

BEFORE THE NEW ZEALAND TEACHERS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

NZTDT 2020/18

IN THE MATTER of the Education Act 1989

AND

IN THE MATTER of a charge referred by the Complaints Assessment
Committee to the New Zealand Teachers
Disciplinary Tribunal

BETWEEN **COMPLAINTS ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**

Referrer

AND **EDWARD JOHN COAD**

Respondent

DECISION OF THE TRIBUNAL

21 September 2020

HEARING: Held on 25 August 2020 on the papers

TRIBUNAL: Rachael Schmidt-McCleave (Deputy Chair)
Kiri Turketo and Aimee Hammond (members)

REPRESENTATION: E Woolley, Meredith Connell for the Complaints Assessment
Committee
The respondent self-represented

Hei timatanga kōrero – Introduction

1. The Complaints Assessment Committee ("CAC") has charged the respondent with engaging in serious misconduct and/or conduct otherwise entitling the Disciplinary Tribunal to exercise its powers.
2. The CAC charges that Dr Coad, a registered teacher now in Wanaka, in or around August 2019 breached professional boundaries and/or acted in a manner that brings, or is likely to bring, the teaching profession into disrepute by:
 - (a) Engaging in and/or encouraging inappropriate communication with his former Year 12 students at Saint Kentigern College, by sending and/or receiving text and photo messages in a group message conversation on the social media platform 'Instagram' where the subject matter of the conversation included references to sex and/or prostitution and/or alcohol and/or drugs.
3. The CAC alleges that this conduct amounts to serious misconduct pursuant to section 378 of the Education Act 1989 ("the Act") and Rules 9(1)(e) and/or (k) of the Teaching Council Rules 2016, or alternatively amounts to conduct which otherwise entitles the Disciplinary Tribunal to exercise its powers pursuant to section 404 of the Act.
4. The matter was heard on the papers.

Kōrero Taunaki - Evidence

Agreed Summary of Facts

5. The ASoF is set out in full below:

Introduction

1. *At the relevant time, Edward John Coad (**respondent**) was a registered teacher with a full practising certificate (registration 361017) who was employed by Northern Southland College (**NSC**), Lumsden, as Head of Department of Mathematics. The respondent worked as a Maths teacher at Saint Kentigern College, Auckland, from 4 June 2018 until 23 August 2019, and at Glendowie College, Auckland, during 2017 to 2018.*

2. *Prior to commencing work in the education sector in New Zealand, the respondent worked for over 15 years in New York and London in other industries.*
3. *The respondent obtained a Graduate Diploma of Teaching (Secondary) in 2016, was provisionally registered in 2017 and obtained full certification in December 2018.*
4. *Saint Kentigern College is a private co-educational Presbyterian secondary school in Pakuranga, Auckland, catering to approximately 2100 students in Years 7 to 13.*
5. *The respondent left Saint Kentigern College to take up the Head of Department, Mathematics position at NSC in September 2019. NSC is a secondary school for years 7 to 13 based in the Waimea Valley in the South Island.*
6. *On 9 September 2019 a mandatory report was filed with the Teaching Council by the Deputy Principal of Saint Kentigern College.*
7. *The respondent resigned from his position at NSC in December 2019 pending the outcome of the Teaching Council's investigation into the matters that are the subject of the mandatory report.*

Conduct

8. *At some time between 23 August 2019 and 28 August 2019, after the respondent had finished his employment at St Kentigern College and before he commenced his role at NSC, the respondent engaged in an Instagram group conversation with some of his former St Kentigern College students.*
9. *Excerpts from the conversation are set out in the **Appendix** to this summary of facts.¹*

Teacher's response

10. *The respondent provided written responses to the allegations during the Teaching Council's investigation.*
11. *The respondent accepted he engaged in the Instagram conversation with his former students and expressed regret and embarrassment at his involvement in the conversation. The respondent accepted that the language he used in the conversation was wrong and unprofessional and that he had made an error in judgement. The*

¹ Attached as an Appendix to this decision.

respondent explained that he had built up relationships with the students and his comments ought to be considered in the context of those relationships.

