

1965
[REDACTED]
Memorandum

To: CCPA Ethics and Integrity Committee members
From: Laura Bronstein, Chair, Department of Social Work
Re.: Andre Massena
Date: October 21, 2008

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

"Social work educators have a responsibility to prepare students to be competent professional practitioners. Historically, this responsibility has included the task of 'gatekeeping', or preventing the graduation of students who are not equipped with the requisite knowledge, skills, and values for professional practice." (Koerin & Miller, 1995, p.247). This role as gatekeepers has led social work programs around the country and the world, to develop mechanisms so that students whose professional behavior is seen to be below the standards of the profession, are reviewed regarding their ability to "advance" in a social work program. Our "advancement policy" at BU Dept. of SW (Attachment A) states that:

[REDACTED]

"The purpose of this policy is to create a process which will allow a timely and positive intervention when students are identified by faculty, field instructors, or student peers as experiencing problems which interfere with their progress in the MSW program. Through this policy the MSW program exercises its responsibility to the social work profession and its clients to determine whether students have demonstrated the required level of achievement, in the areas of classroom performance, professional and ethical behavior, necessary to interact positively with client systems." It goes on to state that: "Students are expected to adhere to the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics in all interactions with clients, peers, staff, full-time and adjunct faculty, practicum instructors, and all other members of the University community".

All students sign the Social Work Contract (Attachment B) upon entering our program documenting that they will uphold the Code of Ethics and engage in "self-assessment ofpersonal aptitude and performance" and "faculty assessment of... professional aptitude and performance." In addition, this contract requires students to acknowledge that if their "professional development is not deemed satisfactory by the social work faculty, the MSW Program has the right and responsibility to request reassessment of (my) suitability for the program."

[REDACTED]

Leading up to this appeal which may be considered by the CCPA Ethics and Integrity Committee, Andre Massena has violated the NASW Code of Ethics (Attachment C) in at least four areas which I will outline and which will be documented through a series of attachments:

- Attachment A: Social Work Dept. Advancement Policy [REDACTED]
Attachment B: Social Work Contract
Attachment C: National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Code of Ethics
Attachment D: John Fleming's NYS University Police Voluntary Report
Attachment E: Dara Raboy-Piccano, MSW, email to Laura Bronstein
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Attachment F: Andre Massena's email to social work faculty and adjuncts

Attachment G: Andre Massena's email to social work alums

Attachment H: Andre Massena's email to the BU Graduate Student Organization

Attachment I: Tina Archie-Brown, President Broome/Tioga NAACP email to Laura Bronstein

Attachment J: Jennifer Marshall, testimony

Attachment K: Dave Tanenhaus email to Laura Bronstein

Attachment L: Diane Wiener letter to CCPA Ethics & Integrity Committee

Attachment M: Brian Flynn email to Laura Bronstein

- I. The first violation is 4.04 *"Social workers should not participate in, condone, or be associated with dishonesty, fraud, or deception"*.

Regarding this standard, John Fleming's report is attached (Attachment D) outlining how Andre lied to him on two subsequent days about his involvement posting flyers in the UDC. In addition, Andre attempted to lead me to believe he didn't post the flyers himself as per the following email he sent to me on 8/29/08, 12:56am: "Below is a copy of a letter I sent to Tina Archie Brown (NAACP President) and the NAACP community concerning the posters I and many others have been seeing posted throughout the community."

① On September 30th, Dara Raboy-Piccano, MSW sent me an email (Attachment E) outlining how Andre lied about getting an appointment with her at the Counseling Center.

On September 16th, Andre sent a 10 page email attachment to social work faculty and current and prior adjuncts. This (Attachment F) contains a number of deceptive remarks, including:

1.) On page two Andre notes that he told John Fleming that he didn't distribute the flyers in question because he had "different ones that (I) made and distributed and wasn't sure which one it was". The exact version of the poster that was distributed was clearly NOT what John was asking about and it was disingenuous of Andre to say that it was.

2.) On page three Andre states regarding the class Dave Tanenhaus taught in the spring that after "Chat with Laura", "many if not most of my cohort decided they want another professor or will boycott the class." In actuality, ten students attended the Chat with Laura where Dave's role as an instructor was discussed. One student said she didn't want to take his class based on what she heard from another student; the other nine said they thought that Dave was being slandered prior to folks even meeting him and they would be happy to take his class. After the close of class, the one student who voiced not wanting to take the class told me she was sorry she didn't take Dave's class, when it was clearly the best of the three sections offered.

3.) On page three Andre states that I told him that I wouldn't have Dave Tanenhaus teach after the first semester after I looked at the "facts"; in actuality I always said that it was not my place to look at the facts surrounding Dave's role at the Housing Authority, but that if an independent investigator (i.e., NASW, NAACP) revealed data that he was conducting unethical practice, then of course, he (or anyone else in that situation) would not teach in our program.

② 4.) On page four, Andre states that one of his clients came to my office "countless times"... "but got turned away". Andre also states that another client "tried countless times to set up appointments" with me, but that I was "always 'busy' or had 'meetings'". On page five, Andre describes the lack of support I gave his clients. On page nine, Andre says that I "ignored

(my) client cries." In point of fact, I am religious about responding to emails and phone calls as is Amy Edwards, my secretary, and I NEVER received a message from any of Andre's clients and neither did Amy. One woman came by with her children once when I was in a meeting, but left no message. I did meet with an advocate of one of Andre's clients when she made an appointment.

5.) On page four, Andre says that a social work professor questioned whether he was "worthy of the program." I cannot believe that is true of any of our full-time or adjunct faculty.

6.) Later on page four, Andre states that security at the UDC "outright harassed me and continue give me dirty looks when they see me now, all on behalf of protecting Mr. Tanenhaus." Our security staff is highly professional and I do not believe that they "harassed" Andre. Nor do I think they have any reason to "protect" Dave Tanenhaus.

7.) On the bottom of page five Andre describes my not being "available to talk" when he was upset about treatment from women in the program. I have never turned Andre away from a meeting.

8.) On page six, Andre talks about my not doing enough when he talked to me about Nadia planting drugs on him. My understanding was that the police were investigating this and unless they revealed something to the contrary, I could not imagine Nadia doing that.

9.) On page eight, Andre continues to state that "the community...feels Mr. Tanenhaus has violated social work code of ethics and should not be teaching". That is not the resounding message I get from the array of community members, students and alum that have come to me since Andre began sending emails around about this subject.

On September 27th, Andre sent an email around to SW alumni (Attachment G) which was given to me by some alums who felt uncomfortable with its contents, stating that it contained many falsehoods, especially regarding their experiences as students of color. This email is especially upsetting because faculty are not allowed to address Andre's situation despite the fact that students and alum are saying they know they are receiving one side of the story and are eager for the "other side".

1.) On page one, Andre states, in regards to John Fleming questioning him about his activities in the building after midnight the night that the flyers were distributed, "So beware you current and former MSWs, when you get in the building, you are supposed to tell security all you came there to do in the building when asked, if you don't, you can get kicked out of school for it."

2.) On page two, Andre states that "the MSW faculty is extremely divided right now." On the contrary, 100% of the social work faculty have either initiated this case or heard Andre's appeal and supported that he take a leave from the program.

