the presence of a special needs student at the School, the Member screamed at an Educational Resource worker – “Why is he not in class? This crap has gone on all year! I am sick of it!”
4. On or about June 13, 2005, the Member entered the parking lot in her van and accelerated her van towards an Educational Resource worker who was in the parking lot speaking to another teacher.

5. In or about February 2006, the Member accused a female student in her Grade 11 Biology class of going to the Resource room for help and having the staff there do all the student's work.
6. In or about April 2006, the Member addressed a new teacher at the School in an unprofessional manner when she questioned this new teacher, in front of the teacher's class, about the teacher's tearing up of the science homework project of one of the Member's students.
7. On May 3, 2006, the Member physically assaulted an Educational Resource worker in the School.
8. On or about May 4, 2006, the Member put her foot on the ankle of a female student who was sitting in the School hallway, and who failed to move her legs when the Member approached her. While placing her foot on the female student's ankle, the Member asked - "Do you want to lose it?"

At the hearing on May 26, 2009, College counsel advised that the College would not be calling any evidence with respect to paragraph 5. above in the *Notice of Hearing*.

MEMBER'S PLEA

The Member denied the allegations set out in the *Notice of Hearing*.

OVERVIEW

Susan Mary Clark is a member of the Ontario College of Teachers. At all material times she was employed by the Dufferin Peel Catholic District School Board (the "Board"). In

2005-2006 she was a teacher of Science at St. Martin's Secondary School, (the "School"), in Mississauga, as well as being an athletic coach and supporter of numerous school activities.

It is alleged that the Member spoke to a teacher new to the school in an unprofessional manner and questioned the teacher's approach to discipline in front of the class. The Member is also accused of disciplining a student with what was described as a threat.

Further, it is alleged that the Member on one occasion, used inappropriate language towards an educational support worker, "ERW", and on another occasion, drove towards the ERW in the school parking lot in an unsafe manner. In addition, physical contact in the hallway of the school between the member and the ERW resulted in an accusation of assault on the part of the ERW.

THE EVIDENCE

The Committee heard and received evidence in the form of witness testimony and tendered exhibits.

The Witnesses

The College called four witnesses, Carmel Murphy-Brogly, Romela Georgis, Seamus Byrne and Mary Louise Clarke. The Member also testified before the Committee. The Member also called Ian Le Marquand as a witness.

Particular #8 - (Student in hallway)

Testimony of Carmel Murphy-Brogly

Carmel Murphy-Brogly was one of two vice principals at the school in 2005-2006. She testified in chief that on May 4, 2006, a student reported that the Member had threatened to step on her (the student) while she was sitting in the hallway with her legs extended. The witness also testified that she spoke to the Member who did not deny the incident. She also testified that she was reluctant to speak with the Member and referred the matter to the principal. She indicated that she had not kept any notes on this incident. The witness further testified that at times her relationship with the Member was contentious and that the Member often sent many students to the office for discipline infractions. The witness felt that the Member often disagreed with, and challenged her method of discipline.

Under cross-examination, the witness confirmed that teachers at the school had, as part of their duties, the responsibility to address students who were seated in the hallway floor, and discipline them for this school safety violation. She also testified that she did not recall speaking with the member about the incident. When questioned in 2007 by the College investigator with respect to this incident, she told the investigator that she had no specific recollection of the matter, or notes.

Testimony of the Member

In examination in chief, the Member testified that there were continuous “blitzes” in the school related to student behaviour, specifically about what they wore, where they sat and where they ate. It was during one of these “blitzes”, the Member testified, that she spoke

to a student three times within a short period of time. Each time the Member cautioned the student about her behaviour, stating that the student was in danger of being stepped upon, or in the Member's words, "trod on". The Member testified that she was merely trying to warn the student of possible danger. As far as the Member was concerned the matter was ended and there was no communication with the administration about this exchange.

In cross-examination, the Member testified that in general she did not send students to the office for discipline except during a "blitz" period, as requested by the administration. She denied speaking to the student in the language that was alleged. She indicated that she would never speak in a rude way to a student. She reiterated that the vice principal never spoke with her about this incident.

Particular #6 - (Interaction with colleague)

Testimony of Romela Georgis

Romela Georgis was a teacher who originally taught for eight years in Iraq. She received a Master of Education degree in Buffalo in 2005, was a member of the Ontario College of Teachers and the 2005-2006 school year was her first year of teaching at the school. She testified that while she was conducting her first period class, she noticed a student completing a Science assignment for the Member, and which was unrelated to the Mathematics class. She testified that she advised the entire class that if they were doing any work for another class at the moment, to put the work away. This particular student continued to work on the assignment. The witness testified that this was the third

occasion on which she had warned that student. She took the student's paper, ripped it into four pieces and placed them in the recycling bin just inside the classroom door.

She further testified that during her second period class, with twenty minutes left in the period and while the students were working at their desks, the Member knocked on Ms Georgis' classroom door and asked permission to look in the recycling bin. Upon receiving permission, the Member took the student's paper, held up the ripped pieces and asked, "Did you do this?"

Ms Georgis testified that she asked the Member if they could discuss this later, but the Member repeated the question and said something to the effect: "you shouldn't have done this." The witness testified that she felt embarrassed, uncomfortable, and intimidated.

Ms Georgis reported the incident to her Department Head who advised her to report the matter to the principal. She reported the incident, but testified that she did not make a formal complaint. Ms Georgis indicated that at the end of the day, when the student came to apologize she taped the paper together and returned it. Ms Georgis testified that she had no further interaction with the member and also testified that she had forgotten about the incident until reminded about it during a telephone conversation with an investigator from the College.

Under cross-examination Ms Georgis acknowledged that she was advised by the principal that the tearing up of student work was inappropriate. She admitted that given more experience she would have dealt with the matter differently. Ms Georgis also testified that she had told the College investigator that she had no definite memory of the details, just the "big picture" of the event.