The Complaints Assessment Committee (CAC)

12. *As a result of the investigation into the allegation, the matter was referred to the CAC for consideration.*

13. *The CAC met on 27 February 2020. The respondent attended the meeting.*

14. *The CAC considered that the conduct may constitute serious misconduct and referred the matter to the Tribunal pursuant to s 401(4) of the Education Act 1989.*

Te Ture - The Law

6. Section 378 of the Act defines serious misconduct:

serious misconduct means conduct by a teacher –

- (a) *that –*
 - (i) *adversely affects, or is likely to adversely affect, the wellbeing or learning of 1 or more students; or*
 - (ii) *reflects adversely on the teacher's fitness to be a teacher; or*
 - (iii) *may bring the teaching profession into disrepute; and*
- (b) *that is of a character or severity that meets the Teaching Council's criteria for reporting serious misconduct.*

7. The test under section 378 is conjunctive², meaning that as well as meeting one or more of the three adverse consequences, a teacher's conduct must also be of a character or severity that meets the Teaching Council's criteria for reporting serious misconduct, pursuant to Rule 9 of the Teaching Council Rules 2016.

8. The CAC alleges that the respondent's conduct falls within the following sub-rules of Rules 9(1):

² *Teacher Y and Education Council of Aotearoa New Zealand*, [2018], NZTDT 3141, 27 February 2018 at [64].

- (a) Rule 9(1)(e): breaching professional boundaries in respect of a child or young person with whom the teacher is or was in contact as a result of the teacher's position as a teacher; for example,—
 - (i) engaging in an inappropriate relationship with the child or young person:
 - (ii) engaging in, directing, or encouraging behaviour or communication of a sexual nature with, or towards, the child or young person:
- (b) Rule 9(1)(k): an act or omission that brings, or is likely to bring, the teaching profession into disrepute.

Ngā Kōrero a te Kōmiti – CAC and Respondent Submissions

9. The CAC submits that the respondent's conduct amounts to serious misconduct. They rely on section 378 of the Act, as well as Rule 9(1)(e) and/or (k) of the Teaching Council Rules 2016. Alternatively, the CAC submits that the conduct otherwise entitles the Tribunal to exercise its powers under section 404 of the Act.
10. The CAC submissions and the respondent's submissions on penalty and name suppression are addressed below.
11. The CAC submits that Dr Coad's conduct meets both limbs of the section 378 definition of misconduct:
 - (a) The conduct is such that it may bring the teaching profession into disrepute (s 378(a)(iii)); and
 - (b) The conduct is of a character or severity that meets either or both of the criteria for reporting serious misconduct contained in Rules 9.1(e)³ and (k).
12. The CAC noted that the themes of the Instagram conversation included sexual innuendo and topics of an explicit sexual nature (e.g. "*pussies are a pita*", "*Male g spot*" reference to sex "*outside of the immediate family*", penis size), prostitution (e.g. "*a girl in New York*", "*not if you pay for it*", reference to hookers and coke), binge drinking of alcohol (e.g.

³ The CAC submissions refer to rule 9.1(d) in error at para 3.4 but refer to rule 9.1(e) everywhere else.

“another 8 to get down”), and drugs (*“MDMA should be under 200 here”*, conversation about *“coke, molly and pills”*). There is also an “over familiarity” evident in the language used in the conversation between Dr Coad and the students (e.g. *“What is this shit?? Bedtime at 8 pm?? You come in wrecked from too much sleep. Prostrate exams start at 40, take my word”*).