On October 6th, Andre sent an email around to officers of the BU Graduate Student Organization (Attachment H) that was also given to our department by students upset about the claims against the department. This document also contains untruths including the following:

1.) On page two, Andre states that the "department's reason for kicking me out, it is all based on the content of the flyer...ALL of it." In truth, flyering is often a method used in community organizing and thus, many members of the social work faculty have engaged in it and support it as a means of creating public awareness about injustice. The concerns about Andre's flyers are: a.) his lying about putting them up; b.) that he targeted the Dept. of Social Work as perpetrators of injustice when a number of us on the faculty have been talking with

Andre for a year about our lack of ability to investigate the Housing Authority, although we have given him avenues to pursue for investigation himself which he ignores; and, c.) that he posted our department secretary, Amy Edwards' phone number on the poster without her permission resulting in a series of disconcerting calls to her on the first (and subsequent) day(s) of class about something which she knew nothing about. (14)

On September 23rd Andre submitted his appeal to the CCPA Ethics and Integrity Co. (which you have from him) where he states that the President of the NAACP "will want to be there". Attachment I is an email dated October 17th from NAACP Broome/Tioga President Tina Archie-Brown where she says she "never had a conversation with anyone (Andre included) where I stated I would be present at a hearing on campus as Andre's advocate. This was a falsehood or a misunderstanding, for this conversation never took place." (15)

A statement from Jennifer Marshall is included where she states that Andre has recently made dishonest statements about her which he has circulated among alums (Attachment J). A statement from Diane Wiener is also included with dishonest statements Andre has made and circulated about her (Attachment L). (16)

- (17) II. The second violation is 2.04 "*Social workers should not exploit clients in disputes with colleagues or engage clients in any inappropriate discussion of conflicts between social works and their colleagues*"; and 1.06b "*Social workers should not take unfair advantage of any professional relationship or exploit others to further their personal, religious, political, or business interests.*"

Regarding this standard, Andre has used those whom he calls his clients inappropriately by encouraging their involvement in his own personal educational appeal regarding his professional behavior in the MSW program. In his appeal to the CCPA Ethics and Integrity Co. he states that he wants his clients at his hearing "because they are among the people who have been supporting me..." It is inappropriate for clients who by definition of the relationship are in vulnerable positions in relation to the professional, to be the supports for workers; social workers are there to serve their clients.

Throughout Attachment F, Andre outlines clients that he claims contacted me. While I reiterated earlier that this was not the case, these statements from Andre point to his encouraging clients to meet with me, since they would have no idea of why to do that otherwise. This comes after I had many, many conversations with Andre where I told him that I could not help his clients with Housing Authority issues since I don't work in public housing in this community; encouraging clients to meet with me is about Andre's agenda with regard to Dave Tanenhaus and the BU Social Work Department, since I told Andre many times over the course of a year that I was not in a position to help his clients with housing-related concerns. (18)

- III. The third violation is 5.01 "*Social workers should act to prevent the unauthorized and unqualified practice of social work.*"

Andre has used the term "social justice" or "social work" (Attachment F; page six) to define his approach to the Binghamton Housing Authority and the Dept. of Social Work, but it is not the kind of social justice or social work we teach in the BU MSW program, nor is it the kind endorsed by NASW. Andre continually complains about the department and the Housing Authority but refuses to engage in productive activity geared towards change.

On page one of Attachment G, Andre reports a conversation with me, and argues, "I told her I'm tired of her telling myself and the student body to call NASW and file charges against Dave Tanenhaus. It was her job as department head." Despite my telling Andre over and over that it was not my job, he continues to perpetuate this useless path of complaining about my inaction in this regard instead of the many productive paths I continually encouraged him to follow. Some of my suggestions over the year that we discussed around this issue included: Encouraging Andre to file a claim with NASW to investigate Dave, offering to work on a grant together on eviction prevention for this community, and developing opportunities for MSW students to work on eviction prevention in the community. Andre was interested in none of these; only in complaining but without any substance, work or opportunities for resolution of the issue which he claims concerns him.

On page three of Attachment F Andre reports showing me the "numerous documentation on Mr. Tanenhaus and how he was breaking families in our community." Any "data" that Andre put forward to me documented no such thing. With regard to the "many racially insensitive experiences from classmates as well from some professors in the program", Andre refers to on page four of Attachment F, he has done nothing productive to address such concerns. In contrast, at one point the SW Students of Color group put forward a list of suggestions of ways the SW department could be more culturally competent. Two student leaders presented these at a department meeting; the department worked on these; we had a follow-up meeting with the leaders a few months later where they expressed appreciation for our responsiveness, including changing our new student orientation. Andre has been nowhere to be found among these types of productive efforts at change, engaged in by his peers.

IV. The fourth violation is 4.05 *"Social workers should not allow their own personal problems, psychological distress, legal problems, substance abuse, or mental health difficulties to interfere with their professional judgment and performance or to jeopardize the best interests of people for whom they have a professional responsibility."*

Andre's judgment is clearly called into question by the explicit sexual language and provocative accusations made in his emails which he sent to faculty, adjuncts and alums in Attachments F & G. In addition, Diane Wiener's letter to the CCPA Ethics & Integrity Committee illustrates his poor judgment (Attachment L), as does Brian Flynn's email (Attachment M).

After all of the allegations in the first nine pages of Andre's remarks in Attachment F, Andre says at the end of page nine that he is "really proud of the department and the great work we have accomplished." It doesn't make sense given what preceded it. Then he says that I should "put personal issues aside", when there are no personal issues in this case. He goes on to say "there will be dialogue" and that he has "faith these issues will be addressed and resolved." However those sentiments are so disjointed from the first nine pages and from his actions this semester. Andre has done nothing to take advantage of the dialogue that Diane, Brian (his two advisors) and I have all invited in the last few months. Diane and I gave Andre two conditions of the contract we proposed (which he included for the CCPA committee) that we said were unconditional - withdrawal from classes and a leave of absence for a year until his current courses are again offered; the contract presented an array of optional opportunities to address professional issues. Andre has refused to discuss these with us. (2)

On page two of Attachment G, Andre states that "the school" is "trying to quiet this and negotiate with me to stay in classes while sweeping it under the carpet." This is an alarming assessment of the situation. We have asked Andre to leave his classes; no "sweeping" is occurring. Later on that page, Andre's judgment is in question when he states: "I won't get into details but you will see a VERY different MSW program in the coming years. PROMISE that!" (22)

Juxtaposed against Andre's diatribe regarding Dave Tanenhaus is the following in a recent email from Dave (Attachment K): "Andre and I are planning on participating with the MSW Student Organization in their New Orleans trip in January 2009. After Andre wrote a statement detailing his displeasure about my participation, some students wondered whether his feelings would create a problem in the planning and implementation of the trip. A student reported to me that she questioned Andre about this and that he replied that there had been a misunderstanding with me in the past, but this had been resolved." (23)

In summary, discovering that a student is not a good fit for the profession is not an easy thing. Many social work faculty feel that the gatekeeper function is among the most challenging, sensitive and crucial aspects of what we do. We recognize this process has been difficult for Andre; it has also been difficult for our faculty, staff, students, alum and field instructors, made exorbitantly more difficult by Andre's one-sided emails that have blanketed the community and university. Unfortunately, these actions have done the opposite of his intention, presenting even more grave concerns about his ability to practice as a professional social worker, than when we met with him early in the second week of class. At this point, I am not sure that a leave of absence and work with a social work faculty member (as recommended by our social work advancement committee) will be adequate for Andre to make the changes necessary to complete his MSW degree at BU. A more realistic course of action and my recommendation at this point is for Andre to be dismissed from the social work program and to reapply should he take seriously the violations outlined in this memo and have the commitment and wherewithal to do something to turn his behavior around.

Reference

Koerin, B. & Miller, B. (1995). Gatekeeping policies: Terminating students for nonacademic reasons. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 31(2), 247-260.