Testimony of the Member

The Member testified in chief that she first learned of the torn assignment towards the end of her second period class when the student, who was crying, reported the incident to her. The Member said that she told the student it was wrong to have been working on her Biology assignment in another teacher's class and that the student would have to go back to Ms. Georgis and apologize. The Member testified that she went to Ms. Georgis' classroom and asked if she could look in the recycling bin and that Ms. Georgis took the torn paper from the box. The Member asked if Ms. Georgis had ripped it. Ms. Georgis admitted that she had, but she did not give the paper to the Member. The Member testified that she returned to her class and had no further discussion with Ms. Georgis. She also testified that the following week while discussing another matter, the principal mentioned that he had spoken to Ms. Georgis with respect to this matter. He did not suggest that the Member was in error.

Under cross-examination, the Member denied she was challenging Ms. Georgis' professional conduct, but was concerned that Ms. Georgis, by her actions, could encounter difficulty with a parent. Her only concern was that the student have the work returned so that it could be re-copied. She also testified that the event took place toward the end of the period and that several of Ms. Georgis' students were packing to leave.

Particular #3 - (Incident involving recycling duty)

Testimony of Mary Louise Clarke (ERW)

Mary Louise Clark was an educational resource worker at the school from 2001 until the present. Her role was to take directions from the lead teachers in the special needs

classroom, to take students into the mainstream or work with them in the classroom setting. The ERW testified that on February 18, 2005 the lead teacher requested that she take a student to perform recycling duties on the second floor of the school. Ms. Clarke said that when they reached the top of the stairs, the Member passed them and was visibly and verbally upset that the student was not in her class that morning. She testified that the Member said: “This is crap” and “I’m sick of this.” The ERW said that the Member was angry and spoke loudly and that the exchange had a negative effect on the behaviour and the language of the student, to the point that she had to take him to the administration office where she reported the matter to the principal and requested that both he and the vice-principal make note of the incident. She said that at the time she felt that if the Member had an issue with the student not attending her class, this matter should not have been discussed in the presence of the student.

Under cross-examination, the witness admitted that when the Member originally asked the student why he was not in class, there were no raised emotions at that juncture, but as a result of the incident the student’s language became very loud and inappropriate. The ERW said that it took a long time to settle the student down after they returned to the special needs classroom. She also testified that the Member was not in her classroom at the time of the incident, and that the exchange took place near the south stairs.

Testimony of the Member

The Member testified that the exchange with the student took place at her classroom door after the ERW and the student knocked on her door to get the recycling box. She denied that any discussion took place with the ERW, but that the student had said: “I want to be

in your class and they're making me do this dumb recycling and I don't want to do it.”

The Member denied that she said: “This is crap”, but had said, “I'm tired of this.” She further testified that no one from the administration spoke with her about this and that she only became aware of this particular complaint when it was filed with the College.

Under cross-examination the Member testified that she had concerns and disagreed with the idea that the special needs student would often be out of her class doing recycling duties or other tasks. The Member denied raising her voice, stating that it was not in her nature to scream and yell, especially with challenged kids. She did not recall any exchange with the ERW and that her statement, “I'm tired of this,” was spoken to no one in particular, but meant: ‘oh, well, there is nothing I can do’.

The Member further testified that she saw the exchange as a non-incident and only recalled it because she had to respond to the statements made by the ERW to the College and the police with respect to the matter.

Particular #4 - (Parking Lot)

Testimony of Seamus Byrne

Seamus Byrne was a teacher at the school for approximately twenty-four years, where he taught History, English, Law and Political Science. The witness testified that on June 13, 2005 he was standing in the middle of the school parking lot speaking with the ERW when a van driven by the Member came into the lot, approaching quickly. Mr. Byrne said he instinctively pulled the ERW towards him, but added that he didn't know who was driving the van until it passed and that he didn't believe that the vehicle would have touched the ERW who had her back to the oncoming van. He said that he had pulled the

ERW towards him in case she was in the way. He testified that the Member was staring straight ahead and did not look in their direction at all.

Under cross-examination Mr. Byrne confirmed that he did not get the sense that the Member looked in their direction.

Testimony of Mary Louise Clark

Mary Louise Clark testified that she was in the parking lot with Mr. Byrne, that she was facing him and that they were chatting on the way to her car. The ERW said that she could hear a car accelerating and that Mr. Byrne pulled her back towards him. She testified the car was being driven by the Member and that it stopped abruptly. She felt that the car was going too fast in the parking lot.

Under cross-examination, the ERW testified that she was not sure whether the Member intended to hit her or not, but she believed the Member was capable of intentionally hitting her with her vehicle.

The ERW testified that she reported this incident to the principal and vice-principal, requesting that they document the matter. She did not confirm if the matter had been documented, nor did the witness speak with the Member about it.

Ms Clarke was unable to explain why her report to the police of another incident included information with respect to this matter, and which implied that the Member was intentionally trying to run her down.

Testimony of the Member

The Member testified that she had no recollection of the event, and that no one, including any administrator ever spoke with her about it. She also said that she never exceeded speed limits in the parking lot and was always sure to drive safely and carefully. Under cross examination, the Member conceded that since she had no recollection of the incident, it could be possible that she was driving quickly in the parking lot that day.

Particular # 7 (Physical Contact in Hallway)

Evidence of Mary Louise Clarke

Mary Louise Clarke (ERW) testified that at lunchtime on May 3, 2006, she left her class room carrying materials for photocopying and proceeded along the east hallway towards the administrative office. At the corner of the east and north hallway, she testified that when she saw the Member coming toward her she stopped abruptly. The ERW testified that she put up her hand and said “excuse me” several times but the Member stepped into her space and “gave me her left elbow into my right breast.” The ERW then said that the Member continued up the east hallway, did not turn around and apologize or ask if she was okay. Ms Clarke further stated that there was plenty of space for the two of them as they came around the corner but “She stepped over into my space.” She further testified that the Member actually saw her and there was eye contact prior to the physical contact. During her testimony, College Counsel displayed a videotape from the school surveillance camera (Exhibit 6) and the witness verified the events as recorded.

