

ONTARIO COLLEGE OF TEACHERS

DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

REASONS FOR DECISIONS AND ORDERS

IN THE MATTER OF ONTARIO COLLEGE OF TEACHERS ACT, 1996, and the Regulation (Ontario Regulation 437/97) thereunder:

AND IN THE MATTER OF Discipline proceedings against Alexander Teliatnik.

The Discipline Committee held a hearing commencing on February 21, 2000,

BETWEEN:

ONTARIO COLLEGE OF TEACHERS

- and -

**ALEXANDER TELIATNIK
CERTIFICATE #119011**

PRESENT:

Members of the Panel

George Merrett (Chair)

Sterling Campbell

Diane Leblovic

The Honourable Lloyd Houlden, Independent Counsel to the Panel

L. Thomas Forbes, Q.C. McCarthy Tétrault, Counsel for the Prosecution, assisted by Jane Langford

John Judson, Lerner and Associates, Defence Counsel, assisted by Sarah A. Colman and Alison Otten

Alexander Teliatnik

Heard: February 21-24, 2000, April 3-5, 13 & 14, 2000, May 29-31, 2000, and June 7, 2000

A Notice of Hearing, dated August 30, 1999 was served on Alexander Teliatnik, requesting attendance before the Discipline Committee of the Ontario College of Teachers on September 27, 1999 to set a date for hearing and specifying the charges. The hearing date was set for February 21, 2000.

It is alleged that Alexander Teliatnik is guilty of professional misconduct in that:

- a) he failed to maintain the standards of the profession, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(5);
- b) he failed to supervise adequately a person under his professional supervision, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(11);
- c) he failed to comply with the *Education Act*, Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1990, c. E.2, and in particular 264 and 265 thereof, or the Regulations made under that Act and in particular Regulation 298, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(15);
- d) he committed an act or 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); and
- e) he engaged in conduct unbecoming a member, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(19).

It is also alleged that Alexander Teliatnik has displayed in his professional responsibilities a lack of knowledge, skill or judgement or disregard for the welfare of a student or students of a nature or extent that demonstrates that he is unfit to carry out

his professional responsibilities or that a certificate held under the Act should be made subject to terms, conditions, or limitations, and he is therefore incompetent as defined in section 30(3) of the Act.

The Notice of Hearing states that Alexander Teliatnik is a member of the Ontario College of Teachers and therefore comes under the jurisdiction of the Ontario College of Teachers (Exhibit #1).

Commencing on February 21, 2000, the Discipline Committee of the Ontario College of Teachers conducted a hearing into whether Alexander Teliatnik was guilty of professional misconduct and incompetence.

EVIDENCE:

Counsel for the Ontario College of Teachers referred to the charges set out in Exhibit #1, alleging that Alexander Teliatnik is guilty of professional misconduct in that his acts were contrary to the Professional Misconduct Regulation made under the *Ontario College of Teachers Act, 1996* and filed as Ontario Regulation 437/97 on December 4, 1997.

Particulars of the alleged misconduct are set out in Exhibit #1 and include:

1. Alexander Teliatnik (the “member”) is a member of the Ontario College of Teachers.

2. At all material times, the member was employed by the Toronto District School Board and its predecessor, the Toronto Board of Education, as a principal at [REDACTED] School, Toronto.
3. As the principal, the member had overall responsibility for the discipline of all students attending [REDACTED] School, and for the safety and well being of the students.
4. Between September, 1995 and May, 1998, [REDACTED] was a student at [REDACTED] School.
5. In the fall of 1997, [REDACTED] frequently engaged in inappropriate behaviour, including aggression towards other students, stealing items from other students, and using sexually explicit language.
6. Between September and December 1997, [REDACTED]'s classroom teacher reported eight incidents of serious misbehaviour by [REDACTED] to the vice-principal. The member was made aware of those reports on a regular basis.
7. In or about December 1997, school board staff working at the school reported to the member that [REDACTED]'s behaviour was a concern, and that he was frequently abusive to other students.
8. On or about 16 December 1997, at a meeting attended by the Member, the classroom teacher of [REDACTED] expressed her concerns as to [REDACTED]'s escalating misbehaviour.
9. Between December 1997 and February 1998, the classroom teacher of [REDACTED] continued to report to the responsible vice-principal or the school's social worker incidents of misbehaviour by [REDACTED], on a weekly basis. Those incidents included sexual harassment, bullying and sexual acting out. The member was made aware of these reports.

