



DISCIPLINE CASE SUMMARY

- a. Steven Russell Mills (DOB: 1952.06.16, Certificate Issued: 1991.06.03; cancelled in 2004 for non-payment of fees)
-
- b. Professional misconduct
 - c. The hearing was held on August 23 and August 24, 2007, at the College's offices in Vancouver, B.C. The report and recommendations of the Hearing Sub-Committee were presented to Council on June 12, 2008, in accordance with section 22 of the *Teaching Profession Act*. This matter originated as a report under section 16(2) of the *School Act*.
 - d. Mr. Mills was an art teacher at a school when the incidents took place in 1989 to 1991. He was found to have had a personal, sexual relationship with a female student in his grade 11 and grade 12 classes.
 - e. The Hearing Sub-Committee (the "Committee") was unanimous in its decision that Mr. Mills, while employed as an art teacher between September 1989 and June 1991, did engage in an intimate relationship with a female student. The Committee unanimously found that Mr. Mills' relationship with the student included kissing, fondling and sexual intercourse. The Committee determined that the facts in this case indicated that the conduct occurred while the victim was still a student under Mr. Mills' direct supervision and authority. The Committee found that this conduct is contrary to the standards of behaviour expected of a teacher and found him guilty of professional misconduct.
 - f. The Committee considered the submissions presented by counsel on penalty, publication and costs. The Committee unanimously agreed to a penalty of at least a five-year bar from re-issuance of a College certificate. With respect to costs, the Committee acknowledged that Mr. Mills was no longer a member of the College and that there was no compulsion on his part to participate in College proceedings. They concluded that his absence did not hinder the College in exercising its mandate. In the matter of publication, the Committee unanimously agreed that Mr. Mills' name be published as he took no position on this issue and there was no evidence supporting anonymous publication.
 - g. Council considered the report and recommendations of the Committee and agreed to accept the recommendations and reasons as to penalty, costs and publication.