Attachment A

1. Hearing. If a mutually satisfactory resolution of the alleged violation cannot be reached through a conference between accused and accuser, then a departmental hearing will ensue. The departmental grievance committee (see Section V above) will receive written documentation of the alleged violation. The graduate student will be given the opportunity to respond to the alleged violation in writing and in person. After a thorough investigation, the committee's decision on the disposition of the case will be forwarded to the accused student and to the department chair or program director. The committee may make recommendations concerning penalties for substantiated violations, but is not required to do so. The department chair or program director will accept the disposition of the case rendered by the committee and will determine and implement penalties in cases so disposed. Penalties for academic or professional misconduct may vary according to the circumstances of any particular case.
2. Appeal. If the student wishes to appeal either the disposition or penalties in a case of alleged misconduct, a written appeal should be forwarded to the Grievance Committee of the Graduate Council.

Academic Standards

A cumulative grade-point average (GPA) of at least 3.0 (on a scale where A = 4.0) is required for satisfactory academic standing and for graduate degree certification. When the GPA falls below 3.0, a student may be placed on academic probation (see below for further details). Graduate students may be dropped from the Graduate School by action of the Dean, on recommendation of the graduate program, or if it appears that they are not making satisfactory progress toward the degree and it is unlikely that they will satisfactorily complete the requirements for the degree.

Probation Policy

The Graduate School Policy clearly states that students must have a 3.0 GPA to receive a degree. In addition, Graduate School policy states that the minimum requirement for continuing status is the maintenance of a 3.0 GPA. If a student's GPA drops below a 3.0, he/she is placed on academic probation. When placed on probation a student meets with his/her advisor to develop a plan to improve performance to satisfactory levels. In the following semester, the student must obtain a semester GPA of 3.0 or higher. The student must obtain a cumulative GPA of 3.0 within two semesters (including summer terms) in order to continue with the program. The Graduate School allows students three semesters on probation before severing them from the program. Individual graduate programs may develop a more stringent policy, and the MSW Program has opted to do so. As stated above, we allow students to be on probation for two semesters (including summer sessions as a semester) before recommending to the Graduate School that they be severed from the program. While on probation, a student must meet with his/her advisor each semester.

Students whose GPA falls below a 2.0 are deemed by the Graduate School to be in "academic jeopardy." Students may be in academic jeopardy for only one semester. Additionally, the MSW Program has a policy that a grade of "C" in each of three courses or a grade of "F" in any course ~~taken as either a matriculated or non-matriculated status~~, will result in automatic dismissal from the MSW Program. The student may not be a candidate for the degree unless reinstated by the Dean of the Graduate School, upon recommendation of the MSW Program Director.

Student Advancement Policy

The purpose of this policy is to create a process which will allow a timely and positive intervention when students are identified by faculty, field instructors, or student peers as experiencing problems which interfere with their progress in the MSW program. Through this policy the MSW program exercises its responsibility to the social work profession and its clients to determine whether students have demonstrated the required level of achievement, in the areas of classroom performance, professional and ethical behavior, necessary to interact positively with client systems.

Advancement Requirements

from
Bu Social Work Handbook

Advancement of students from one semester to the next is contingent upon satisfactory progress each semester. Evaluation of student progress in class courses and in practicum is based upon criteria as stated in syllabi and the practicum manual and on skill, competencies, and personal behaviors listed below:

Academic Performance:

A "B" average (3.0 GPA) must be maintained in all work taken as part of the requirements for the degree.

The grade of "C" in each of three courses or a grade of "F" in any course will result in AUTOMATIC dismissal from the MSW program. The student may not be a candidate for the degree unless reinstated by the Director of the MSW program, upon recommendation of the faculty.

BACK TO TOP

Professional Performance:

1. Students are expected to obtain and analyze data, synthesize information, and reach sound assessment judgments.
2. Students are expected to plan and implement effective interventions.
3. Students are expected to relate well with clients and client systems, colleagues, agency supervisors, and community systems.
4. Students are expected to demonstrate a commitment to and skill in self-evaluation of practice.
5. Students are expected to respond to evaluation, testing and criticism with appropriate modification of behavior.

Ethical Performance

1. Students are expected to demonstrate honesty and integrity in all aspects of their academic program.
2. Students are expected to adhere to the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics in all interactions with clients, peers, staff, full-time and adjunct faculty, practicum instructors, and all other members of the University community.

Advancement Process and Procedure

Advancement is a process intended to assure each student maintains adequate progress in gaining the skills, competencies and behaviors required for graduation and ethical professional social work practice.

Students will advance automatically from semester to semester unless they are informed otherwise. Problems in academic, professional or ethical behavior may be identified at any point in the semester by faculty (full-time and adjunct) or staff. Additionally, the faculty will review students currently enrolled once each semester. This will be done at a closed meeting in which responses to students' names will be limited to "concern". No details or discussion will be allowed to facilitate timely completion of the review. The individual expressing the concern, if someone other than the student's adviser, will confer with the student's adviser (or the director of the program if the individual is the student's adviser) to determine whether the concern justifies the process set forth below.

1. Any faculty member (full-time or adjunct) or staff, who identifies a concern regarding a student's academic performance, professional behavior, or ethical conduct, shall immediately notify the student, the student's adviser, and the Program Committee Chair. The notice needs to be in writing and specify in what ways the student is failing to meet the advancement requirements.
2. The person identifying the concern shall meet with the student, the student's adviser, and one of the following: Director of the program or Program Committee Chair. They shall develop a written plan to resolve the academic, professional, or ethical deficiency. The plan shall state with specificity the concern(s), the actions to be undertaken by the student, and the date by which the student must demonstrate the completion of and compliance with the plan. The plan must allow a reasonable period of time for completion, but shall not allow more than one semester beyond the semester in which the concern is expressed. The plan must be signed by all the participants of

this meeting. If unable to reach consensus, the concern shall be returned to the Program Committee Chair who will appoint an Advancement Committee to consider the concern. A written copy of the plan agreed upon must be filed with the Program Committee Chair.

3. Students who have unresolved concern(s) (i.e. concern(s) for which the written plan is in the process of development or the written plan remains executory) on file with the Program Committee at the end of the semester shall be notified by the Program Committee chair that they are advanced on a probationary basis. Notwithstanding the foregoing, students will not be approved for graduation if they have unresolved concern(s) on file.

4. The student's adviser shall, on or before the date specified in the plan for resolution of the concern, consult with the person who identified the concern under item 1 above. If the student's adviser is the person identifying the concern, then he/she will consult with the Director of the program. They will determine whether or not the student has completed the actions designated in the plan and whether the concern has been resolved. This decision will be reported in writing to the Program Committee chair.

1. If the concern(s) is resolved, the Program Committee Chair shall provide the student a copy of this report.

2. If the concern(s) is not resolved, the Program Committee Chair shall notify the student in writing and provide a copy of the report. The Program Committee chair will appoint an Advancement Committee to consider action.

BACK TO TOP

Advancement Committee

The Program Committee Chair appoints the Advancement Committee which will determine if the student should be advanced in the program. The Advancement Committee shall consist of the following: the Program Committee Chair (chairs the Advancement Committee) and two faculty members. If the Program Committee Chair is the person identifying the concern under item 1 above or the student's advisor, the Director of the Program shall appoint another faculty member to serve on the committee and appoint one of the three members to serve as chair.

The Advancement Committee chair will convene a meeting of the Advancement Committee within 14 working days of its appointment. This meeting will include the Advancement Committee members, the person identifying the concern, university legal counsel as needed, the student's adviser and the student.

The student will be permitted to introduce any evidence, either in writing or through live witnesses, which the chair determines relevant to the proceeding. Formal rules of evidence shall not be applicable. The student may be accompanied by legal counsel or other adviser at his/her own expense. The accompanying adviser or counsel may provide advice to the student, but may not address the Advancement Committee. This process is designed to provide an opportunity for the student to be heard in an informal setting. It is not designed or capable of providing a court room setting with attendant technicalities in which attorneys are well versed.

The chair of the Advancement Committee shall arrange for the meeting to be audio tape recorded. Any additional record of the meeting shall be made at the expense of the requesting party.