Ms Clarke further testified that following the event she reported the incident to the principal who said he would contact the necessary people. The ERW was to contact her

union representative. Following this, the ERW testified that she went to the police and laid a charge of assault. She also testified that she had a pre-existing medical condition and was concerned for her health so subsequently attended for a medical examination.

Under cross-examination the ERW accepted the fact that neither she nor the Member could see the other coming and that they both arrived at the corner almost instantaneously. She admitted to taking the inside position. Ms Clarke reluctantly agreed that normally one in her location would have taken the outside position. She also admitted that because there were no mirrors at the intersection, it would have been impossible for either person to have anticipated the approach of the other. The witness also admitted that given their speed of travel and their position in the hallway, collision was inevitable. The ERW continued in her claim that the contact was intentional.

Ms Clarke admitted to being dissatisfied with the Crown decision not to proceed with the criminal charge against the Member and she outlined the steps she took to elicit support for her case. The ERW confirmed that within a week of the charges being withdrawn, she contacted a long list of persons who might be in a position to assist the pursuance of her complaint. Previously to those contacts and shortly following the incident Ms Clarke had already filed a formal complaint with the Ontario College of Teachers.

Testimony of the Member

The Member testified that she was walking down the hallway from the administration office carrying items from her mail tray. She stated that she was on the right hand side of the hallway, close to the lockers. The Member said that when the ERW came around the

corner, they bumped “like in a shopping mall”. She stated that the ERW cut between her and the lockers.

The Member said that the ERW yelled “Excuse me” at her and she replied “Excuse me”. The Member further testified that in order to avoid a confrontation in front of students she continued walking. From her perspective, it was a very insignificant encounter. The Member said that she had no conversation later with the ERW with respect to the incident and forgot about it until contacted after that by her union representative who informed the Member that she would be contacted by the police and not to attend at the school on the following Monday.

In cross-examination, the Member reiterated her evidence in chief. She referred to the contact as an insignificant bump, an incident easily forgettable. She did add that she thought that ERW was “angry and aggressive and was having a bad day.” The Member said that she could tell that from the tone of the ERW’s voice. It was the Member’s best opinion that this event could escalate into a situation in front of students. She stated that she believed it was best not to pursue the incident at that time. Subsequently the Member completely forgot about the incident because it was so minor.

Testimony of Ian Le Marquand

Ian Le Marquand was the principal at the school in 2005 and 2006. In the opening questions and responses in examination-in-chief he reviewed the Member’s qualifications, teaching experiences, and general contribution to the school. The principal commented positively on the quality of the Member’s teaching and interactions with staff and students. He also specifically focussed on the special skills that the Member had with

students who were on individual education plans (IEP). The witness commented on the Member's Teacher Performance Appraisals conducted in 2005 and 2006 (Exhibits 9, 10). In each appraisal the Member received an exemplary overall performance rating. For example the 2006 Teacher Performance Appraisal contained the following quote: "Through her tireless effort both in the classroom and in athletics, the teacher continues to have a huge positive impact on our St. Martin students. Her dedication, enthusiasm, along with faith makes her a very special teacher to many students both present and past. Thanks for all you do." (Exhibit 10)

In cross-examination with respect to the document entitled "Assault and Earlier Incidents" (Exhibit 11) Mr. Le Marquand was asked if the document was entirely created on his own volition. The witness testified that the second part of the document entitled "Other Behaviour Concerns" was not crafted at his own volition, but at the request of a superintendent. When asked if he had discussed the hallway incident with the Member, Mr. Lemarquand said that he had no opportunity to speak with her. When questioned if the reason he did not speak with the Member was because he had been requested not to do so by a board official (as outlined in Exhibit 11), the witness said he had not had the opportunity to speak about it because the Member was under suspension and not permitted in the school.

When questioned with respect to Particular #6 involving the Member and Ms. R. Georgis, the witness stated that the situation did not warrant any kind of formal write-up. When questioned regarding Particular #8, the incident with the student, he testified that he had not witnessed the incident but that his recording of it was accurate as to what had been

reported to him by the vice-principal, Carmel Murphy. With respect to the Particular #7, the contact in the hallway between the ERW and the Member, the witness testified that he believed that the ERW was telling about the incident from her perspective to the best of her ability, and that he remembered that she was upset.

In re-examination when asked about his documentation “Other Behaviour Concerns” and why he had been asked to outline them, Mr. Le Marquand stated: “I think ...the agenda was to discredit the teacher.”

Credibility of Witnesses

Carmel Murphy-Brogly

Carmel Murphy-Brogly was a newly appointed vice-principal at St. Martin Secondary School. This was her first assignment as a vice-principal. By her own admission Ms. Murphy-Brogly stated that she had little direct recollection of the particulars that formed part of the hearing. In most instances where she gave testimony she relied on the information given to her by third parties. Ms. Murphy-Brogly kept no notes of any of the incidents reported to her. When asked subsequently by investigators she had to “refresh” her memories. All of her reports to the principal were made orally and she assumed that the principal would be keeping notes on the incidents. Ms. Murphy-Brogly was asked to try to “recall as best you can.” “I didn’t keep notes on a lot of incidents with Miss Clark.” “Just as I’m thinking about the number of things I dealt with her, things would start to come back because I had to think about it”. Ms Murphy-Brogly admitted to having “refreshed” her memory once contacted by the college investigators. She admitted to not filling out any incident reports at the time that the particulars were reported to her.

The testimony of Ms. Carmel Murphy-Brogly was unclear and lacked specificity. It was unsupported by any documentation produced by Ms. Murphy-Brogly. The descriptions of events under consideration were based on hearsay or third party evidence and were underpinned by a significant confusion about dates, places and persons involved. The Committee determined that Vice-principal Carmel Murphy-Brogly lacked credibility as a witness in the particulars stated in the case against the Member.

