

IN THE MATTER OF: *The Registered Teachers Act, 2015*
and Lisette T. Denis, registered teacher certificate # [REDACTED]

**DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE FOR THE
SASKATCHEWAN PROFESSIONAL TEACHERS REGULATORY BOARD**

Counsel: Roger Lepage and Romain Baudemont
for the Professional Conduct Committee

Jessie Buydens
for Lisette T. Denis

Hearing Date and Location: March 23 and March 24, 2017
Regina, Saskatchewan

INTRODUCTION

1. By a Notice of Hearing and Formal Complaint dated October 14, 2016, it was alleged that Lisette Denis did on or about December of 2015 engage in professional misconduct as follows:

While a registered teacher for the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] operating the school called
[REDACTED] in [REDACTED]
Saskatchewan, you purchased two Helly Hansen jackets from
Student A. At the relevant time you should reasonably have
suspected that the student may be involved in selling stolen
products. Taking into account the context of your purchase of the
two Helly Hansen for \$175 and the fact that you asked the student
to keep this secret would have led a reasonable professional to not
become involved in the said purchases. You received a personal
benefit from these transactions.

While a registered teacher for [REDACTED] operating the school called
[REDACTED] you failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries
with Student A. This contributed to you becoming involved in the
purchase of two Helly Hansen jackets from him. You received a
personal benefit from these transactions. You should have refused
to proceed with the transactions.

There was no objection to the composition of the Discipline Committee.

FACTS

2. The basic facts are not in dispute. Ms. Denis, a registered teacher, started employment at [REDACTED] in February, 2015. The school takes a small number of high risk youth and provides both vocational and academic training. A very high percentage of the students have criminal records, addiction issues, or gang relationships. They have not succeeded in the traditional school environment.
3. While a teacher at the school, Ms. Denis admits to buying two jackets from Student A. It is the context of the purchase that will determine if it was professional misconduct.

EVIDENCE

Keith Jorgenson

4. Mr. Jorgenson was the founder of [REDACTED] and had the joint role of teacher and administrator. The only other staff member in 2015 was Ms. Denis. Because of the small staff, both were required to fill numerous roles at the school.
5. In 2015, the school had approximately 14 students. It provided work experience in [REDACTED] and adult education classes. There was personal contact between the instructors, the [REDACTED] and the students that may not occur in a traditional classroom setting. For example, it was common for teachers to facilitate attendance by picking students up in the morning or taking them home at night. Some of these arrangements were made through conversations on social media such as Facebook.
6. In late 2015 Mr. Jorgenson began hearing rumors that Ms. Denis was buying stolen items from Student A. Mr. Jorgenson also gave evidence that it was well known in the school that Student A was engaged in shoplifting. Mr. Jorgenson's evidence was not objected to and was not considered hearsay because it was not intended to prove that Student A was

actually shoplifting so much as Student A's rumors of shoplifting was a topic of conversation at the school. The implication is that everyone at the school was aware of the rumors whether true or not.

7. The school also has limited resources so Mr. Jorgenson allowed Student A to use his personal computer to complete assignments. In December of 2015, Mr. Jorgenson opened his computer to find Student A's Facebook page and a conversation that Student A had online with the Ms. Denis on December 3, 2015 as follows:

Denis: U up

Student A: u want to buy a helly hansen jacket.

Denis: Mens or ladies what size What colour.

Student A: ladies and lx and blue.

Denis: How much.

8. For some unexplained reason, Mr. Jorgenson did not record the next part of the conversation, but it was put in evidence by the defence. It continues as follows:

Student A: its worth 200.

Denis: Who is selling.

Student A: and she wants 100 bucks

Denis: Who

What colour blue

Student A: My aunty whos stay here.

Denis: [REDACTED] sister. Any word about those kids? And

9. On December 7, 2015 the following Facebook conversation occurred:

Denis: Hwy

Student A: Wry now

Denis: Here

Student A: Hey she got you them jackets for [REDACTED]

Student A: If u give her 200 she well throw inn another nice jacket its worth 125.

Denis: What sizes are all of them

Student A: Xg, Lg, [REDACTED] size.

Denis: Send me a picture of each of them

And [REDACTED] wants me to tell u she is not fat.

Student A: They all lg. The last one is a men's

Denis: The mens is it thinker or summer coat

Student A: Thicker. They all thick.

Denis: Okay 175

Student A: 180

Denis: 176...lol

Student A: 177

Denis: Ok 176.50.