The Advancement Committee will consider the concern(s) as explained by the person identifying the concern(s), the response of the student, and then discuss with the student's advisor any attempted resolution of the problem. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Advancement Committee will excuse themselves to determine a course of action.

The Advancement Committee may choose to:

- dismiss the concern as having no merit;
- place conditions on the student's advancement in the program;
- recommend the student be suspended for a period of time or dismissed from the program.

The Advancement Committee shall write a report that summarizes their deliberations and decision and send it to the student, the Director of the Program and the Dean of the College of Community and Public Affairs. The report shall be so delivered within 14 working days of the Advancement Committee meeting. Any notices or reports deliverable to the student hereunder

shall be deemed delivered when such is accomplished in person or by deposit in the United States Mail with adequate first class postage prepaid to the student's address of record with the University.

The proceedings and deliberations of the Advancement Committee shall be confidential, except to the extent (1) necessary to implement the findings of the Advancement Committee, (2) necessary to any appeal, (3) that the student has waived confidentiality by discussing the matter with parties outside the Advancement Committee, and (4) that the student seeks resolution of the concern in a forum external to the University.

Any report of the Advancement Committee shall become a part of the student's disciplinary record.

Grade Appeal Process and Procedure

- a) If a student wishes to appeal a final course grade, the student needs to put in writing the reasons why the student believes that the grade should be changed. The student needs to submit this written appeal via e-mail to the instructor-of-record for the course (field, non-field) within ten (10) business days of receiving the final course grade from the registrar's office. Upon receipt of the written appeal, the instructor-of-record for the course (field, non-field) will discuss the situation with the student as soon as possible (keeping in mind that the instructor may be out of town during semester breaks) with an aim to come to a satisfactory resolution of the matter.
 - b) Within five (5) business days of the discussion with the student, the instructor-of-record will submit a written response via e-mail to the student addressing the student's concerns and notifying the student whether or not the grade will be changed. A copy of the written notification will be placed in the student's folder. If the student is not satisfied with the instructor-of-record's decision, the student needs to put in writing the reasons why the student still believes that the grade should be changed, and attach a copy of the original document that was written to the instructor-of-record, along with a brief summary of the student's experience of the discussion with the instructor-of-record. All of these documents need to be forwarded via e-mail to the Director of the MSW Program within ten (10) business days following written notification from the instructor-of-record as to whether or not the grade will be changed.
 - c) Upon receipt of the student's written appeal, the Director will consult with the Program Committee Chair and they will appoint an ad hoc committee of a minimum of three (3) faculty and staff who will review the appeal. The Department will send a registered letter to the student with the date, time and location of the review.
 - d) The student should consult her/his advisor if the student requires more information about the appeal process.
 - e) The ad hoc committee will review all supporting documentation and hear from all parties concerned in this matter and make a decision as to whether the original grade stands or is changed. Within ten (10) business days of the review, the Committee will notify the student via e-mail the results of the review. A copy of this notification will be placed in the student's folder.
 - f) If the student is still not satisfied with the ad hoc committee's decision, the student may submit an appeal to the CCPA Grievance Committee.
2. Conflicts of Interest: Exemptions to Ad Hoc Committee Membership
- a) The student's advisor is exempt from serving on the ad hoc committee.
 - b) If the grade appeal concerns a grade for a field class, the student's field liaison and the Director of Field are exempt from serving on the ad hoc committee.
 - c) If the grade appeal concerns a grade for a non-field class, the student's instructor (who gave the grade being appealed) is exempt from serving on the ad hoc committee.

Graduate Student Severance or Removal of Support

Attachment B

Appendix B: Social Work Contract

College of Community and Public Affairs
MSW Program

Social Work Contract

I agree to the following academic contract:

Social workers serve a wide variety of client systems that could include the poor, victims, as well as perpetrators of abuse, people with different sexual orientations, those with racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds, people of all ages, persons from diverse religious, spiritual and cultural backgrounds, and many other aspects of human diversity. Social work services should be provided without prejudice and/or imposition of the worker's values on clients.

I have read and understand the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics and agree to adhere to the standards therein.

I will continue my professional development through regular self-assessment of my academic and personal aptitude and performance.

I will continue my professional development through regular faculty assessment of my academic and professional aptitude and performance.

I give any faculty or staff member permission to discuss my progress in the MSW Program with the Director and any other social work faculty or staff members.

I will become familiar with all course and program requirements and accept responsibility for taking all required courses in the correct sequence.

I understand that although I am admitted to the MSW Program, if my professional development is not deemed satisfactory by the social work faculty, the MSW Program has the right and responsibility to request reassessment of my suitability for the program. The social work faculty, in turn will provide academic instruction and professional advising to assist with the learning and professional development process.

Student's Name: _____

Student's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix C: NASW Code of Ethics

Attachment C

Code of Ethics

of the National Association of Social Workers

Approved by the 1996 NASW Delegate Assembly and revised by the 1999 NASW Delegate Assembly

Preamble

The primary mission of the social work profession is to enhance human well-being and help meet the basic human needs of all people, with particular attention to the needs and empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty. A historic and defining feature of social work is the profession's focus on individual well-being in a social context and the well-being of society. Fundamental to social work is attention to the environmental forces that create, contribute to, and address problems in living.

Social workers promote social justice and social change with and on behalf of clients. "Clients" is used inclusively to refer to individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers are sensitive to cultural and ethnic diversity and strive to end discrimination, oppression, poverty, and other forms of social injustice. These activities may be in the form of direct practice, community organizing, supervision, consultation, administration, advocacy, social and political action, policy development and implementation, education, and research and evaluation. Social workers seek to enhance the capacity of people to address their own needs. Social workers also seek to promote the responsiveness of organizations, communities, and other social institutions to individuals' needs and social problems.

The mission of the social work profession is rooted in a set of core values. These core values, embraced by social workers throughout the profession's history, are the foundation of social work's unique purpose and perspective:

- service
- social justice
- dignity and worth of the person
- importance of human relationships
- integrity
- competence

This constellation of core values reflects what is unique to the social work profession. Core values, and the principles that flow from them, must be balanced within the context and complexity of the human experience.

Purpose of the NASW Code of Ethics

Professional ethics are at the core of social work. The profession has an obligation to articulate its basic values, ethical principles, and ethical standards. The *NASW Code of Ethics* sets forth these values, principles, and standards to guide social workers' conduct. The *Code* is relevant to all social workers and social work students, regardless of their professional functions, the settings in which they work, or the populations they serve.

The *NASW Code of Ethics* serves six purposes:

1. The *Code* identifies core values on which social work's mission is based.
 2. The *Code* summarizes broad ethical principles that reflect the profession's core values and establishes a set of specific ethical standards that should be used to guide social work practice.
 3. The *Code* is designed to help social workers identify relevant considerations when professional obligations conflict or ethical uncertainties arise.
 4. The *Code* provides ethical standards to which the general public can hold the social work profession accountable.
 5. The *Code* socializes practitioners new to the field to social work's mission, values, ethical principles, and ethical standards.
 6. The *Code* articulates standards that the social work profession itself can use to assess whether social workers have engaged in unethical conduct. NASW has formal procedures to adjudicate ethics complaints filed against its members.* In subscribing to this *Code*, social workers are required to cooperate in its implementation, participate in NASW adjudication proceedings, and abide by any NASW disciplinary rulings or sanctions based on it.
- *For information on NASW adjudication procedures, see *NASW Procedures for the Adjudication of Grievances*.
- The *Code* offers a set of values, principles, and standards to guide decision making and conduct when ethical issues arise. It does not provide a set of rules that prescribe how social workers should act in all situations. Specific applications of the *Code* must take into account the context in which it is being considered and the possibility of conflicts among the *Code*'s values, principles, and standards. Ethical responsibilities flow from all human relationships, from the personal and familial to the social and professional.
- Further, the *NASW Code of Ethics* does not specify which values, principles, and standards are most important and ought to outweigh others in instances when they conflict. Reasonable differences of opinion can and do exist among social workers with respect to the ways in which values, ethical principles, and ethical standards should be rank ordered when they conflict. Ethical decision making in a given situation must apply the informed judgment of the individual social worker and should also consider how the issues would be judged in a peer review process where the

ethical standards of the profession would be applied.