13. Further, the CAC observed that Dr Coad knew the conversation was inappropriate and demonstrated an immaturity on his part (e.g. *“Professional grey area”, “I sometimes think I’m not mature enough to be a teacher”*).
14. The CAC then reviewed the relevant cases (which are discussed in greater detail below) before submitting, in summary, that the conversation was inappropriate and unprofessional and involved a clear breach of the professional boundary between learners and teachers. The CAC submitted that the decisions show that teachers are expected to maintain professional relationships with students and to exercise a high degree of judgement when using social media to engage with students. The onus is strictly on the teacher to ensure they do not become involved in any potentially inappropriate situations.
15. Here, the CAC submits, the conversation not only took place outside school hours, via social media, and for a non-educative purpose but it also went well beyond the parameters of appropriate conversation between teacher and student. While it was not always Dr Coad who instigated discussion of a particular topic, he willingly participated and encouraged the students to do the same.
16. The Committee further submits that the students’ admiration for and desire to impress Dr Coad comes through strongly in the messages. The students were young men of an impressionable age (in their penultimate year of secondary school) and the CAC submits that Dr Coad should have been aware of that and removed himself from the conversation thread immediately.
17. The CAC submits that Dr Coad’s conduct is therefore a clear breach of professional boundaries, as well as conduct which may or is likely to bring the profession into disrepute.
18. Dr Coad has admitted the conduct and accepted that it was wrong, unprofessional and a lapse in judgement. He states that he is humbled and ashamed by the charge and deeply

regrets his actions and the damage done to the profession. He states that there were no deviant, sexual or inappropriate expectations planned as a result of the group chat and it was “*simply idiotic, poorly considered and stupid*”.

19. Dr Coad emphasises that the interaction was after he had left the school, was in a group setting via a digital platform, and was never in person or on a one-to-one basis. He says he never approached individual students via social media and didn't initiate this group chat or group, but was invited while in transit to the South Island. His submissions as to the effects on him and his family are discussed further below when this Tribunal discusses penalty.

Kupu Whakatau – Decision

20. In summary, we are satisfied that the respondent's conduct meets the threshold for serious misconduct in terms of section 378 of the Act, and Rules 9(1)(e) and (k).
21. The conduct demonstrated by Dr Coad by engaging in the Instagram conversation, and the nature of that conversation, was extremely silly and is undoubtedly in breach of the above rules. The tone of the conversation was unforgiveable in terms of his duty to maintain a professional relationship with his students. It was incumbent on Dr Coad to resist all attempts to engage him in the group chat and, certainly, to shut the chat and his involvement down when the topics of conversation turned lewd and unbecoming of a teacher to his student.
22. Moreover, the Tribunal considers that the fact that Dr Coad was en route at the time to move from a science technology role to a middle leadership role, taking his whole family, underscores the inappropriateness of the conversation and its topics. The Tribunal agrees with the CAC that the role of a teacher in maintaining appropriate standards and boundaries does not end when he or she leaves the school, or goes on holiday.
23. There is therefore no doubt in the Tribunal's mind that Dr Coad's conduct meets the threshold for serious misconduct, and that such a finding is in line with the cases discussed in greater detail below.

24. In terms of rule 9(1)(k), the High Court in *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*⁴ confirmed that the test for bringing the profession into disrepute is an objective one. In making its determination, the Tribunal must ask itself whether reasonable members of the public fully informed of the facts of the case could reasonably conclude that the reputation and good standing of the profession has been lowered by the respondent's actions.
25. Turning now to look at whether the respondent's conduct is also of a character or severity that makes the Teaching Council's criteria for reporting serious misconduct, we note that we only need to find contravention of one of the specific rules covered in Rule 9(1) for this limb to be satisfied. The CAC has focussed on Rules 9(1)(e) and (k) in this regard and we are satisfied that the respondent's actions breach both those sub-Rules for the reasons discussed above.
26. Finally, the Tribunal considers that, bearing in mind the above points, reasonable members of the public fully informed of the facts of the case would reasonably conclude that the reputation and good standing of the profession has been lowered by the respondent's actions.
27. The analogous cases bear out the Tribunal's conclusions above. As emphasised in *CAC v Huggard*⁵, the teacher (as the adult in the teacher/student relationship), is in a position of power and responsibility and should be the one to adopt and role model appropriate behaviour.
28. Similarly, in *CAC v Brabant*⁶, where the teacher concerned engaged in Facebook conversations with a student which contained inappropriate and sexually suggestive statements, the Tribunal emphasised that:

It is necessary to be entirely clear that it is never acceptable for a teacher to engage in an exchange at this level of familiarity with a student, whatever the motive, and we are in no doubt that it is incumbent on us, bearing in mind the need for the protection of the public and the maintenance of professional standards to impose a penalty which properly meets the seriousness of the respondent's conduct.