10. Mr. Jorgenson interpreted this conversation to mean that Student A was "boosting". The term is slang for contract theft. It is essentially placing an order for an item and having another person steal it and sell it at significantly less than the retail price.
11. Mr. Jorgenson began an investigation by speaking with Student A. He picked Student A up in his car and they drove around. He said that Student A admitted that he had sold stolen jackets to Ms. Denis and that she had asked him to keep it secret. He said that the jackets were new Helly Hansen jackets with tags on.
12. Mr. Jorgenson also related a second conversation with Student A this time in the presence of board member Jennifer Amy, and a staff member [REDACTED] [REDACTED] named Carmen Dyck. Student A again admitted that stolen jackets were sold to Ms. Denis.
13. Mr. Jorgenson also expressed the view that Ms. Denis was well aware of Student A's shoplifting. He recalled one occasion when Student A came in with a new purse. He recalls Ms. Denis saying to Student A "you little shit you've been shoplifting again".

14. Mr. Jorgenson also recalls Student A receiving a shopping list from his mother. Jorgenson's interpretation was that Student A was expected to steal the items. Whether this was the intent or not, there was a discussion as to the impropriety of such conduct in Ms. Denis's presence.
15. Mr. Jorgenson called a meeting to discuss the allegations with Ms. Denis and a board member, Ms. Amy. Ms. Denis did not attend the meeting so they telephoned her. Mr. Jorgenson states that she was confrontational and quickly agreed to resign. His interpretation of the phone call was that she was aware of the allegations prior to the call and that the only source of this information would be Student A. He also interpreted her quick resignation as an admission of guilt.
16. Mr. Jorgenson also introduced evidence of another online conversation between Student A and Ms. Denis that probably occurred in late 2016, just prior to the first scheduled hearing before the Discipline Committee. Mr. Jorgenson received this information from Student A's brother, [REDACTED] who is also a witness at this hearing. The back-story is that [REDACTED] had been residing in Mr. Jorgenson's household for several years. [REDACTED] also paid visits to his grandmother's residence where Student A was residing. On one occasion, he used his grandmother's Samsung tablet and found more conversation between Student A and Ms. Denis as follows:

Denis: Well it's a subpoena so u have to attend. See what he has to say and keep in mind never say you stole jackets.

Student A: So I have to go to Regina on December 6.

Denis: Yes. Prob just for the morning.

Student A: Oh my Lord

Denis: And just stick to the truth. The jackets were your sisters and not even helly hansen. That is Keith giving them a brand name.

Student A: Yes

Denis: Don't worry I will be there and just make keith look like an idiot.

Student A: Okay then.

Denis: And you can admit you stole makeup But never anything bigger And that keith started the rumor you were stealing a list for your mom's christmas gifts. I got a job in [REDACTED] Academic resources.

Student A: OMG. That's great. And I got kick out of school.

Denis: What!!! so I will go back tomorrow.

Student A: Take me with you go drop me off at mr. [REDACTED]'s house.

Denis: What about the kids u have.

Student A: There mother is there.

Denis: What happened to [REDACTED]

Student A: I couldn't do any more I found how he was doing meth and he went psycho on me. He went crazy
Out***

Denis: Well dont go back to [REDACTED] Whay about school at [REDACTED] We will have to do lunch the 26th. Are you still planning to go and call keith a liar.

Student A: I look in the website nothing really interested me and I wicked confused about my career. Yes I'm still wanting to go.

Denis: Stick around stoon until after that. I need you to stand up and say that stuff was not stolen And that it was for my daughters not me.

Student A: Oh, okay I might move to [REDACTED] lol

Denis: U don't need to. Just ur name and info But don't need number.
Did you see article in newspaper
I got hauled into principals office.
But it went well and he supports me. I just hope they don't revoke my teacher's certificate as then I would.
Ya It mentioned you.
And that you were going to speak in my defense at the hearing.and
I was embarrassed to be placed in the paper but it was a pretty g
had ur support and the allegations were false
But it keeps saying two helly hanson jackets.

I don't even think they were both that.

So we will talk about it somemore

I think we can win

Student A: I know right fucking dumb shit (unintelligible)

Denis: He thinks we did something so wrong.

wtf

He is so destructive

I hope he cant get to your fb page.

Student A: I know he is just a simple guy who should be in a mental disorder home or something and go.