Ethical decision making is a process. There are many instances in social work where simple answers are not available to resolve complex ethical issues. Social workers should take into consideration all the values, principles, and standards in this Code that are relevant to any situation in which ethical judgment is warranted. Social workers' decisions and actions should be consistent with the spirit as well as the letter of this Code.

In addition to this Code, there are many other sources of information about ethical thinking that may be useful. Social workers should consider ethical theory and principles generally, social work theory and research, laws, regulations, agency policies, and other relevant codes of ethics; recognizing that among codes of ethics social workers should consider the NASW Code of Ethics as their primary source. Social workers also should be aware of the impact on ethical decision making of their clients' and their own personal values and cultural and religious beliefs and practices. They should be aware of any conflicts between personal and professional values and deal with them responsibly. For additional guidance social workers should consult the relevant literature on professional ethics and ethical decision making and seek appropriate consultation when faced with ethical dilemmas. This may involve consultation with an agency-based or social work organization's ethics committee, a regulatory body, knowledgeable colleagues, supervisors, or legal counsel.

Instances may arise when social workers' ethical obligations conflict with agency policies or relevant laws or regulations. When such conflicts occur, social workers must make a responsible effort to resolve the conflict in a manner that is consistent with the values, principles, and standards expressed in this Code. If a reasonable resolution of the conflict does not appear possible, social workers should seek proper consultation before making a decision. The NASW Code of Ethics is to be used by NASW and by individuals, agencies, organizations, and bodies (such as licensing and regulatory boards, professional liability insurance providers, courts of law, agency boards of directors, government agencies, and other professional groups) that choose to adopt it or use it as a frame of reference. Violation of standards in this Code does not automatically imply legal liability or violation of the law. Such determination can only be made in the context of legal and judicial proceedings. Alleged violations of the Code would be subject to a peer review process. Such processes are generally separate from legal or administrative procedures and insulated from legal review or proceedings to allow the profession to counsel and discipline its own members.

A code of ethics cannot guarantee ethical behavior. Moreover, a code of ethics cannot resolve all ethical issues or disputes or capture the richness and complexity involved in striving to make responsible choices within a moral community. Rather, a code of ethics sets forth values, ethical principles, and ethical standards to which professionals aspire and by which their actions can be judged. Social workers' ethical behavior should result from their personal commitment to engage in ethical practice. The NASW Code of Ethics reflects the commitment of all social workers to uphold the profession's values and to act ethically. Principles and standards must be applied by individuals of good character who discern moral questions and, in good faith, seek to make reliable ethical judgments.

Ethical Principles

The following broad ethical principles are based on social work's core values of service, social justice, dignity and worth of the person, importance of human relationships, integrity, and competence. These principles set forth ideals to which all social workers should aspire.

Value: Service

Ethical Principle: *Social workers' primary goal is to help people in need and to address social problems.*

Social workers elevate service to others above self-interest. Social workers draw on their knowledge, values, and skills to help people in need and to address social problems. Social workers are encouraged to volunteer some portion of their professional skills with no expectation of significant financial return (pro bono service).

Value: Social Justice

Ethical Principle: *Social workers challenge social injustice.*

Social workers pursue social change, particularly with and on behalf of vulnerable and oppressed individuals and groups of people. Social workers' social change efforts are focused primarily on issues of poverty, unemployment, discrimination, and other forms of social injustice. These activities seek to promote sensitivity to and knowledge about oppression and cultural and ethnic diversity. Social workers strive to ensure access to needed information, services, and resources; equality of opportunity; and meaningful participation in decision making for all people.

Value: Dignity and Worth of the Person

Ethical Principle: *Social workers respect the inherent dignity and worth of the person.*

Social workers treat each person in a caring and respectful fashion, mindful of individual differences and cultural and ethnic diversity. Social workers promote clients' socially responsible self-determination. Social workers seek to enhance clients' capacity and opportunity to change and to address their own needs. Social workers are cognizant of their dual responsibility to clients and to the broader society. They seek to resolve conflicts between clients' interests and the broader society's interests in a socially responsible manner consistent with the values, ethical principles, and ethical standards of the profession.

Value: Importance of Human Relationships

Ethical Principle: *Social workers recognize the central importance of human relationships.*

Social workers understand that relationships between and among people are an important vehicle for change. Social workers engage people as partners in the helping process. Social workers seek to strengthen relationships among people in a purposeful effort to promote, restore, maintain, and enhance the well-being of individuals, families, social groups, organizations, and communities.

Value: Integrity

Ethical Principle: *Social workers behave in a trustworthy manner.*

Social workers are continually aware of the profession's mission, values, ethical principles, and ethical standards and practice in a manner consistent with them. Social workers act honestly and responsibly and promote ethical practices on the part of the organizations with which they are affiliated.

Value: Competence

Ethical Principle: *Social workers practice within their areas of competence and develop and enhance their professional expertise.*

Social workers continually strive to increase their professional knowledge and skills and to apply them in practice. Social workers should aspire to contribute to the knowledge base of the profession.

Ethical Standards

The following ethical standards are relevant to the professional activities of all social workers. These standards concern (1) social workers' ethical responsibilities to clients, (2) social workers' ethical responsibilities to colleagues, (3) social workers' ethical responsibilities in practice settings, (4) social workers' ethical responsibilities as professionals, (5) social workers' ethical responsibilities to the social work profession, and (6) social workers' ethical responsibilities to the broader society.

Some of the standards that follow are enforceable guidelines for professional conduct, and some are aspirational. The extent to which each standard is enforceable is a matter of professional judgment to be exercised by those responsible for reviewing alleged violations of ethical standards.

1. Social Workers' Ethical Responsibilities to Clients

1.01 Commitment to Clients

Social workers' primary responsibility is to promote the well-being of clients. In general, clients' interests are primary. However, social workers' responsibility to the larger society or specific legal obligations may on limited occasions supersede the loyalty owed clients, and clients should be so advised. (Examples include when a social worker is required by law to report that a client has abused a child or has threatened to harm self or others.)

1.02 Self-Determination

Social workers respect and promote the right of clients to self-determination and assist clients in their efforts to identify and clarify their goals. Social workers may limit clients' right to self-determination when, in the social workers' professional judgment, clients' actions or potential actions pose a serious, foreseeable, and imminent risk to themselves or others.

1.03 Informed Consent

(a) Social workers should provide services to clients only in the context of a professional relationship based, when appropriate, on valid informed consent. Social workers should use clear and understandable language to inform clients of the purpose of the services, risks related to the services, limits to services because of the requirements of a third-party payer, relevant costs, reasonable alternatives, clients' right to refuse or withdraw consent, and the time frame covered by the consent. Social workers should provide clients with an opportunity to ask questions.

(b) In instances when clients are not literate or have difficulty understanding the primary language used in the practice setting, social workers should take steps to ensure clients' comprehension. This may include providing clients with a detailed verbal explanation or arranging for a qualified interpreter or translator whenever possible.

(c) In instances when clients lack the capacity to provide informed consent, social workers should protect clients' interests by seeking permission from an appropriate third party, informing clients consistent with the clients' level of understanding. In such instances social workers should seek to ensure that the third party acts in a manner consistent with clients' wishes and interests. Social workers should take reasonable steps to enhance such clients' ability to give informed consent.