10. All, or substantially all, of the inappropriate behaviour by [] referred to herein was reported to the member at or shortly after, the time of the events.
11. Between September 1997 and April 1998, in the face of repeated and frequent reports of misbehaviour, including physical attacks on, and sexual touching of, other students, the member permitted [] to remain in his school and thus exposed the other students in his school to the risks of such abuse and other misbehaviour as outlined above.
12. Between January 1996 and May 1998, the member failed to appropriately recognize and respond to []'s inappropriate behaviour, including sexual behaviour.
13. Between January 1996 and May 1998, the member failed to recognize signs that [] may be the victim of abuse and failed to take adequate steps to respond to that possibility.
14. Between September 1997 and May 1998, the member failed to communicate to staff members, students and parents of students at his school, any information about what was being done to ensure the safety of the students in light of []'s activities.
15. Between September 1997 and May 1998, the member failed to act in a timely manner to protect the students in his care at []School by preventing [] from verbally threatening, physically harassing and sexually abusing those other students.
16. By his failure to prevent []'s activities as outlined above, the member created an unsafe environment for other students at his school, or permitted an unsafe environment to continue.

17. Between September 1997 and May 1998, the member failed to develop any plan, or an adequate plan, to deal with [REDACTED]'s behaviour and failed to provide any assistance to the students and families involved.

Counsel presented evidence that Alexander Teliatnik is a member of the Ontario College of Teachers (Exhibit #1). At all material times, Alexander Teliatnik was employed by the Toronto District School Board and its predecessor, the Toronto Board of Education, as a principal.

Witnesses who gave evidence included [REDACTED]- Teacher, Steve Bannerman - Vice-Principal, Vicki Kelman - Child Abuse Consultant, Helen Skippon - Social Worker Rayna Morris - Children's Aid Society Worker, [REDACTED] - Parent, [REDACTED] - Parent, Alexander Teliatnik - Member, and Olesia Choma, retired Supervisory Officer.

The panel also heard the expert testimony of Dr. Paul Begley, Centre for the Study of Values and Leadership, Educational Administrative Unit, OISE/University of Toronto.

In addition, the panel considered the submissions made by Counsel.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Between September 1997 and May 1998, student [REDACTED]'s behaviour toward other students was physically and sexually aggressive on a number of occasions. Teacher [REDACTED] instituted several strategies within the classroom to control [REDACTED]'s behaviour. She also consulted Helen Skippon, Social Worker and Vice-Principal Steve Bannerman, regarding [REDACTED]'s behaviour.

Various attempts at correction were made by the classroom teacher, the vice-principal and the school social worker. In addition, school personnel contacted the Children's Aid Society and it was arranged for the family pastor to provide behaviour management counselling to the parents.

[REDACTED], parent, communicated regularly to [REDACTED] her concerns about [REDACTED]'s inappropriate behaviour. Other parents had also complained to [REDACTED].

Steve Bannerman was in his first assignment as a vice-principal and was responsible for discipline in the primary division. Steve Bannerman had knowledge of many of [REDACTED]'s inappropriate behaviours.

At the Local School Team meeting of December 16, 1997, chaired by Alexander Teliatnik, [REDACTED] presented several concerns about [REDACTED]'s recurring aggressive behaviour. She also related a recent incident of inappropriate sexual behaviour.

Alexander Teliatnik was aware that [REDACTED] had been discussed at a Local School Team meeting in March of 1996 regarding inappropriate sexual play and aggressive

behaviour. Alexander Teliatnik was also made aware that [REDACTED] had participated in a program with other children for aggressive behaviour.

At the December 16, 1997 Local School Team meeting, strategies were put in place to assist with the improvement of [REDACTED]'s behaviour. [REDACTED] was satisfied with the recommendations but was dissatisfied that formal consequences for specific behaviours were not put in place.