Denis: I think we should meet before you go Or we should go together.

I am bringing [REDACTED] with me.

Student A: We should go together.

Denis: Sure I will come up from [REDACTED] monday.

And we will go and spend the night in regina.

And do this thing tuesday then see if we need to get back tuesday.

But we need to prove that keith felt threatened by our friendship and he wanted to be in control of everyone.

He had ur brother under his thumb and did not like that I was helping you move away from him and gain done independence.

Student A: Sounds like a pla

Were you in [REDACTED] today.

Denis: Okay we will for sure have to hook up the week before so I know where to pick you up.

No im home for the weekend.

Student A: Yah I was pretty sure you were home today.

I went to [REDACTED] today to pick up a (illegible). My address is [REDACTED].

17. As stated, [REDACTED] is Student A's brother and is responsible for finding the December 2016 conversation on his grandmother's Samsung tablet while attending her residence. His evidence confirms the circumstances and made the evidence admissible.

Student A

18. Student A is 20 years old. He obviously had great respect for Ms. Denis. He gave her significant credit for mentoring him and for helping him graduate with a diploma. In his evidence, he was obviously very reluctant to incriminate Ms. Denis.
19. His evidence was that Ms. Denis did not ask him to boost a jacket. His evidence appears to be corroborated by the Facebook conversation in which he approached her to sell an existing jacket for his aunt. Student A said his aunt was addicted to drugs and needed to sell the jacket to finance her addiction. He states that he was not initially aware the jackets were stolen but later confirmed that they were stolen with his aunt. Following the first Facebook communication outlined above, Student A made arrangements to attend Ms. Denis's house. He states that he took 4 jackets to Ms. Denis's house. She bought 2 of the jackets for \$175.00 cash. Student A said that some of the jackets were new with tags but was unclear if this described all of the jackets. His reticent description of the transaction was essentially that he handed Ms. Denis the jackets and she handed him \$175.00.
20. Student A denies telling Ms. Denis that he needed money for rent and denies that he benefited from the transaction. The money was turned over to his aunt. Student A also denied being heavily involved in boosting. Finally, Student A denies the conversation with Mr. Jorgenson that is alleged to have occurred in paragraph 11.

21. [REDACTED] is a 23-year-old student at the school. She has been going on and off for 5 years. She was a friend of Student A's and they often worked on homework together. She said that Student A bragged about boosting and all of the things he could get. He usually sold merchandise at approximately half-price. Once again in this case, the perception around the school may be more important than Student A's actual behavior.

Jennifer Amy

22. Ms. Amy was a former teacher at the school and is now Chair of the Board. She related extensive academic qualifications in education. She would drop by the school on an informal and irregular basis but was familiar with many of the students and staff. Ms. Amy was also aware that Student A had a reputation for shoplifting. She recalled an occasion where Student A was observed to have a new purse. Ms. Denis was heard to say that Student A had been shoplifting.
23. Ms. Amy recalls another incident where Ms. Denis requested a meeting to discuss school issues. Ms. Denis brought Student A with her and that was the subject of some discussion because Ms. Amy was of the opinion that students should not be present during professional discussions. Little turns on that issue in the present case other than it was a helpful reminder for Ms. Amy. There was an observation that Student A had new boots and another conversation involving Ms. Denis about Student A shoplifting.
24. Ms. Amy also corroborates Mr. Jorgenson's evidence about a conversation that Mr. Jorgenson, Ms. Dyck, Ms. Amy had with Student A. He admitted selling stolen jackets to Ms. Denis.
25. Finally, Ms. Amy recalls Mr. Jorgenson scheduling a meeting at her house to discuss the sale of jackets with Ms. Denis. As the teacher did not attend there was a telephone conversation. Ms. Amy recalls that the teacher offered to resign very quickly which she

interpreted as the teacher being aware of the subject of the meeting. Her recollection is that the teacher was angry and made a threat to "take your school down".

Carmen Dyck

26. Ms. Dyck is married to Mr. Jorgenson and supervises [REDACTED]. She had regular contact with students both in [REDACTED] and in the classroom. Ms. Dyck also recalled that Student A was known to shoplift. She also confirmed that she was present at the conversation with Mr. Jorgenson and Ms. Amy when Student A confirmed that the stolen jackets were sold to Ms. Denis.