(d) In instances when clients are receiving services involuntarily, social workers should provide information about the nature and extent of services and about the extent of clients' right to refuse service.

(e) Social workers who provide services via electronic media (such as computer, telephone, radio, and television) should inform recipients of the limitations and risks associated with such services.

(f) Social workers should obtain clients' informed consent before audiotaping or videotaping clients or permitting observation of services to clients by a third party.

1.04 Competence

(a) Social workers should provide services and represent themselves as competent only within the boundaries of their education, training, license, certification, consultation received, supervised experience, or other relevant professional experience.

(b) Social workers should provide services in substantive areas or use intervention techniques or approaches that are new to them only after engaging in appropriate study, training, consultation, and supervision from people who are competent in those interventions or techniques.

(c) When generally recognized standards do not exist with respect to an emerging area of practice, social workers should exercise careful judgment and take responsible steps (including appropriate education, research, training, consultation, and supervision) to ensure the competence of their work and to protect clients from harm.

1.05 Cultural Competence and Social Diversity

(a) Social workers should understand culture and its function in human behavior and society, recognizing the strengths that exist in all cultures.

(b) Social workers should have a knowledge base of their clients' cultures and be able to demonstrate competence in the provision of services that are sensitive to clients' cultures and to differences among people and cultural groups.

(c) Social workers should obtain education about and seek to understand the nature of social diversity and oppression with respect to race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, political belief, religion, and mental or physical disability.

1.06 Conflicts of Interest

(a) Social workers should be alert to and avoid conflicts of interest that interfere with the exercise of professional discretion and impartial judgment. Social workers should inform clients when a real or potential conflict of interest arises and take reasonable steps to resolve the issue in a manner that makes the clients' interests primary and protects clients' interests to the greatest extent possible. In some cases, protecting clients' interests may require termination of the professional relationship with proper referral of the client.

(b) Social workers should not take unfair advantage of any professional relationship or exploit others to further their personal, religious, political, or business interests.

(c) Social workers should not engage in dual or multiple relationships with clients or former clients in which there is a risk of exploitation or potential harm to the client. In instances when dual or multiple relationships are unavoidable, social workers should take steps to protect clients and are responsible for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries. (Dual or multiple relationships occur when social workers relate to clients in more than one relationship, whether professional, social, or business. Dual or multiple relationships can occur simultaneously or consecutively.)

(d) When social workers provide services to two or more people who have a relationship with each other (for example, couples, family members), social workers should clarify with all parties which individuals will be considered clients and the nature of social workers' professional obligations to the various individuals who are receiving services. Social workers who anticipate a conflict of interest among the individuals receiving services or who anticipate having to perform in potentially conflicting roles (for example, when a social worker is asked to testify in a child custody dispute or divorce proceedings involving clients) should clarify their role with the parties involved and take appropriate action to minimize any conflict of interest.

1.07 Privacy and Confidentiality

(a) Social workers should respect clients' right to privacy. Social workers should not solicit private information from clients unless it is essential to providing services or conducting social work evaluation or research. Once private information is shared, standards of confidentiality apply.

(b) Social workers may disclose confidential information when appropriate with valid consent from a client or a person legally authorized to consent on behalf of a client.

(c) Social workers should protect the confidentiality of all information obtained in the course of professional service, except for compelling professional reasons. The general expectation that social workers will keep information confidential does not apply when disclosure is necessary to prevent serious, foreseeable, and imminent harm to a client or other identifiable person. In all instances, social workers should disclose the least amount of confidential information necessary to achieve the desired purpose; only information that is directly relevant to the purpose for which the disclosure is made should be revealed.

(d) Social workers should inform clients, to the extent possible, about the disclosure of confidential information and the potential consequences, when feasible before the disclosure is made. This applies whether social workers disclose confidential information on the basis of a legal requirement or client consent.

(e) Social workers should discuss with clients and other interested parties the nature of confidentiality and limitations of clients' right to confidentiality. Social workers should review with clients circumstances where confidential information may be requested and where disclosure of confidential information may be legally required. This discussion should occur as soon as possible in the social worker-client relationship and as needed throughout the course of the relationship.

(f) When social workers provide counseling services to families, couples, or groups, social workers should seek agreement among the parties involved concerning each individual's right to confidentiality and obligation to preserve the confidentiality of information shared by others. Social workers should inform participants in family, couples, or group counseling that social workers cannot guarantee that all participants will honor such agreements.

- (g) Social workers should inform clients involved in family, couples, marital, or group counseling of the social worker's, employer's, and agency's policy concerning the social worker's disclosure of confidential information among the parties involved in the counseling.
- (h) Social workers should not disclose confidential information to third-party payers unless clients have authorized such disclosure.
- (i) Social workers should not discuss confidential information in any setting unless privacy can be ensured. Social workers should not discuss confidential information in public or semipublic areas such as hallways, waiting rooms, elevators, and restaurants.
- (j) Social workers should protect the confidentiality of clients during legal proceedings to the extent permitted by law. When a court of law or other legally authorized body orders social workers to disclose confidential or privileged information without a client's consent and such disclosure could cause harm to the client, social workers should request that the court withdraw the order or limit the order as narrowly as possible or maintain the records under seal, unavailable for public inspection.
- (k) Social workers should protect the confidentiality of clients when responding to requests from members of the media.
- (l) Social workers should protect the confidentiality of clients' written and electronic records and other sensitive information. Social workers should take reasonable steps to ensure that clients' records are stored in a secure location and that clients' records are not available to others who are not authorized to have access.
- (m) Social workers should take precautions to ensure and maintain the confidentiality of information transmitted to other parties through the use of computers, electronic mail, facsimile machines, telephones and telephone answering machines, and other electronic or computer technology. Disclosure of identifying information should be avoided whenever possible.
- (n) Social workers should transfer or dispose of clients' records in a manner that protects clients' confidentiality and is consistent with state statutes governing records and social work licensure.
- (o) Social workers should take reasonable precautions to protect client confidentiality in the event of the social worker's termination of practice, incapacitation, or death.
- (p) Social workers should not disclose identifying information when discussing clients for teaching or training purposes unless the client has consented to disclosure of confidential information.
- (q) Social workers should not disclose identifying information when discussing clients with consultants unless the client has consented to disclosure of confidential information or there is a compelling need for such disclosure.
- (r) Social workers should protect the confidentiality of deceased clients consistent with the preceding standards.

1.08 Access to Records

- (a) Social workers should provide clients with reasonable access to records concerning the clients. Social workers who are concerned that clients' access to their records could cause serious misunderstanding or harm to the client should provide assistance in interpreting the records and consultation with the client regarding the records. Social workers should limit clients' access to their records, or portions of their records, only in exceptional circumstances when there is compelling evidence that such access would cause serious harm to the client. Both clients' requests and the rationale for withholding some or all of the record should be documented in clients' files.
- (b) When providing clients with access to their records, social workers should take steps to protect the confidentiality of other individuals identified or discussed in such records.

1.09 Sexual Relationships

- (a) Social workers should under no circumstances engage in sexual activities or sexual contact with current clients, whether such contact is consensual or forced.
- (b) Social workers should not engage in sexual activities or sexual contact with clients' relatives or other individuals with whom clients maintain a close personal relationship when there is a risk of exploitation or potential harm to the client. Sexual activity or sexual contact with clients' relatives or other individuals with whom clients maintain a personal relationship has the potential to be harmful to the client and may make it difficult for the social worker and client to maintain appropriate professional boundaries. Social workers—not their clients, their clients' relatives, or other individuals with whom the client maintains a personal relationship—assume the full burden for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries.
- (c) Social workers should not engage in sexual activities or sexual contact with former clients because of the potential for harm to the client. If social workers engage in conduct contrary to this prohibition or claim that an exception to this prohibition is warranted because of extraordinary circumstances, it is social workers—not their clients—who assume the full burden of demonstrating that the former client has not been exploited, coerced, or manipulated, intentionally or unintentionally.
- (d) Social workers should not provide clinical services to individuals with whom they have had a prior sexual relationship. Providing clinical services to a former sexual partner has the potential to be harmful to the individual and is likely to make it difficult for the social worker and individual to maintain appropriate professional boundaries.