[REDACTED] did not directly speak to Alexander Teliatnik about [REDACTED] between December 16, 1997 and May 1, 1998.

By the end of January, 1998 the focus of assistance to [REDACTED] was on involving Helen Skippon, the school social worker. Helen Skippon called the Children's Aid Society about inappropriate sexual behaviour and alleged punishment by [REDACTED]'s parents. Helen Skippon, Children's Aid Society social worker Rayna Morris, and [REDACTED]'s parents met and determined that the family pastor would provide counselling service with Helen Skippon providing ongoing assistance regarding school problems.

Steve Bannerman, as the administrator responsible for primary division discipline, believed appropriate assistance was being provided by school personnel and the Children's Aid Society and therefore, did not inform Alexander Teliatnik of all the incidents of [REDACTED]'s misbehaviour.

Although Alexander Teliatnik was aware of some of [REDACTED]'s misbehaviours from January 30 to April 28, 1998, he was not informed by [REDACTED], Helen Skippon or Steve Bannerman of

[]'s serious escalating behaviour in school until April 28, 1998 when [] was suspended for one day.

[] was given an in-school suspension, an out-of-school suspension and finally, expulsion from school, as the final steps of progressive discipline. Expulsion occurred in May 1998 after two of the parents, [] and [], had contacted Alexander Teliatnik and demanded that a meeting be held to address []'s behaviour.

Dr. Paul Begley testified that there were five key dimensions of practice in the profile of a principal:

- 1) Manager: The principal utilizes available resources to ensure the effective and efficient operation of the school.
- 2) Instructional Leader/Program Facilitator: The principal initiates and directs a growth oriented and collaborative change process which maximizes learning outcomes for students, staff and community.
- 3) School-Community Facilitator: The principal is aware of stakeholders and resources and utilizes these in achieving school goals.
- 4) Visionary: The principal, recognizing a broad range of environmental influences, is capable of perceiving a condition beyond that which is immediately apparent, and of employing that view to provide focus and direction to the activity occurring within the principal's sphere of influence.
- 5) Problem Solver: The principal, acknowledging the multi-dimensional and contingent nature of school leadership, engages in the generic human function of

identifying, interpreting, and solving problems encountered within the greater school community (Exhibit #18, pp. 12-23).

School Leadership in Canada (Exhibit #18, p. 6) states, "There is a very real potential for the mis-use of principal profiles as a tool of summative evaluation. Many principals involved in the validation of our profile have been quick to point this out. In our view, this is not an appropriate use for profiles. There are simply too many personal and contextual variables for which we cannot account. Informal, formative or growth-oriented performance appraisal applications may be acceptable uses. However, we cannot support the use of profiles for summative evaluation purposes. We acknowledge that there are those who do not agree with us."

REASONS:

The majority of the Committee (the "Majority") finds that Alexander Teliatnik's handling of the events in this case did not constitute professional misconduct or incompetence.

The Majority finds that Alexander Teliatnik's performance as a principal met the minimum standards of practice and accepts Defence Counsel's notion of "we are not...talking about standards of perfection. We will be talking about real people...", (Transcripts of Hearing, Vol. 2, p. 20). The Majority relied on the wording of section 30(3) of the Ontario College of Teachers Act to determine incompetency:

Incompetence:

The Discipline Committee may, after a hearing, find a member to be incompetent if, in its opinion, the member has displayed in his or her professional responsibilities a lack of knowledge, skill or judgement or disregard for the welfare of a student of a nature or extent that demonstrates that the member is unfit to continue to carry out his or her professional responsibilities or that a certificate held by the member under this Act should be made subject to terms, conditions or limitations.

The Majority believes incompetence to be a failure to perform up to standards in a number of situations over an extended period of time. The Majority does not believe Alexander Teliatnik's actions or inactions satisfy these criteria. The Majority believes that if Alexander Teliatnik had been informed at a much earlier date as to the seriousness of the problem, the Majority would likely have made a finding that he was incompetent. However, it was not until May 1, 1998 that he was informed of the extent of the problem and when he became aware, he immediately took action.