⁴ *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*, [2001] NZAR74 at [28] regularly applied by the Tribunal, for example see *CAC v Harrington* NZDT 2016/63, 6 April 2017

⁵ *CAC v Huggard* NZTDT 2016/33

⁶ *CAC v Brabant* NZTDT 2014/68. The Tribunal has made similar observations in *CAC v Huggard* supra and *CAC v Luff* NZTDT 2016-70, by way of examples.

29. Furthermore, the Tribunal has also made clear that communication with a student from a teacher does not need to be highly personal to breach a professional boundary. In *CAC v Teacher M*⁷, the Tribunal found that the teacher's conduct, in extensively text messaging a student outside of school hours, would bring the profession into disrepute. Again, the Tribunal said, the onus is on the teacher to manage such a situation.
30. In summary, then, the cases bear out the Tribunal's conclusion that the communications with the students here on Instagram were completely inappropriate, breached the rules, were Dr Coad's alone to manage, and warrant a disciplinary response.

Whiu - Penalty

31. Having determined that this case is one in which we consider exercising our powers, we must now turn to consider what is an appropriate penalty in the circumstances.

404 Powers of Disciplinary Tribunal

- (1) *Following a hearing of a charge of serious misconduct, or a hearing into any matter referred to it by the Complaints Assessment Committee, the Disciplinary Tribunal may do 1 or more of the following:*
- (a) *any of the things that the Complaints Assessment Committee could have done under section 401(2):*
 - (b) *censure the teacher:*
 - (c) *impose conditions on the teacher's practising certificate or authority for a specified period:*
 - (d) *suspend the teacher's practising certificate or authority for a specified period, or until specified conditions are met:*
 - (e) *annotate the register or the list of authorised persons in a specified manner:*
 - (f) *impose a fine on the teacher not exceeding \$3,000:*
 - (g) *order that the teacher's registration or authority or practising certificate be cancelled:*

⁷ *CAC v Teacher M* NZTDT 2018/13

- (h) *require any party to the hearing to pay costs to any other party;*
 - (i) *require any party to pay a sum to the Education Council in respect of the costs of conducting the hearing;*
 - (j) *direct the Education Council to impose conditions on any subsequent practising certificate issued to the teacher.*
- (2) *Despite subsection (1), following a hearing that arises out of a report under section 397 of the conviction of a teacher, the Disciplinary Tribunal may not do any of the things specified in subsection (1)(f), (h), or (i).*
- (3) *A fine imposed on a teacher under subsection (1)(f), and a sum ordered to be paid to the Teaching Council under subsection (1)(i), are recoverable as debts due to the Teaching Council.*

32. We note that, in determining penalty, the Tribunal must ensure that the three overlapping principles are met, that is, the protection of the public through the provision of a safe learning environment for students and the maintenance of both the professional standards and the public's confidence in the profession.⁸ We refer to the decisions of the superior Courts which have emphasised the fact that the purpose of professional disciplinary proceedings for various occupations is actually not to punish the practitioner for misbehaviour, although it may have that effect.⁹

33. In *Mackay* we looked at the principles the Tribunal must turn its mind to when considering penalty following a finding entitling it to exercise its powers¹⁰:

- (a) Protecting the public;
- (b) Setting the standards for the profession;
- (c) Punishment;
- (d) Rehabilitation;

⁸ *CAC v McMillan*, NZTDT 2016/52.

⁹ *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2008] NZSC 55, [2009] 1 NZLR 1 at [97]; *In re A Medical Practitioner* [1959] NZLR 784 at p 800 (CA).