1.10 Physical Contact

Social workers should not engage in physical contact with clients when there is a possibility of psychological harm to

the client as a result of the contact (such as cradling or caressing clients). Social workers who engage in appropriate physical contact with clients are responsible for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries that govern such physical contact.

1.11 Sexual Harassment

Social workers should not sexually harass clients. Sexual harassment includes sexual advances, sexual solicitation, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature.

1.12 Derogatory Language

Social workers should not use derogatory language in their written or verbal communications to or about clients. Social workers should use accurate and respectful language in all communications to and about clients.

1.13 Payment for Services

(a) When setting fees, social workers should ensure that the fees are fair, reasonable, and commensurate with the services performed. Consideration should be given to clients' ability to pay.

(b) Social workers should avoid accepting goods or services from clients as payment for professional services.

Bartering arrangements, particularly involving services, create the potential for conflicts of interest, exploitation, and inappropriate boundaries in social workers' relationships with clients. Social workers should explore and may participate in bartering only in very limited circumstances when it can be demonstrated that such arrangements are an accepted practice among professionals in the local community, considered to be essential for the provision of services, negotiated without coercion, and entered into at the client's initiative and with the client's informed consent. Social workers who accept goods or services from clients as payment for professional services assume the full burden of demonstrating that this arrangement will not be detrimental to the client or the professional relationship.

(c) Social workers should not solicit a private fee or other remuneration for providing services to clients who are entitled to such available services through the social workers' employer or agency.

1.14 Clients Who Lack Decision-Making Capacity

When social workers act on behalf of clients who lack the capacity to make informed decisions, social workers should take reasonable steps to safeguard the interests and rights of those clients.

1.15 Interruption of Services

Social workers should make reasonable efforts to ensure continuity of services in the event that services are interrupted by factors such as unavailability, relocation, illness, disability, or death.

1.16 Termination of Services

(a) Social workers should terminate services to clients and professional relationships with them when such services and relationships are no longer required or no longer serve the clients' needs or interests.

(b) Social workers should take reasonable steps to avoid abandoning clients who are still in need of services. Social workers should withdraw services precipitously only under unusual circumstances, giving careful consideration to all factors in the situation and taking care to minimize possible adverse effects. Social workers should assist in making appropriate arrangements for continuation of services when necessary.

(c) Social workers in fee-for-service settings may terminate services to clients who are not paying an overdue balance if the financial contractual arrangements have been made clear to the client, if the client does not pose an imminent danger to self or others, and if the clinical and other consequences of the current nonpayment have been addressed and discussed with the client.

(d) Social workers should not terminate services to pursue a social, financial, or sexual relationship with a client.

(e) Social workers who anticipate the termination or interruption of services to clients should notify clients promptly and seek the transfer, referral, or continuation of services in relation to the clients' needs and preferences.

(f) Social workers who are leaving an employment setting should inform clients of appropriate options for the continuation of services and of the benefits and risks of the options.

2. Social Workers' Ethical Responsibilities to Colleagues

2.01 Respect

(a) Social workers should treat colleagues with respect and should represent accurately and fairly the qualifications, views, and obligations of colleagues.

(b) Social workers should avoid unwarranted negative criticism of colleagues in communications with clients or with other professionals. Unwarranted negative criticism may include demeaning comments that refer to colleagues' level of competence or to individuals' attributes such as race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, political belief, religion, and mental or physical disability.

(c) Social workers should cooperate with social work colleagues and with colleagues of other professions when such cooperation serves the well-being of clients.

2.02 Confidentiality

Social workers should respect confidential information shared by colleagues in the course of their professional relationships and transactions. Social workers should ensure that such colleagues understand social workers' obligation to respect confidentiality and any exceptions related to it.

2.03 Interdisciplinary Collaboration

- (a) Social workers who are members of an interdisciplinary team should participate in and contribute to decisions that affect the well-being of clients by drawing on the perspectives, values, and experiences of the social work profession. Professional and ethical obligations of the interdisciplinary team as a whole and of its individual members should be clearly established.
- (b) Social workers for whom a team decision raises ethical concerns should attempt to resolve the disagreement through appropriate channels. If the disagreement cannot be resolved, social workers should pursue other avenues to address their concerns consistent with client well-being.

2.04 Disputes Involving Colleagues

- (a) Social workers should not take advantage of a dispute between a colleague and an employer to obtain a position or otherwise advance the social workers' own interests.
- (b) Social workers should not exploit clients in disputes with colleagues or engage clients in any inappropriate discussion of conflicts between social workers and their colleagues.

2.05 Consultation

- (a) Social workers should seek the advice and counsel of colleagues whenever such consultation is in the best interests of clients.
- (b) Social workers should keep themselves informed about colleagues' areas of expertise and competencies. Social workers should seek consultation only from colleagues who have demonstrated knowledge, expertise, and competence related to the subject of the consultation.
- (c) When consulting with colleagues about clients, social workers should disclose the least amount of information necessary to achieve the purposes of the consultation.

2.06 Referral for Services

- (a) Social workers should refer clients to other professionals when the other professionals' specialized knowledge or expertise is needed to serve clients fully or when social workers believe that they are not being effective or making reasonable progress with clients and that additional service is required.
- (b) Social workers who refer clients to other professionals should take appropriate steps to facilitate an orderly transfer of responsibility. Social workers who refer clients to other professionals should disclose, with clients' consent, all pertinent information to the new service providers.
- (c) Social workers are prohibited from giving or receiving payment for a referral when no professional service is provided by the referring social worker.

2.07 Sexual Relationships

- (a) Social workers who function as supervisors or educators should not engage in sexual activities or contact with supervisees, students, trainees, or other colleagues over whom they exercise professional authority.
- (b) Social workers should avoid engaging in sexual relationships with colleagues when there is potential for a conflict of interest. Social workers who become involved in, or anticipate becoming involved in, a sexual relationship with a colleague have a duty to transfer professional responsibilities, when necessary, to avoid a conflict of interest.

2.08 Sexual Harassment

- (a) Social workers should not sexually harass supervisees, students, trainees, or colleagues. Sexual harassment includes sexual advances, sexual solicitation, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature.

2.09 Impairment of Colleagues

- (a) Social workers who have direct knowledge of a social work colleague's impairment that is due to personal problems, psychosocial distress, substance abuse, or mental health difficulties and that interferes with practice effectiveness should consult with that colleague when feasible and assist the colleague in taking remedial action.
- (b) Social workers who believe that a social work colleague's impairment interferes with practice effectiveness and that the colleague has not taken adequate steps to address the impairment should take action through appropriate channels established by employers, agencies, NASW, licensing and regulatory bodies, and other professional organizations.

2.10 Incompetence of Colleagues

- (a) Social workers who have direct knowledge of a social work colleague's incompetence should consult with that colleague when feasible and assist the colleague in taking remedial action.
- (b) Social workers who believe that a social work colleague is incompetent and has not taken adequate steps to address the incompetence should take action through appropriate channels established by employers, agencies, NASW, licensing and regulatory bodies, and other professional organizations.

2.11 Unethical Conduct of Colleagues

- (a) Social workers should take adequate measures to discourage, prevent, expose, and correct the unethical conduct of colleagues.
- (b) Social workers should be knowledgeable about established policies and procedures for handling concerns about

colleagues' unethical behavior. Social workers should be familiar with national, state, and local procedures for handling ethics complaints. These include policies and procedures created by NASW, licensing and regulatory bodies, employers, agencies, and other professional organizations.