Lisette T. Denis

27. Ms. Denis began by providing a brief history. She was employed teaching elementary school for 18 years and left to pursue business opportunities including the operation of private care homes. She then moved to the Caribbean and taught university classes. She returned to [REDACTED] in 2014. In February, 2015 she began employment at the school.
28. Her observation was that the school was a much different environment than the traditional schools at which she had worked. There was no employment contract, no job description and no code of conduct. She noted that Mr. Jorgenson's interaction with the students was much different than in the mainstream school situation. She characterized the school as having very relaxed personal boundaries with the students.
29. Ms. Denis stated that there were usually between two and 12 students at any given time and they worked independently. She helped them with everything from homework to minding their children. As mentioned, she also picked up students in the morning and drove them home at night as required.
30. Ms. Denis noted that there was certainly more tolerance for student misbehavior whether truancy, smoking marijuana or even threatening behavior.

31. Ms. Denis admitted to having a good relationship with Student A. He was one of the students who was serious about earning a diploma and regularly attended. She admitted to favoring Student A sometimes with extra food or extra snacks because of his diligence. Ms. Denis also admitted to taking Student A shopping on several occasions. On one occasion they went shopping for pizza to reward his good attendance. On another occasion she took him to buy decorating supplies for graduation.
32. The crux of the hearing really turns on purchasing the jackets. Ms. Denis admitted to purchasing jackets because Student A needed rent money. She advised that her aboriginal studies revealed that the aboriginal community had a cultural tradition of barter. She therefore would not provide money to Student A unless she got something in return. She saw this as a process for reinforcing Student A's cultural identity.
33. Ms. Denis did make one inquiry as to whose jackets they were and she was advised that the jackets belonged to Student A's auntie, [REDACTED]
34. Ms. Denis claims she did not know that the jackets were stolen.
35. Ms. Denis recalled the night the jackets were purchased. Student A and his auntie came to her home. It was a short transaction. Student A handed her a bag with two jackets and she paid him \$175 in cash. She states that she has no knowledge as to the contents of the bag. She was unaware of the brand of the jackets or any other details. Apparently one jacket fit her daughter and the other one was given away.
36. Ms. Denis asked Student A to keep the transaction a secret because she didn't want other students coming to her for money.
37. With respect to the proposed Sunday meeting with Mr. Jorgenson and Ms. Amy, Ms. Denis states that she had company and didn't feel a Sunday meeting was necessary. She therefore advised that she would not be attending. By this time Ms. Denis also had concerns with the operation of the school and had considered resignation. When there

was a suggestion that she acted unprofessionally, she simply offered to resign. She denies threatening to take the school down.

38. The Discipline Committee reads very little into this meeting by telephone.
39. Ms. Denis states that she did know that Student A was shoplifting but her information was that it was confined to cosmetics for his own use. She would reprimand him and was concerned that he would get caught. Ms. Denis did not recall other conversations about shoplifting a bag or boots. Ms. Denis did recall Mr. Jorgenson mentioning that Student A was boosting but said she did not believe it was true.

LAW

The Registered Teachers Act

40. The analysis of the *Act* starts with Section 4. It states that the purpose of the *Act* is the public interest as follows:

The objects of the regulatory board are to establish and administer the professional certificate and the standards of professional conduct and competence of teachers with a purposes of serving and protecting the public interest.

41. Section 33 of *The Registered Teachers Act* states as follows

33 Professional misconduct is a question of fact, but any matter, conduct or thing, whether or not disgraceful or dishonourable, constitutes professional misconduct within the meaning of this Act if:

- (a) **it is harmful to the best interests of students or other members of the public;**
- (b) **it tends to harm the standing of the profession;**
- (c) **it is a breach of this Act or the bylaws; or**

- (d) it is a failure to comply with an order of the professional conduct committee, the discipline committee or the board of directors.

42. Regulatory Bylaw 2.01 defines misconduct. It reads as follows:

2.01 Without restricting the generality of section 33 of the Act, the following conduct on the part of a teacher is misconduct:

- (a) conduct which is harmful to the best interest of pupils or affects the ability of a teacher to teach;
- (b) any intentional act or omission designed to humiliate or cause distress or loss of dignity to any person in school or out of school which may include verbal or non-verbal behavior;
- (c) physically abusive conduct which involves the application of physical force which is excessive or inappropriate in the circumstances to any person;
- (d) sexually abuse conduct that violates a person's sexual integrity, whether consensual or not which includes sexual exploitation;
- (e) an act or omission that, in the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by the profession as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional;
- (f) being in violation of a law if the violation is relevant to the teacher's suitability to hold a certificate of qualification or if the violation would reasonably be regarded as placing one or more pupil's in danger.