¹⁰ Above n 16 at [40] – [62]

- (e) Consistency;
 - (f) The range of sentencing options;
 - (g) Least restrictive;
 - (h) Fair, reasonable and proportionate.
34. We do not intend to repeat what we said in that decision, other than to note that we have turned our mind to these principles in reaching our decision on penalty.
35. The CAC, in its submissions, acknowledged that Dr Coad's conduct was not directed at one student, but was part of a group conversation, and did not involve him forming an inappropriate relationship with one student. For that reason, the CAC does not seek cancellation of Dr Coad's registration.
36. The CAC also pointed to, as mitigating factors, Dr Coad's lack of previous disciplinary history, and his cooperation with the CAC investigation and with the Tribunal proceedings in admitting the charge. The CAC notes that Dr Coad is not currently teaching, having resigned from his position at Northern Southern College.
37. The CAC therefore seeks censure, a condition on Dr Coad's practising certificate that for three years he advise his current and any prospective employer of the Tribunal's decision and to provide a copy to any such employer, and annotation of the register.
38. The respondent has raised a number of points in mitigation that he wishes the Tribunal to consider. He states that he resigned from teaching as he felt he would not be able to properly focus with the stress he has been under, and this would be unfair to students, staff and any school. He states he does not currently feel he is equipped to return to teaching without the support of the teaching profession and he has expressed a willingness to surrender registration as a demonstration of his sorrow and regret for the incident and to try and undo any damage to the profession his actions have caused.
39. During lockdown, the respondent says, he reflected on his situation, and the journey he took to teaching, as well as his efforts to help his children and two other students. He has

reflected upon a possible return to the profession, if assisted by further training and mentoring as recommended.

40. We have considered both sets of submissions very carefully. We are also mindful that this conduct occurred over a year ago, and the respondent has not been teaching since the investigation commenced. We note that, were it not for the delay in this matter coming on for hearing, we would have made an order suspending the respondent's practising certificate.
41. Bearing in mind the above, as well as the obligation upon us to impose the least restrictive penalty in the circumstances, pursuant to section 404(1) of the Act, we therefore order as follows:
- (a) A censure under section 404(1)(b) of the Act;
 - (b) Under section 404(1)(c) of the Act the following conditions are to be placed on the respondent's practising certificate:
 - (i) If the respondent returns to teaching, the respondent must enrol in an externally provided professional development course on maintaining boundaries, and a completion certificate sent to the Manager of Professional Responsibility of the Teaching Council;
 - (ii) The respondent must tell his current and prospective future employer of the decision for a period of three years from the date of the full decision and provide them with a copy of the full decision with evidence to the Teaching Council of this disclosure.
 - (c) Pursuant to section 404(1)(e) of the Act, annotation of all the above for a period of three years following the date of the full decision.

Utu Whakaea – Costs

42. The CAC submits that a 40% contribution to the CAC's overall costs is appropriate and will file a memorandum in due course. This reflects a discount from the starting point of 50% to acknowledge Dr Coad's cooperation.

43. The Tribunal sees no reason to depart from the usual principles and therefore orders 40% costs in favour of the CAC.
44. The CAC is to file and serve a copy of its cost schedule. Under section 404(1)(h) the respondent is ordered to pay 40% of the costs shown in the CAC schedule unless the respondent files and serves submissions as to costs within 10 days of the date the CAC has sent the cost schedule. If these submissions are received the Tribunal delegates to the Deputy Chair the task of fixing the amount of the CAC's costs.
45. The respondent is also ordered to pay 40% of the Tribunal's costs. This matter was dealt with on the papers and the schedule submitted by the Tribunal shows \$1,145.00 of total costs. The respondent is to pay \$458.00 pursuant to section 404(1)(i). Any objection should be filed within 10 days of receipt of the decision and referred to the Deputy Chair.

He Rāhui tuku panui – Non-publication

46. The respondent seeks permanent name suppression for himself and his family, on the basis, in summary, that:
 - (a) He has suffered significant emotional trauma for which he has sought medical assistance, and which has impacted unfairly on his children and wife. That stress is exacerbated at the thought of his name being released to the public.
 - (b) His children are at school in Wanaka and are adjusting to a move to Wanaka, and developing a network of friends for the third time in their lives having moved from the USA to England and to Auckland previously.
 - (c) He wishes his children to be protected from the stigma associated with the nature of this complaint.
 - (d) He has become actively involved in the school PTA and junior soccer in Wanaka, and would have to leave these roles should his name become public.
 - (e) He would have to consider another overseas move should non-publication not be ordered.