Romela Georgis

Romela Georgis was a newly appointed teacher at St. Martin Secondary School and was in the first months of teaching in this placement when the incident, Particular #6, occurred. In her description of the incident involving the Member, Ms. Georgis maintained that at different times the Member's action was both "rude" and "embarrassing." In general, Ms. Georgis was clear about what happened. At the same time she also was vague about the actual sequence of events. At times, the Member stepped into the classroom and took the papers from the recycling bin and in other descriptions of the event she "stood" in the doorway with her hands in her pockets. The Member retrieved the four pieces of the student's paper; these were handed to Ms. Georgis. Ms. Georgis taped them back together and upon receipt of an apology from the student they were returned to the student so that the assignment could be handed in to the Member. There was some confusion in the testimony as to when exactly during the lesson being given by Ms. Georgis that the interchange took place.

All of the descriptions seemed to be fairly accurate and no witness contested what actually happened. What was contentious was the thinking and psychological repercussion of the event. Ms. Georgis admitted to doing something that was pedagogically inappropriate given current standards of the profession. She admitted to feeling intimidated by the Member in general and by her questions about the torn assignment.

It would appear that Ms. Georgis' personal feelings and her level of confidence coloured her reaction to an exchange between two colleagues. What might have been an incident that would have sparked no comment in many instances became one that was filled with "threat". When Ms. Georgis reported the incident, perhaps as an opportunity for self-defence about her reaction to the student working on a paper for another teacher during her Math class, the principal dealt with it in a manner which he deemed appropriate. It appeared that the event had been forgotten by all, even Ms. Georgis, until she was contacted by an investigator at the Ontario College of Teachers. In summation, the description of the event as witnessed by Ms. Georgis appeared to be accurate and truthful. However, the assessment as to its implications and meaning resulted in highly subjective analysis by Ms. Georgis. The action of the principal seemed to confirm this assessment. The Committee felt that Ms. Georgis may have been credible in the recitation of facts but less so in a discussion of the meaning of the event.

Seamus Byrne

Seamus Byrne was a senior and long-serving teacher at St. Martin Secondary School. He was a witness to events of Particular #4, and an accusation of inappropriate driving in the school parking lot. In examination-in-chief and in cross-examination, Mr. Byrne was

adamant that at no time was there any real physical danger to Mary Louise Clarke as a result of the Member's driving. Mr. Byrne stated that his action in pulling the ERW back was purely instinctive, that he did not actually see who was driving, how fast the car was moving until it was well past, and that the car maintained the same rate of speed throughout. Mr. Byrne maintained his account that there was never any danger to persons in the parking lot by a vehicle being operated by the Member. The Committee found the testimony of Mr. Byrne to be credible and to demonstrate that Particular #4 had no foundation of accuracy.

Mary Louise Clarke

Mary Louise Clark (ERW) is an Educational Resource Worker at St. Martin Secondary School. She was directly involved with the events of Particular #3 (incident in hallway with special needs student), Particular #4 (incident in parking lot), and Particular #7 (alleged assault in the hallway). As such, the testimony of the ERW was essential to the charges brought against the Member. The incident with the special needs student was not documented and was never processed by the principal within the guidelines established by the school board. The version recounted by the ERW rested on interpretation of what transpired without any corroborative testimony by any other participant. The student was not called as a witness. The Member gave an entirely different account and assessment of the nature of the exchange in the hallway. There was no agreement about the exact words and tone of the language that was used. Nor was there agreement as to where the exchange took place, at the classroom door at the end of the hallway.

Accuracy is a very important part of witness credibility. With respect to Particular #3 (the parking lot), the testimony of the ERW was contradictory to the version of the events that

transpired as recounted by Seamus Byrne. Ms Clarke was vague about the speed of the vehicle but very specific about “being pulled back” by Mr. Byrne. That did not correspond to the testimony of Mr. Byrne who stated that he “pulled her forward”. The ERW also stated that the van accelerated and then stopped abruptly. This assertion was in direct conflict with Mr. Byrne’s testimony that the van maintained the same rate of speed and continued past them.

With respect to Particular #7 (alleged assault in hallway) the witness offered a verbal version of the events in the hallway that was at variance with the events as recorded in a videotape presented by College Counsel. The ERW could not have seen the Member approaching as the two corridors used by each of the persons involved were at a ninety degree angle to each other. Neither could the Member have seen the ERW approaching. To the Committee, it would appear to have been a pedestrian accident or “contact” typical of crowded passageways. There was no evidence of intent. In fact the contact was seamless and appeared not to have affected the Member. And that was perhaps the problem. The ERW expected an apology and did not receive one. The aftermath of the contact perhaps coloured the entire interpretation of the event. The issue for the Committee to determine was “intent” and the Committee could see none.

In the opinion of the Committee, the testimony of Mary Louise Clark was not credible in each of the particulars.

Ian Le Marquand

Ian Le Marquand was the principal at St. Martin Secondary School during the period in which the particulars transpired. He is presently retired from the Dufferin-Peel Catholic

Secondary School Board after more than thirty years in education of which twenty were in varying positions of responsibility. The Committee found him to be a credible witness in that he knew all of the other witnesses in his professional responsibility of leadership. He recognized the Member, both in her instructional capacity and her leadership involvement within the school, the board and her community. He also conducted a number of Teacher Performance Appraisals of the Member.

In Particular #6, Mr. Le Marquand stated that “the situation did not warrant any kind of formal write-up” and therefore, in his professional capacity as “lead teacher’ placed no overt concern on the incidents that transpired. In Mr. Le Marquand’s comments about a document containing “additional behaviours”, he maintained that the school board’s intention “was to discredit the teacher”.

Mr. Le Marquand gave clear, concise and consistent testimony as to the qualities of the Member and the incident with Romela Georgis. Mr. Le Marquand’s testimony appeared to the Committee to be compelling and credible.