43. The formal complaint alleges that Ms. Denis breached 2.01 (a), (e) and (f).

Onus and Standard of Proof

44. The Discipline Committee must weigh the evidence during the hearing and determine if there is professional misconduct on the balance of probabilities. As the Supreme Court of Canada stated in *F.H. v McDougall*, [2008] 3 SCR 41:

Like the House of Lords I think it is time to say once and for all in Canada that there is only one civil standard of proof at common law and that is proof on a balance of probabilities.

45. The Saskatchewan Court of Appeal in *Merchant v Law Society of Saskatchewan*, 2009 SKCA 33 said at paragraph 50 professional misconduct cases are strict liability offences as follows:

Regulatory offences that affect matters of public interest or concern fall into the intermediate category. These frequently involve controlled, restricted or regulated spheres of activity rather than conduct prohibited on pain of criminal sanction. In strict liability offences, the onus is on the accused to establish on a balance of probabilities that he took all reasonable steps to avoid committing the offence. Or, as more recently articulated by Goudge J.A., speaking for the Ontario Court of Appeal, what must be established is that the...accused exercised all reasonable care by establishing a proper system to prevent commission of the offence and by taking reasonable steps to ensure the effective operation of the system.

46. Further clarification is provided at paragraphs 52 and 52 as follows:

Therefore, strict liability offence requires at minimum, a fault element amounting to negligence before misconduct will be found. Negligence consists in an unreasonable failure to know the facts which constitute the offence or the facts to be duly diligent in taking steps which a reasonable person would take.

Accordingly, while lack of requisite knowledge or intent constitutes a defence to a full mens rea offence, it is not a defence in law to a strict liability offence required instead is evidence that establishes on a balance of probabilities that all reasonable steps were taken by the defendant to prevent the commission of the prohibited act.

47. The Discipline Committee is also conscious that professional regulation prosecutions have a broad scope of review. The Saskatchewan Court of Appeal in *Merchant v Law Society of Saskatchewan*, 2009 SKCA 33 said at paragraph 62:

The definition in the *Act* is expansive, and conduct unbecoming may be established through intentional conduct, negligent conduct or total insensibility to the requirements of acceptable practice (as in professional incompetence). In the last two instances, where practitioners have been careless or merely incapable in some aspect, moral turpitude is not, typically speaking, a feature of the

unacceptable behavior. The section provides that the conduct in question need not be disgraceful or dishonourable to constitute conduct unbecoming. It is abundantly clear that moral turpitude is no longer an active requirement.

ANALYSIS

48. The first important finding of fact is that Student A was involved in shoplifting. He admitted to shoplifting in his own testimony. As a rather sad footnote, he admitted that when his grandmother passed away he lost a source of support and turned to shoplifting. The evidence of Mr. Jorgenson, Ms. Amy, Ms. Dyck, and Student [REDACTED] confirmed that Student A had a reputation for shoplifting at the school. Most importantly, Ms. Denis herself was aware that Student A was engaged in shoplifting although she purported to confine his activities to shoplifting cosmetics.
49. The Discipline Committee finds there was overwhelming evidence that Student A was involved in shoplifting and that it was well known by all and sundry around the school including Ms. Denis.
50. The Discipline Committee also turned its attention to whether the jackets were actually stolen. The direct evidence is scant.
51. The evidence points to the fact that the jackets came from Student A's auntie [REDACTED] and that she would have direct evidence as to the origin of the jackets. The only evidence at the hearing was from Student A. He gave evidence that he spoke to his auntie after the fact and that she confirmed the jackets were stolen. This evidence has the uncertainty of hearsay.
52. There was no objection to this evidence and the Discipline Committee is prepared to give some weight to the reliability of the evidence for several reasons. The first is that Student A was directly involved in the transaction and had opportunity to observe all aspects and to discuss with his aunt. The second is that Student A appeared to be a reluctant witness

and not inclined to get either his auntie or Ms. Denis into legal difficulty by unfounded stories. The third circumstance is that Student A repeated that the jackets were stolen in conversations with Mr. Jorgenson and then later with Mr. Jorgenson, Ms. Amy and Ms. Dyck.