The Majority accepts Defence Counsel's argument that the degree of proof must be clear and convincing and based on cogent evidence. After carefully reviewing the evidence and submissions, the Majority finds this standard of proof has not been met for a finding of Professional Misconduct contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1 (5), (11) (15), (18) and (19).

In addition to relying on the individual and collective experience of the Majority in the education field, the Majority did consider the profiles developed by Dr. Begley in determining whether Alexander Teliatnik is guilty of professional misconduct and is incompetent. The Majority is of the opinion that Alexander Teliatnik undoubtedly met the minimum standard of performance.

The Majority acknowledges that parents of students in the class had a number of concerns about [REDACTED]'s behaviour and expressed them to [REDACTED], Steve Bannerman and ultimately to Alexander Teliatnik. The Majority has empathy for the parents and believes their concerns could have been better addressed by school personnel through better communication among staff. Unfortunately, Steve Bannerman was inexperienced and did not keep Alexander Teliatnik informed about all of the events transpiring with [REDACTED].

In view of the preceding comments, the Majority strongly recommends that Alexander Teliatnik be cognizant of the need to address the above shortcomings.

The Majority, on the basis of its findings, is satisfied that the case has not been made that Alexander Teliatnik is guilty of professional misconduct or is incompetent as charged. Accordingly, the charges are dismissed.

DECISIONS AND ORDERS:

The Majority finds Alexander Teliatnik not guilty of the allegations as set out in the Notice of Hearing. In these circumstances, we do not believe that this is an appropriate case for costs. Accordingly there shall be no order as to costs.

DATED AT TORONTO, THIS 20th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2000

BY ORDER OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

George Merrett, **Chair**

Sterling Campbell

MINORITY DECISION (DIANE LEBLOVIC)

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The minority of the Committee (the “Minority”) has read the decision of the Majority of the Committee (the “Majority”) and concurs in the findings of facts outlined in the Majority decision. However, the Minority find the following additional facts to be germane for the purposes of its conclusions in this matter:

1. Alexander Teliatnik, as principal of [REDACTED] School, had overall responsibility for the discipline and safety of the students in the primary division.
2. Alexander Teliatnik, as principal, assigned Steve Bannerman, an inexperienced vice-principal, the responsibility for discipline in the primary division and left it up to the discretion of the vice-principal in what circumstances he would report to him on issues.
3. [REDACTED], [REDACTED]’s teacher, was specifically directed [REDACTED] by Alexander Teliatnik to report to Steve Bannerman, the vice-principal, any continuing incidents of aggressive behaviour by [REDACTED] as a result of the Local School Team Meeting on December 16, 1997.
4. Alexander Teliatnik, as an experienced administrator, was familiar with Standard Procedure 54 which had definitions of sexual assault and other related behaviours and had been in place until revised on October 14, 1997. Standard Procedure 54 was then replaced by Standard Procedure B-23 which did not have those definitions.
5. Three binders were kept in the office for each of the divisions (primary, junior, intermediate) containing information regarding activities of students in each division which necessitated disciplinary action. Alexander Teliatnik testified that the purpose of the binders was “to refer to if we were dealing with a particular child so that we would know some of the background of the child”. Staff could also refer to

these binders to know what disciplinary actions were being taken regarding their students. Between September 1997 and April 1998, the primary division binder contained seventeen discipline reports on [REDACTED]'s aggressive behaviour towards other students including eight incidents related to offensive language and sexually abusive actions toward other children. Alexander Teliatnik did not refer to these binders with reference to [REDACTED] during the period from September 1997 to April 28, 1998.

6. Between March 2, 1998 and March 4, 1998, Alexander Teliatnik was told by the vice-principal, Steve Bannerman, that [REDACTED] was subjected to assaultive behaviours and threats to his personal safety by so-called "cousins" who were family friends. Alexander Teliatnik was also made aware that the Children's Aid Society was involved with [REDACTED].
7. Alexander Teliatnik received a verbal report from Vice-Principal Steve Bannerman, as well as a written behaviour report dated March 12, 1998, outlining the concerns of Mr. and Mrs. [REDACTED] regarding [REDACTED] grabbing their son's private parts as well as other inappropriate behaviours. The [REDACTED] also indicated that they wanted a safe environment for their son and that inappropriate behaviours had been "going on for a long time".

