



DISCIPLINE CASE SUMMARY

a. Tammy Anne Chibanoff (DOB: 1973.07.12)

b. Professional Misconduct

c. The hearing was held on October 20, 2003, at the Colleges offices in Vancouver, B.C. The report and recommendations of the Hearing Sub-Committee were presented to Council on January 22, 2004.

d. The respondent admitted that she set three fires to burn in West Whalley Secondary School during or shortly before school hours on May 24, 25, and 28, 2001. She was charged with three counts of recklessly causing damage to property under the *Criminal Code of Canada* and pled guilty to one of those counts. She received an 18-month conditional sentence.

The Hearing Sub-Committee accepted that the respondent suffered a medical and psychiatric condition.

The respondent further admitted to smoking marijuana with teenaged students in and around school and, on certain occasions, purchasing or supplying the marijuana. She also acknowledged driving her vehicle with students as passengers while smoking or having smoked marijuana.

The respondent also permitted students to engage in disruptive or other inappropriate behaviour in the school. She used vulgar and abusive language in dealing with her students.

e. The respondent acknowledged and the Hearing Sub-Committee found that her behaviour constituted professional misconduct. The Hearing Sub-Committee held that the respondent exposed children to risk of injury or death by setting the fires while school was in session. She also engaged in smoking marijuana with students on several occasions, students who were under her care and supervision as a teacher.

The respondent further consented to the cancellation of her certificate and termination of her membership in the College.

f. Council considered the report and recommendations of the Hearing Sub-Committee. It accepted the penalty recommendation and cancelled the respondent's certificate and terminated her membership in the College.



BC College
of Teachers

DISCIPLINE CASE SUMMARY

Council also accepted the Hearing Sub-Committee's recommendations that the respondent's name be published in this case. Costs were not assessed against the respondent, as she had been highly cooperative throughout the process.