53. The Discipline Committee infers that Student A was well positioned to have information on the origins of the jackets, was not motivated to incriminate any party and was personally convinced that the jackets were stolen. Student A's evidence along with all of the other circumstances causes the Discipline Committee to believe that it is more likely than not that the jackets were stolen.
54. The Discipline Committee then turned its attention to the value of the jackets and if Ms. Denis obtained a benefit. There is circumstantial evidence such as the fact that the jackets were new and a recognized brand. The inference is that they had some significant value. The Facebook conversation provides more evidence that the sale was less than perceived retail value. The Discipline Committee interprets the online conversation to mean that Ms. Denis wanted a jacket for her daughter at a reduced price. While the Discipline Committee cannot make any specific determination as to the value of the jackets it finds that it is more likely than not that Ms. Denis bargained for and received at least some benefit from the transaction. The Discipline Committee did not find Ms. Denis's story that she was bargaining to reinforce Student A's cultural identity to be credible.
55. Finally, the Discipline Committee considered the online conversation between Ms. Denis and Student A in Late 2016. Ms. Denis has not been charged with interfering with a witness, so the Discipline Committee was not required to make any findings of fact. However, comments such as 'just make Keith look like an idiot', detracted from her credibility.
56. We now return to the first of the charges. It has been established that the teacher purchased two jackets from Student A. The allegation of misconduct is that

"you should reasonably have suspected that the student may be involved in selling stolen products. Taking into account the context of your purchase of the two Helly Hansen jackets for \$175 and the fact that you asked the student to keep this secret would have led a reasonable professional not to become involved in the said purchases. You received a personal benefit from these transactions".

57. The allegation is framed in the concept of negligence. A reasonable person would not be involved in this transaction. From the strict liability analysis, did the teacher take reasonable precautions?
58. The Discipline Committee acknowledges that there may be a significant secondhand market in goods. There are numerous websites dedicated to such activity in the city of [REDACTED]. The Discipline Committee also acknowledges that there may instances when a teacher purchases an item from a student. However, in this case, there are several indicia that alerted Ms. Denis to the inappropriate nature of the transaction.
59. The suspicious nature of the transaction alone should have been enough. A student with no financial means appearing at her house with four jackets at a reduced price would cause a concern. Add to this the prior information that Ms. Denis had about Student A's shoplifting. The Discipline Committee finds, without hesitation, Ms. Denis was negligent and did not take adequate precautions as alleged in the charge. The Discipline Committee also finds that it is more likely than not that her culpability is more serious. At best she was willfully blind and at worst she intentionally bought stolen property,
60. The Discipline Committee finds that the Professional Conduct Committee has proven all factual elements of the first charge.
61. The next question is whether this is professional misconduct. Little analysis is required. Involving a student in a transaction that has such an obviously high risk for attracting

possible criminal proceedings shows a shocking lack of concern for the student's welfare or for the standards expected of the teaching profession.

62. The Discipline Committee finds that the Professional Conduct Committee has proved professional misconduct with respect to the first charge.
63. The second charge is that Ms. Denis failed to maintain proper boundaries with Student A and this contributed to the purchase of the two jackets. During the course of the hearing there was considerable discussion about the nature of the interaction between the staff and pupils. Mr. Jorgenson suggested Ms. Denis was having Student A shoplift on a regular basis. There were also allegations that she took him shopping and there was inappropriate fraternization. Little of this was actually proven. Ms. Denis portrayed the school as having no rules and that she was simply following the example set by Mr. Jorgenson. She did not acknowledge that she had professional obligations quite apart from school policies.
64. The Discipline Committee finds there was no evidence to support an allegation of inappropriate professional boundaries other than the conduct subsumed in the first charge. Human behavior is often complex and this is another case study. While the Discipline Committee has found that Ms. Denis showed a shocking lack of judgment in purchasing the two jackets, there is also evidence that she was a kind and supportive teacher offering assistance to Student A during his term at the school and afterwards. For example, after Student A graduated, Ms. Denis helped him enroll in post-secondary education, obtain funding and on other matters. She demonstrated a commitment to Student A's welfare.
65. For the reasons above the Discipline Committee finds that the Professional Conduct Committee has not succeeded in establishing professional misconduct with respect to charge number two.

66. Penalty to be spoken to at a later date.

DATED at Regina, Saskatchewan, this 4th day of April, 2017.



Thomas Schonhoffer, Chair
Robin Bellamy
Candace Elliott-Jensen
Don Lee
Yasmina Lemieux