Susan Mary Clark

Susan Mary Clark (The Member) was a teacher with thirty-four years of experience as a professional educator and as coach and community activist. She was a teacher at St. Martin Secondary School from 1991 to 2007. She still teaches with Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board. The Member had no memory of the incident in the parking lot, Particular #4. From her perspective nothing had occurred. It was never brought to her attention and only after a complaint was laid with the College of Teachers was she asked about it. The Member’s comment was that “I don’t speed in the parking

lot... and I'm always sure to drive safely and carefully.” The Member stated that she was not asked about the incident with the special needs student (Particular #3) at the time that it occurred, but maintained that she had only been concerned about the student who enjoyed her Science class having to miss it for recycling duties. Her first detailed involvement with the events of that particular occurred when a complaint was lodged at the College of Teachers.

This was the same situation with Particular #8 where the Member was alleged to have threatened a student with stepping on her foot if it was not moved. Again her only awareness of this was as a result of a complaint being filed with the College of Teachers. The Member stated that she does not use words such as those described in the complaint and uses a different form of colloquial speech. At any rate the Member maintained that she was responding to an administration directive to make sure that halls were clear of students.

The Member's version of the events of Particular #7 (hallway assault) were in keeping with the portrayal in the video. In fact she appeared to be the victim of the “bump” since she was walking on the correct side of the hallway and allowing for other persons to be turning the corner. She did admit that the ERW appeared to be surprised by the contact and angry but the Member decided not to escalate the situation in the presence of students. In the end, and again because it was never raised with her by the administration, the Member forgot about it, deeming it a minor event in the course of a busy day.

In Particular #6 (the torn paper) in retrieving an important assignment, the Member testified that she was trying to assist the student who was upset and to salvage the

situation. The Member maintained that she persuaded the student to apologize for her inappropriate classroom behaviour in the Math class and that in fact it was Ms. Georgis who reached into the recycling box and held up the torn bits. At that point the Member returned to her class. The Member said that the principal asked her about the incident when they were discussing other school matters. This was corroborated by the principal when he testified that he investigated the incident but did not feel that it warranted any formal notation in either the Member's or Ms. Georgis' files. The Member also testified that nothing further was said until the complaint was made to the College.

The Committee found that the testimony of the Member was measured and calm and consistent with other evidence. It refuted other testimony in a very specific manner, one that was plausible and credible.

The Exhibits

The following exhibits were entered into evidence:

Exhibit No.

1. Notice of Hearing: Ontario College of Teachers and Susan Mary Clark, February 29, 2008
2. Registered Member Information of Susan Mary Clark
3. Memo to File from Ontario College of Teachers' investigator, Liisa Ferris, dated September 13, 2007
4. Letter from Romela Georgis to Liisa Ferris, October 8, 2007
5. Halton Healthcare Services Halton District Hospital Emergency Record dated, May 6, 2006 re: Mary Clark
6. CD-Rom surveillance tape of hallway of St. Martin Secondary School, May 3, 2006
7. Letter of Complaint of Mary Louise Clarke to Ontario College of Teachers re: Susan Mary Clark, May 16, 2006

8. Dufferin Peel Catholic District School Board General Administrative Procedure (GAP) #305.00 - procedure for dealing with an incident of Discrimination or Harassment
9. Teacher Performance Appraisal Summative Report, Susan Mary Clark, November 15, 2005
10. Teacher Performance Appraisal Summative Report, Susan Mary Clark, April 21, 2006
11. Memo of May 3, 2006 prepared by Ian Le Marquand re Mary Louise Clarke & Sue Clark

An additional two documents were given to the committee for information purpose only, but not entered as exhibits.

- Workplace conduct complaint of Mary Louise Clarke, May 4, 2006
- Witness statement by Mary Louise Clarke to Peel Regional Police, May 5, 2006

Assessing the Evidence

Exhibits #3 and #4 related to Particular #6 where it was alleged that the Member spoke to a teacher, Romela Georgis, in an unprofessional manner with respect to that teacher tearing up a student's assignment. The Committee determined that it was evident from both the letter written by Ms. Georgis and the memo from the College investigator, that the teacher, while initially feeling uncomfortable with the incident, did not view the matter as 'serious'. In fact Ms. Georgis had to be reminded of the incident and was unsure as to the sequence of events, what the Member had said, and when in the school year the incident had occurred. The Committee did not find that this evidence was compelling proof that the Member had acted unprofessionally. The principal, Ian Le Marquand did not make detailed notes about the incident. He did not speak to the Member about the event at the time.

Exhibits #5, #6, and #7 related to Particular #7 where it was alleged that the Member assaulted Mary Louise Clarke, an educational resource worker (ERW). Exhibit #6 was a video recording taken from the security camera at St. Martin Secondary School and showed the contact between the Member and the ERW in a hallway on May 3, 2006. The Committee had the opportunity to view the incident from two hallway views. It was evident from the video that neither person could see the other coming their way until they each turned the corner. It was also evident that the Member made a right turn into the hallway and kept to her right. Generally it is customary to keep to the right when walking and driving. The ERW was making a left turn and kept to her left and cut the corner as if to make a short-cut. Under these circumstances an accidental collision may have been unavoidable, and the Committee could see no deliberate movement on the Member's part to intentionally harm the ERW.

In her complaint to the Ontario College of Teachers, (Exhibit #7) the ERW indicated that she abruptly stopped when she saw the Member moving toward her and that the Member stepped into her space and deliberately elbowed her in the right breast. Upon viewing the video, the Committee could see no evidence that the ERW had stopped before the collision occurred. In fact it was impossible for the ERW to actually see the Member before she turned the corner. The video did show that the ERW stopped after the collision and looked back at the Member who kept on walking after the contact was made. The video showed that there had indeed been physical contact between the two persons, but the evidence was neither clear nor compelling that the contact was deliberate on the part of the Member. Nor was there any way to assess via the video the level of impact. Certainly there was not evident "jolting" of any person.

Exhibit #5, (Hospital Emergency Record), did not assist the Committee in determining the significance and extent of the injuries caused by the contact. It would have been helpful to have the writer of the report present so that a fuller understanding may have been made through an examination.