47. The CAC opposes name suppression for the following reasons:
- (a) It would be contrary to the principle of open justice.
 - (b) Dr Coad's concern for his children is understandable but does not outweigh the default position. There is no evidence provided that the effect on Dr Coad's children would be over and above the usual adverse effects that may occur to children where a parent faces disciplinary proceedings.
 - (c) As the Tribunal noted in *CAC v McMillan*¹¹, the mere fact that the teacher's children attended school in the same area as where the parent is based is not relevant and, if that were a basis for name suppression, would apply in almost all cases where the teacher has school-age children.
 - (d) Dr Coad's symptoms are representative of the natural stress, embarrassment and shame that follow disciplinary proceedings.
 - (e) There is no evidence from Dr Coad's GP that publication would result in any particular detrimental effect on Dr Coad's health.
48. The application of the principle of open justice to proceedings before the Tribunal is contained in section 405(3) of the Act. The primary purpose behind open justice in a disciplinary context is the maintenance of public confidence in the profession concerned through the transparent administration of the law.¹²
49. The Tribunal's powers to prohibit publication is found in section 405(6) of the Act. It can only make one of the non-publication orders in (a) to (c) of section 405(6) if it is of the opinion that it is "proper" to do so having regard to the interests of any person, including but not limited to, the privacy of the complainant and to the public interest.
50. The Tribunal has adopted a two-step approach to applications for non-publication orders. First, it considers whether it is proper to make a non-publication order having regard to the various interests identified in section 405(6); and, secondly, it decides whether to exercise

¹¹ *CAC v McMillan* NZTDT 2016/52

¹² *CAC v Teacher* NZTDT 2016/27 at [66] [citing *X v Standards Committee (No 1) of the New Zealand Law Society* [2011] NZCA 676 at [18].

its discretion to make the orders sought.¹³ Bare assertions will not suffice for displacing the principle of open justice and nor will the “ordinary” hardships or expected consequences of a proceeding involving allegations of serious professional misconduct.¹⁴

51. Here, the Tribunal does not consider there to be a basis to displace the presumption of open justice by suppressing the respondent’s identity. There is no evidence before the Tribunal of negative impact on the respondent, or people connected to him, beyond that which ordinarily exists in proceedings of this kind.
52. The Tribunal therefore declines the respondent’s application for permanent name suppression.



Rachael Schmidt-McCleave
Deputy Chair

¹³ Ibid at [61].

¹⁴ *Y v Attorney-General* [2016] NZCA 474 citing *Hart v Standards Committee (No 1) of the New Zealand Law Society* [2011] NZCA 676 approved by the Supreme Court declining leave to appeal in *Hart v Standards Committee (No 1) of the New Zealand Law Society* [2012] NZSC 4.

NOTICE - Right of Appeal under Section 409 of the Education Act 1989

1. This decision may be appealed by the teacher who is the subject of a decision by the Disciplinary Tribunal or by the Complaints Assessment Committee.
2. An appeal must be made within 28 days after receipt of written notice of the decision, or any longer period that the court allows.
3. Section 356(3) to (6) applies to every appeal under this section as if it were an appeal under section 356(1).

APPENDIX

Excerpts from Instagram conversation

Student: Our new teacher thinks I have

Tourette's Mr Coad: Good god! You do...

[...]

Mr Coad: Hope you guys are behaving! Any arse
slapping? [...]

Student: Fuck no sir he has no arse

[...]

Student: In all honesty tho compared to you no one has an
arse Mr Coad: Professional grey area.

Student: Can you please come back!!!

Mr Coad: Never coming back...Auckland is dead to me!! I'm experiencing nz
at its best...after 15 months of it at its worst".

Student: Sir is a functioning

alcoholic Student: I did witness
that indeed.

Mr Coad: [photo]

Student: Woah sir slow down

[...]

Student: Easy there sir it's not even 7
o'clock Mr Coad: Slow down???

Student: hahahaha slow down sir

Student: If you don't wake up in an emergency room getting your
stomach pumped then fuck mate you ain't goin hard enough

Mr Coad: Another 8 to get down...need to find some additives

Student: I challenge u to 9 more not 8. Sir you're a bad

influence... Student: ...I like sirs influence. He lives life without

fucks given

Mr Coad: [photo of cats] these are too

cute Student: pussy

Mr Coad: That's my cats

Student: you mean ur pussies. They could use a haircut

aye Student: No one like a hairy pussy

Mr Coad: My cats. Cats don't cause hassle

[...]