REASONS:

The Minority accepts Defence Counsel's argument that the degree of proof for a finding of professional misconduct or incompetence must be clear and convicting and based on cogent evidence. The Minority agrees with the Majority that Alexander Teliatnik's handling of the events in this case did not constitute incompetence. In reaching this conclusion, the Minority relied on the following wording of section 30(3) of the Ontario College of Teacher's Act to determine incompetence:

"The Discipline Committee may, after a hearing, find a member to be incompetent if, in its opinion, the member has displayed in his or her professional responsibilities a lack of knowledge, skill or judgment or disregard for the welfare of a student of a nature or extent that demonstrates that the member is unfit to continue to carry out his or her professional responsibilities or that a certificate held by the member under this Act should be made subject to terms, conditions or limitations".

In that regard, the Minority concurs with the Majority in their view that incompetence is a failure to perform up to the standards over an extended period of time and that Alexander Teliatnik's actions or inactions did not satisfy these criteria.

However, the Minority disagrees with the following statement made by the Majority of the Committee:

"The Majority believes that if Alexander Teliatnik had been informed at a much earlier date as to the seriousness of the

problem, the Majority would likely have made a finding that he was incompetent.”

Firstly, the Minority does not believe that even if Alexander Teliatnik had been informed earlier, that circumstance would have met the above definition of incompetence.

Secondly, based on all the evidence, the Minority has no reason to believe that, if Alexander Teliatnik had in fact been informed as to the seriousness of the problem earlier, he would not have reacted promptly as he did on May 1, 1998.

After carefully reviewing all evidence and submissions, the Minority finds that the standard of proof has been met for a finding of professional misconduct, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1 (5), (11), and (15), and the Education Act, Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1990 c. E.2 and in particular, 265 (a) and the Regulation made under that Act and in particular, Regulation 298, subsection 11(1) a and b, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(15). The Minority concurs with the Majority of the Committee that Alexander Teliatnik is not guilty of professional misconduct under Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1 (18) or (19).

The Minority notes that the Majority decision relied upon its own experience and the profiles presented by Dr. Begley in reaching its decision. While the Minority believes these reliances are appropriate, as the Minority also relied on her own experience, the Minority would also rely on the conclusions of Dr. Begley, who has extensive experience in developing principal profiles of standards and competencies as well as training and evaluating teaching professionals in leadership roles. In that regard, Dr. Begley

concluded that, based upon the principal profiles and his expertise, Alexander Teliatnik did not properly discharge his obligations as a principal under the Education Act.

In light of the unique nature of this case, the Minority believes it would be useful to provide some context for her conclusions.

The Majority decision found that, while Alexander Teliatnik met the minimum standards of performance, it noted that his actions did not meet community standards for principals. Implicit in this conclusion is that it is acceptable for a principal to perform below reasonable community expectations. The Minority cannot accept this position. The reasonable expectations of the community should be an essential element of the standard of a profession whose primary function is to serve the community. The Minority believes that Alexander Teliatnik did not meet the standards of the profession that the community would have expected of a principal in similar circumstances.

The Committee also had to consider the meaning of the words 'supervise adequately' in Regulation 437/97, subsection 1 (11).

It was submitted by defence counsel that 'adequate' should be interpreted to mean "proportionate, sufficient, barely sufficient". In the Minority view, this interpretation sets the bar too low. In the context of this regulation, the Minority believe it would be more appropriate to interpret the term "adequate" to mean "commensurate" or "what is required" in the particular circumstances.

In applying these interpretations to the applicable Regulations noted above, and to the facts in this case, the Minority believes Alexander Teliatnik did not meet the standards by reason of his failure to provide proactive leadership in the areas of effective communication, timely issue resolution and supervision of the vice-principal. The Minority believes that it would be reasonable to have expected the member to take a more proactive stance in all of the areas given the seriousness and sensitive nature of the events and the acknowledged inexperience of his vice-principal.

Alexander Teliatnik's lack of knowledge of specific events does not constitute an acceptable defence to the charges, rather it evidences a delegation of authority and a chain of reporting and communication which was clearly inadequate and inappropriate in the circumstances.