Exhibit #11 is a memo from the school principal, Mr. Ian Le Marquand. The memo detailed the incident in Particular #7 as reported to him by the ERW immediately after the incident occurred, and the steps taken by the principal following the report. The ERW reported that the Member had made no effort to avoid a collision but had altered her course in such a way as to hit the ERW on the right breast with her (the Member's) right shoulder. The Committee found this evidence to be contradictory to the evidence in Exhibits #5 and #7 where the ERW alleged that the Member used her elbow.

Additionally the video directly refutes this assertion of intentional contact as the ERW could not have seen the Member to determine if there was any absence of evading movement. Assuming that the Member did indeed hit the ERW on the right breast with the Member's right shoulder, this would indicate that the ERW was actually squeezing herself right against the corner of the intersection. The ERW placed herself in a position of inevitable accidental contact.

The memo also included another incident with respect to the Member and the ERW and outlined in Particular #3 where it was alleged that the Member accelerated her van toward the ERW in the parking lot of the school. This had been reported by the ERW to the vice-principal, Carmel Murphy who then reported the incident to the principal. There was

nothing further indicated about what steps, if any, the principal had taken with respect to this incident.

The document also contained additional details with respect to Particular #3, involving Ms. Georgis and the incident with the torn student assignment and Particular #8 where it was alleged that the Member threatened to step on a student's leg. Both incidents were reported to the principal, who addressed Particular # 3 with the Member. There is no indication that there was any follow-up with Particular #8. In examining this exhibit, the Committee concluded that with respect to Particular #3, the principal addressed the incident appropriately and that the matter should not have any bearing, particularly in light of Exhibits #3 and #4, where Ms. Georgis indicated that she did not view the matter as particularly serious, and believed that it was over and forgotten. With respect to Particular #8, there was no additional information or corroborating evidence provided in the form of notes submitted by the vice-principal to whom the alleged incident had been reported, and no action was taken on the part of the principal. The Committee considered that with the lack of evidence, it would be difficult to make a finding of professional misconduct with respect to Particular #8.

Exhibit #11 needs further examination. This was described as a "rolling" document by College Counsel. The panel accepted that it was more of an "evolving" document. This fine point was made since it was determined that the report by Principal Le Marquand was not completed on the same day but rather as a result of a request by the school superintendent to detail "other behaviours". These "behaviours", some undocumented and others not acted upon in any dialogue with the Member, do not add to an

understanding of the initial purpose of the principal's report. Rather, under cross-examination by Counsel for the Member, Principal Le Marquand stated that the second half of the document, which was produced at the request of the superintendent and which is based on memory of incidents occurring some time before those events that were the original subject of the document, was produced in order to "discredit" the Member. In the light of this statement the panel found that Exhibit#11 became suspect in part and perhaps in whole.

Exhibits #9 and #10 were the Member's Teacher Performance Appraisals conducted by the principal. The Committee did give some weight to these, and recognized that the Member had received an evaluation of 'Exemplary' on both reports. The principal also noted how well the Member worked with challenged students, how she had supported and mentored new teachers, and how she had worked co-operatively with her colleagues. The Committee believed that it was important to appreciate that the summary sense of the two appraisals was that they spoke to an entirely different pattern of behaviours and approaches to education by the Member than that described in evidence presented for Particulars #3, #4, #6, #7, and #8.

Exhibit #8 is useful. This describes and details the GAP process at the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board to be followed in developing cases such as the one under review before the Committee. It appeared that the board employees did not follow their own procedures in the development and resolution of issues described in the particulars before the Committee.

The Committee concluded that the only truly objective and helpful exhibit was the video showing, in real time, the incident of contact in the hallway.

Submissions by the College

College Counsel stated that the behaviour of the Member, Susan Mary Clark, was of such a character that it required discipline action before a panel of the Ontario College of Teachers. He argued that the incidents detailed before the panel were not trivial or overblown and constituted, together, professional misconduct. He further stated that the behaviours indicated that the Member was unable to maintain the standards of the profession and exercise good judgment in interactions with students and colleagues. The committee was asked to ascertain the truth of the allegations and the testimony of witnesses. He argued that together they revealed a pattern of unacceptable behaviour. The testimony of the principal was provided honestly and accurately and needed to be addressed. There was no “hidden agenda”.

Specifically College Counsel stated that in Particular #6 where a new teacher was confronted by Susan Clark, the Member showed poor judgment in the manner of the exchange. The testimony of Ms. Georgis was strong, credible and specific and needed to be accepted as a proper rendition of the event. On the balance of probability the conduct of the Member in approaching Ms. Georgis, although not intentional, reflected a lack of judgment and understanding of the standards of the profession and respect towards a colleague. As the senior colleague, the Member who should have handled it better, demonstrated unprofessional conduct.

In the submission about Particular #8, College Counsel made reference to the incident where the Member threatened to step on the foot of a student sitting in the hallway. Even though there was no hard evidence and no notes by the vice-principal, there were notes written by the principal based on an oral report. College Counsel stated that it appeared that the Member was reluctant to admit to her impolite exchange with the student and perhaps her communication was more colloquial than that reported by the Member. He further stated that given the nature of the exchange, the allegation of unprofessional conduct was not to be shrugged off.

College Counsel submitted that Particular #4, the incident in the parking lot, revealed that the Member, even though not demonstrating any intent to harm the ERW, gave context to the assertion that the Member exhibited reckless behaviour. This behaviour, taken in the whole, constituted unprofessional conduct.

Particular #3 addressed an exchange in the hallway between the Member and an ERW working with a special needs student who had been assigned to recycling duties. Counsel stated that the Member felt that the duties conflicted with the student's participation in her Science class and she contended that she had addressed the issue in an appropriate way, but the ERW testified that the exchange was heated and inappropriate in a public context. On the balance of probabilities, College Counsel argued that the Member was angry and not a reliable witness in regard to her comments and behaviour. In this case therefore, the behaviour was unprofessional.