Student: are u saying pussies

do [...]

Mr Coad: Pussies are a pita.

Mr Coad: Jamie has joined. Sup, Jamie!! I'm laughing at the fact I'm having an insta group chat with yr 12s

Student: keep laughing

Mr Coad: I sometimes think im not mature enough to be a

teacher Student: why's that Edward

Mr Coad: See current situation

Student: HAHAAH, facts

Student: Don't lie sir you love us

Mr Coad: How many teachers do this?? I do.

Student: Sir I need you to come back. Who else is gonna drive me to my prostrate exam...

[...]

Mr Coad: ...What is this shit?? Bedtime at 8pm?? You come in wrecked from too much sleep. Prostrate exams start at 40, take my word.

Student: What's prostrate

Student: Google it

Mr Coad: Male g spot. Logan can tell you all about it

Student: Isn't that in the butt? That's why anal was

invented

[...]

Student: No. Finger up it. Gets good feel around in there. Not even fucking with you.

Student: Did (redacted) show u that?

Student: No my uncle actually. But it's ok cos we were both crying so it doesn't count as rape

Student: What the fuck

Mr Coad: Holy shit

Student: Edward did your uncle show u too?

Mr Coad: \$25000 per year well spent...Nope...a girl in New York [...]

Student: BRO THATS SO COOL

Mr Coad: And I didn't pay for it, before you ask

Student: Ooh a free bee? Like a package deal?

Student: Fuck usually I have to pay even for a rim

job Mr Coad: That's cos you're a boy

Student: No I'm a man

Mr Coad: Not if you pay for it.

Student: Sir how was your

day

Mr Coad: Long...6 hour drive from Nelson. Managed 3 pints before I started. Oil the wheels

Student: Are you with the kids?

Mr Coad: Nope...solo. You know what that means. Student: Hookers and coke

Mr Coad: I know. NZ though short on both, and both cost

\$350 Mr Coad: [video]

Student: why r u by urself

Student: the place is empty

Mr Coad: it's a Tuesday...all the tourists are in

bed Student: HAHHAHA

Student: Sir my uncle became my aunty and now he/she is a prostitute so
hey I can get you in contact

Mr Coad: I just got 20% because the guy thought I was
local. Mr Coad: Enjoy school!!!

Student: I'll be thinking of you and your body ever second
of it Mr Coad: [photo] [photo] [photo] Quality! #25000ayear???

Mr Coad: [photo] [video]
[Students send multiple
photo] Mr Coad: [starts video chat]

[video chat ends]

Mr Coad: Slackers

Student: Sir u are loud it's coming through phone and it's muted. U gonna get
me in shit.

Mr Coad: 3 pints with the principle

Student: At 5pm
[...]

Mr Coad: Back in pub for burger. Barmaid here has never been to
Auckland Student: Bless

Student: HAHAHAHA

Mr Coad: But then you guys haven't been to
Lumsden [...]

Student: I bet she hasn't had sex with anyone outside of the immediate
family as well tho

Mr Coad: Neither have you
#southislanders Student: Is my uncle
immediate family?

Mr Coad: Nah

Mr Coad: Plus I got a welcome package from the
school! Student: What was it

Mr Coad: So in the space of 3 hours I got more love from a school I haven't
started working at than I got from SKC

Student: Coke, molly and
pills [...]

Mr Coad: No...tim tams, baked beans, tea and

coffee Student: excuse me sir

Student: Tight*

Student: we gave u love

Mr Coad: Sure

Student: Yea sir I gave you all 1.3 inches of my

love Mr Coad: Twice what you have?

Mr Coad: 18 teachers at the school, so

tiny Student: Hahahahaha

Mr Coad: Bens comment prompted me to say

that Student: Poor teachers. Poor wives

Mr Coad: Teachers are about \$50,000 better off here. Disposable

income etc Student: Their loss

Mr Coad: Is it? MDMA should be under 200 here