In addition, Alexander Teliatnik did not adequately utilize, in a timely manner, the processes and resources that were put in place by himself, his staff and the school system, which could have given him clues as to the seriousness of [REDACTED]'s behaviour (i.e., the teachers' behaviour log regarding [REDACTED], the discipline binder and the child abuse consultant).

The Minority is persuaded by the evidence given by Dr. Begley around timing of Alexander Teliatnik's reaction and Vicki Kelman's testimony regarding Standard Procedure 54 that all of these incidents between March 2, 1998 and March 12, 1998 noted in paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7 above under "Findings of Fact" should have heightened Alexander Teliatnik's awareness that he had a very serious problem on his hands

concerning [REDACTED] and the safety of other students. This information should have prompted him to immediately talk with Helen Skippon (social worker), [REDACTED] (teacher), Steve Bannerman (vice-principal), Vicki Kelman (child abuse consultant), and Olesia Choma (Superintendent) regarding [REDACTED] and to have [REDACTED] removed from the school immediately. By not recognizing the seriousness of the problem in early March, Alexander Teliatnik failed in his duties as a principal to maintain proper order and discipline at [REDACTED] and to organize and manage the school.

The Minority is of the view that Alexander Teliatnik should have been proactive and vigilant in his supervision of his inexperienced vice-principal, in particular, by monitoring his handling of the matter and by asking for regular updates concerning [REDACTED]. Given the inexperience of the vice-principal, it would have been reasonable to expect the member to establish parameters which would dictate the circumstances in which the vice-principal would report to him. The Minority also believes that a much more timely intervention by Alexander Teliatnik would have resulted in immediate and appropriate help for [REDACTED] whose repeated aggressive behaviour, sexual play and offensive language was unacceptable and highly unusual for an [REDACTED]. The Minority believes that a more timely intervention by Alexander Teliatnik would have protected and minimized the effect that these repeated episodes had on the young victims, their classmates, parents and staff.

DECISIONS AND ORDERS:

The Minority finds Alexander Teliatnik guilty of professional misconduct in that:

1. he failed to maintain the standards of the profession, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(5);
2. he failed to supervise adequately a person under his professional supervision, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(11);
3. he failed to comply with the Education Act, Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1990, c. E.2, specifically subsections (a) and (b) of section 265 “Duties of Principal” and subsections 11(1) a and b of Regulation 298 under the Act, “Duties of Principals”, contrary to Ontario Regulation 437/97, subsection 1(15).

As a consequence, the Minority would order as follows:

- (i) The member be reprimanded by the Committee and that the facts of the reprimand be recorded on the Register for twelve months from the date of this decision.
- (ii) The imposition of this penalty in clause (i) be postponed for twelve months on condition that Alexander Teliatnik undertake the following remedial activities during that period. The Minority recommends that:
 - 1) Commencing immediately, the member will undertake professional development approved by the Registrar which will address the following areas:
 - a) proactive anticipatory management and leadership
 - b) timely preventative issue resolution, and
 - c) effective communication in his role as principal.
 - 2) Upon the conclusion of Alexander Teliatnik’s remediation, he will prepare a report for the Registrar demonstrating what he has been involved in and

what he has learned. This report shall be signed by his supervisor. Upon receipt of the report satisfying the Registrar, the penalty will be removed.

- (iii) If Alexander Teliatnik satisfies the undertaking in clause (ii), the penalty in clause (i) would not be imposed.

The Minority strongly recommends that during the twelve month period, the Superintendent responsible for Alexander Teliatnik closely supervise him and, in particular, the professional development activities referred to above.

The Minority concurs that this is not an appropriate case for costs. Accordingly, there shall be no order as to costs.

Pursuant to section 30 (5) (iii) of the Ontario College of Teachers Act, the Minority orders that the findings of this hearing, as well as the name of the member, be published in the official publication of the Ontario College of Teachers and in any other manner or medium that the Minority considers appropriate in the particular case. The student's names will be identified by the use of two initials only.

**DATED AT TORONTO, THIS 20th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2000
BY ORDER OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE**

Diane Leblovic