College Counsel addressed Particular #7 which is referred to as "the assault in the hallway". He contended that this was an assault with a "question of degree". He

reminded the Committee that there was a video submitted into evidence which documented the “collision”. He stated that the ERW believed it to be an assault and reported the event to the police. She also sought medical attention. She took time off work as a result of her injury and sought W.S.I.B. assistance while off work. He stated that these are all documented facts and that the issue was primarily one of care and of respect for a colleague. He contended that the Member did not make any effort to connect with the ERW to determine if there was any effect as a result of the collision and even though the ERW called out as a response to the contact, there was no response from the Member. Counsel submitted that respect for colleagues and the maintenance of professional conduct is expected of teachers and that the Member failed to show these characteristics.

College Counsel asked the Committee to find that the Member acted unprofessionally and demonstrated the lack of judgment required by a teacher, in that all of the above incidents, taken together, demonstrated that the Member displayed unprofessional conduct and poor judgment and required some measure of discipline. There should be a finding, he contended, under Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(18) as to unprofessional conduct.

Submissions of the Member

Member’s Counsel expressed concerns about the entire process exercised against the Member and about the quality of the evidence itself. He maintained that there was no physical assault. The evidence of the vice-principal had no credibility as it was based on hearsay. He posed the question: Who in fact is the intimidator, Susan Clark or the

complainant, Mary Louise Clarke? He maintained that the entire matter before the Committee was a strange course of events where there was no evidence that was clear, cogent and credible, yet the Committee was asked to accept it on the balance of probability.

Member's Counsel questioned the conduct of the school board and stated that the sequence of events suggested a pattern of intimidation. The "assault" complaint (Particular #7) triggered a series of events. The Crown declined to pursue the case. A peace bond was used as device to allow the Member and the complainant to enter the same building. The board of education rejected the assault complaint. There is no basis for an accusation of an intentional contact. The vice-principal does not like the Member. The superintendent instructed the principal to expand his documentation. Member's Counsel maintained that the basis for the entire process before the Committee was a false complaint, one without basis but one that will not be allowed to be withdrawn.

Member's Counsel submitted that this case should not have come before an Ontario College of Teacher's discipline panel because it did not have merit. The ERW, in her view, was denied "justice" in all of the previous venues open to her and finally the last resort was the Ontario College of Teachers.

Member's Counsel stated that in Particular #3 (Recycling incident) there was no evidence of any unprofessional conduct and that this was a case of what may have been said. In this instance, he submitted that the Committee must accept the testimony of the Member who had proven herself credible and at the same time a professional teacher.

With respect to Particular #6 (Georgis) Member's Counsel submitted that the exchange about tearing up a student's assignment at the hands of another teacher was based on the fact that the teacher had done something wrong and perhaps regretted that behaviour. He suggested that the Member merely went to look for the torn assignment so that it might be reconstructed, as any responsible teacher might have done. He maintained that this was not a serious case and did not merit pursuit. In addition, he stated that the fact that there was no written report on the incident indicated that it was not a serious incident in the first place.

Particular #4 refers to an incident in the school parking lot where the Member is alleged to have been driving quickly with the apparent intention of intimidating the ERW. Member's Counsel stated that Seamus Byrne, testifying on behalf of the College, did not agree that the vehicle was speeding or that there was any obvious intent of intimidation. In fact, argued Member's Counsel, there was no agreement that the vehicle was anywhere near the ERW and that Mr. Byrne did not agree that there was any danger at all. Counsel maintained that therefore, the allegation was clearly not proven.

Particular #8 refers to the incident in the hallway and the alleged threat to a student to step on her foot. Member's Counsel submitted that in this case there was no evidence of any kind because there was no first hand account nor any witness who could corroborate the exchange. Therefore, he submitted that it was purely an instance of hearsay and should be discounted, always keeping mind that the Member had established herself as a credible witness.

Particular #7 refers to an incident of alleged physical assault. Member's Counsel acknowledged that the Member and the ERW did bump into each other in a crowded school hallway but there was clearly no evidence of intention, as demonstrated in the videotape, because neither person could see the other. Further, he argued that the police investigations attested to the fact of absence of intention. The principal declined to pursue the matter as did the school board, but the ERW, having run out of legal options within her community and the school, was determined and reported the incident to the Ontario College of Teachers.

Member's Counsel stated that it was at this time that the school board's evidence was "strengthened" by the inclusion of events and incidents that were designed to undermine the position of the Member. He further stated that the principal's report became a "rolling" document with additional "behaviours" added to the original draft at the instigation of the superintendent. All of this, Counsel maintained, indicated a "discrimination" undertone on behalf of the school board.

Counsel encouraged the Committee to review the videotape of the assault incident and assess it once again. The evidence of Mr. Byrne should be assessed. The recycling incident needed to be assessed for credibility. The purpose behind the evidence of the vice-principal needed to be evaluated. The evidence of the principal, as well as his written documents, should be reviewed and seriously weighed. At that point, he maintained, the issue of credibility would be made clear.

In his submission, Member's Counsel asked the Committee to consider that the Member is an exemplary teacher. Her Teacher Performance Appraisals attest to that fact. She has

been and continues to be a valued staff member, one who is highly regarded. She acts as a mentor and is an excellent coach. She is an entirely professional teacher, in her place of teaching and within her community. The credibility of the Member was established by her actions and her performance, in the distant past and in the recent past. The motivations of others are of greater concern. The motivation of the school board certainly needs to be considered.

In summation, Member's Counsel made the following points: Particular # 3 should be rejected as a particular as there was no credible evidence. Particular # 4 was underpinned by conflicting evidence by persons who were there at the time. Particular #5, by agreement of all, is to be omitted. Particular #6 regarding the tearing up of a student assignment and the ensuing exchange between teachers is to be deemed as trivial. It was not worthy of pursuit as initially decided by the principal. There was no supporting independent evidence and was only resurrected as an additional behaviour on the instruction of the superintendent. Particular #7, the alleged assault in the hallway, resulted in a charge being laid, but was not pursued by the Crown. The video speaks for itself. Particular #8, the threat to step on a student, had no evidence to support a charge of unprofessional behaviour or that of lack of judgment. No notes were kept and no witness was brought forward except the vice-principal who passed on hearsay.

Member's Counsel submitted that the Member was a credible witness. She is a professional teacher and had proven to be so in her years of service. Her performance reviews were exemplary. He submitted that the school board had an alternate agenda and

pursued it. The case against the member was based on “a house of cards” and it was incumbent upon the Committee to acquit the Member on all counts.

DECISION

The College bears the onus of proving the allegations in accordance with the civil standard of proof, being the balance of probabilities using clear, cogent and convincing evidence.

Having considered the evidence and onus and standard of proof, the Committee finds the College has not proven the allegations of professional misconduct or incompetence and accordingly the allegations in the *Notice of Hearing* dated February 29, 2008 are dismissed.

REASONS FOR DECISION

The particulars that were presented as the underpinnings of the allegations in this case are all of varying degrees of insufficient credibility and in fact some are entirely incredible. Only Particular #6, the torn assignment incident, warrants both a review of versions and reference to the standards of the profession. This will be addressed later in this section of the decision.

Particular #8, an accusation of student abuse by threatening to step on a foot, is shrouded in hearsay and no corroborative proof was presented. There were no first hand notes by the vice-principal. No witness was produced for examination or cross-examination. The principal’s notes were based on third party verbal reports. The primary conveyor of information about the alleged incident, the vice-principal, admitted to having personal and professional interactions with the Member that were contentious. The testimony as it

was presented and then reviewed in detail proved to be contradictory. In measuring the evidence and testimony and applying yardsticks of probability and credibility the Committee came to the conclusion that no finding of unprofessional conduct could be made.

The allegation in Particular #4, the incident in the parking lot, was based on contradictory evidence and in fact the only independent witness maintained that he could not support any of the allegations of danger and threat to the ERW. There is no reasonable basis for believing that there was any intention to harm anyone in the parking lot, or that there was any dangerous or inappropriate behaviour on the part of the Member.

Particular #3 refers to the incident with the student assigned to a recycling duty and once again there is a credibility and hearsay issue in determining if there was a basis for a finding of unprofessional conduct. There were no witnesses. There was no written first hand observation. In fact there was no clear agreement about the degree of negative effect, if any, on the student who was a participant in the alleged incident. In this instance there can be no finding of unprofessional conduct.

Particular #7 details an alleged assault in the hallway. The testimony, as provided by the ERW, proved to be contradictory and changing under examination and cross-examination. The video tape which showed the scene and the events in varying views must be taken as the credible evidence in this instance. Multiple viewing of the video firmly demonstrated what really happened in that crowded hallway. The contact between the ERW and the Member was entirely accidental and was not motivated by any intention. In fact, the pattern of movement by the ERW would indicate that the bulk of

the blame for the unintentional contact resided with her. The ERW was on the wrong side of the hallway for safe passage to be possible by all who used it. As to the degree of physical consequence of the contact suffered by the ERW, regardless of the causation, there is no conclusive proof of any long term or serious injury resulting in this altercation. Since no medical professional was made available to testify about the medical examination and to its meaning, the Committee was dependent on a lay understanding of the medical report. The Committee concluded that there was no physical effect that would warrant an accusation of assault, as did the Crown. The school board also declined to further proceed within its own guidelines in the resolution of this incident. In this particular there can be no finding of professional misconduct.

Particular #6, the torn assignment incident, is the only accusation of professional misconduct that might warrant a serious philosophical and specific review. In this case there was a new teacher in the school that, perhaps unsure of herself professionally, made a mistake in how she dealt with a student and immediately regretted it. The Member, in defence of the student or perhaps in a case of well-intended mentoring, asked the new teacher about the torn assignment. Possibly the matter could have waited until a different time and place, but the torn assignment was in the recycling box and the student, according to the Member, was visibly upset and needed assistance by a teacher she could trust.

This type of interchange between teachers takes place every day in every school in the province and is usually resolved without benefit of administration intervention or for that matter by a regulatory body. If this was to be the case, then no teacher is safe from an accusation of professional misconduct. In this instance, calm reflection and the needs of

the student should have been the order of the day and serve as the operating model of professional dialogue in the resolution of a teachable moment. For a variety of reasons the exchange was reported to the principal. He made the decision that the issue was best left alone to be resolved by time and patience and perhaps appreciation of each of the participants' pedagogical skills and well earned experience in dealing with students. The issue only came to the College as an ancillary "other behaviour" report that was made at the instigation of a school superintendent. This was unfortunate. The Committee determines that in Particular #6, as fully detailed, there can be no finding of professional misconduct.

The particulars as presented in varying degrees of credibility and probability seem to be driven by personal motives, not appropriate to a review by a regulatory body. The Committee cannot and will not make any comment on motivations, but their existence, throughout the hearing at the College was palpable. A more realistic and dispassionate analysis of the nature of the particulars would have pre-empted the hearing in the first place.

If the Member is to be judged in any way, then perhaps it might be that given her senior status on staff, she might have taken more active steps to diffuse some of the incidents through a greater display of measured and professional civility. Often an apology goes a great distance in diffusing an incident of perceived slight. But the Committee recognizes that a school is a very busy place filled with excitement and expectation of superior behaviour. This is the crux of the issue. Had the various players in these incidents merely taken the time to speak with each other as members of a

community, none of this would have found itself before the Discipline Committee of the College of Teachers.

The Committee cannot find any basis for a finding of professional misconduct and therefore dismisses all the allegations.

Date: August 31, 2009

Mel Greif
Chair, Discipline Panel

Tammy Bush
Member, Discipline Panel

Rosemary Fontaine
Member, Discipline Panel