(c) Social workers who believe that a colleague has acted unethically should seek resolution by discussing their concerns with the colleague when feasible and when such discussion is likely to be productive.

(d) When necessary, social workers who believe that a colleague has acted unethically should take action through appropriate formal channels (such as contacting a state licensing board or regulatory body, an NASW committee on inquiry, or other professional ethics committees).

(e) Social workers should defend and assist colleagues who are unjustly charged with unethical conduct.

3. Social Workers' Ethical Responsibilities in Practice Settings

3.01 Supervision and Consultation

(a) Social workers who provide supervision or consultation should have the necessary knowledge and skill to supervise or consult appropriately and should do so only within their areas of knowledge and competence.

(b) Social workers who provide supervision or consultation are responsible for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries.

(c) Social workers should not engage in any dual or multiple relationships with supervisees in which there is a risk of exploitation or of potential harm to the supervisee.

(d) Social workers who provide supervision should evaluate supervisees' performance in a manner that is fair and respectful.

3.02 Education and Training

(a) Social workers who function as educators, field instructors for students, or trainers should provide instruction only within their areas of knowledge and competence and should provide instruction based on the most current information and knowledge available in the profession.

(b) Social workers who function as educators or field instructors for students should evaluate students' performance in a manner that is fair and respectful.

(c) Social workers who function as educators or field instructors for students should take reasonable steps to ensure that clients are routinely informed when services are being provided by students.

(d) Social workers who function as educators or field instructors for students should not engage in any dual or multiple relationships with students in which there is a risk of exploitation or potential harm to the student. Social work educators and field instructors are responsible for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries.

3.03 Performance Evaluation

Social workers who have responsibility for evaluating the performance of others should fulfill such responsibility in a fair and considerate manner and on the basis of clearly stated criteria.

3.04 Client Records

(a) Social workers should take reasonable steps to ensure that documentation in records is accurate and reflects the services provided.

(b) Social workers should include sufficient and timely documentation in records to facilitate the delivery of services and to ensure continuity of services provided to clients in the future.

(c) Social workers' documentation should protect clients' privacy to the extent that is possible and appropriate and should include only information that is directly relevant to the delivery of services.

(d) Social workers should store records following the termination of services to ensure reasonable future access. Records should be maintained for the number of years required by state statutes or relevant contracts.

3.05 Billing

Social workers should establish and maintain billing practices that accurately reflect the nature and extent of services provided and that identify who provided the service in the practice setting.

3.06 Client Transfer

(a) When an individual who is receiving services from another agency or colleague contacts a social worker for services, the social worker should carefully consider the client's needs before agreeing to provide services. To minimize possible confusion and conflict, social workers should discuss with potential clients the nature of the clients' current relationship with other service providers and the implications, including possible benefits or risks, of entering into a relationship with a new service provider.

(b) If a new client has been served by another agency or colleague, social workers should discuss with the client whether consultation with the previous service provider is in the client's best interest.

3.07 Administration

(a) Social work administrators should advocate within and outside their agencies for adequate resources to meet clients' needs.

(b) Social workers should advocate for resource allocation procedures that are open and fair. When not all clients' needs can be met, an allocation procedure should be developed that is nondiscriminatory and based on appropriate

and consistently applied principles.

(c) Social workers who are administrators should take reasonable steps to ensure that adequate agency or organizational resources are available to provide appropriate staff supervision.

(d) Social work administrators should take reasonable steps to ensure that the working environment for which they are responsible is consistent with and encourages compliance with the NASW Code of Ethics. Social work administrators should take reasonable steps to eliminate any conditions in their organizations that violate, interfere with, or discourage compliance with the Code.

3.08 Continuing Education and Staff Development

Social work administrators and supervisors should take reasonable steps to provide or arrange for continuing education and staff development for all staff for whom they are responsible. Continuing education and staff development should address current knowledge and emerging developments related to social work practice and ethics.

3.09 Commitments to Employers

(a) Social workers generally should adhere to commitments made to employers and employing organizations.

(b) Social workers should work to improve employing agencies' policies and procedures and the efficiency and effectiveness of their services.

(c) Social workers should take reasonable steps to ensure that employers are aware of social workers' ethical obligations as set forth in the NASW Code of Ethics and of the implications of those obligations for social work practice.

(d) Social workers should not allow an employing organization's policies, procedures, regulations, or administrative orders to interfere with their ethical practice of social work. Social workers should take reasonable steps to ensure that their employing organizations' practices are consistent with the NASW Code of Ethics.

(e) Social workers should act to prevent and eliminate discrimination in the employing organization's work assignments and in its employment policies and practices.

(f) Social workers should accept employment or arrange student field placements only in organizations that exercise fair personnel practices.

(g) Social workers should be diligent stewards of the resources of their employing organizations, wisely conserving funds where appropriate and never misappropriating funds or using them for unintended purposes.

3.10 Labor-Management Disputes

(a) Social workers may engage in organized action, including the formation of and participation in labor unions, to improve services to clients and working conditions.

(b) The actions of social workers who are involved in labor-management disputes, job actions, or labor strikes should be guided by the profession's values, ethical principles, and ethical standards. Reasonable differences of opinion exist among social workers concerning their primary obligation as professionals during an actual or threatened labor strike or job action. Social workers should carefully examine relevant issues and their possible impact on clients before deciding on a course of action.

4. Social Workers' Ethical Responsibilities as Professionals

4.01 Competence

(a) Social workers should accept responsibility or employment only on the basis of existing competence or the intention to acquire the necessary competence.

(b) Social workers should strive to become and remain proficient in professional practice and the performance of professional functions. Social workers should critically examine and keep current with emerging knowledge relevant to social work. Social workers should routinely review the professional literature and participate in continuing education relevant to social work practice and social work ethics.

(c) Social workers should base practice on recognized knowledge, including empirically based knowledge, relevant to social work and social work ethics.

4.02 Discrimination

Social workers should not practice, condone, facilitate, or collaborate with any form of discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, political belief, religion, or mental or physical disability.

4.03 Private Conduct

Social workers should not permit their private conduct to interfere with their ability to fulfill their professional responsibilities.

4.04 Dishonesty, Fraud, and Deception

Social workers should not participate in, condone, or be associated with dishonesty, fraud, or deception.

4.05 Impairment

(a) Social workers should not allow their own personal problems, psychosocial distress, legal problems, substance abuse, or mental health difficulties to interfere with their professional judgment and performance or to jeopardize the best interests of people for whom they have a professional responsibility.

(b) Social workers whose personal problems, psychosocial distress, legal problems, substance abuse, or mental health difficulties interfere with their professional judgment and performance should immediately seek consultation and take appropriate remedial action by seeking professional help, making adjustments in workload, terminating practice, or taking any other steps necessary to protect clients and others.

4.06 Misrepresentation

(a) Social workers should make clear distinctions between statements made and actions engaged in as a private individual and as a representative of the social work profession, a professional social work organization, or the social worker's employing agency.

(b) Social workers who speak on behalf of professional social work organizations should accurately represent the official and authorized positions of the organizations.

(c) Social workers should ensure that their representations to clients, agencies, and the public of professional qualifications, credentials, education, competence, affiliations, services provided, or results to be achieved are accurate. Social workers should claim only those relevant professional credentials they actually possess and take steps to correct any inaccuracies or misrepresentations of their credentials by others.

4.07 Solicitations

(a) Social workers should not engage in unsolicited solicitation of potential clients who, because of their circumstances, are vulnerable to undue influence, manipulation, or coercion.

(b) Social workers should not engage in solicitation of testimonial endorsements (including solicitation of consent to use a client's prior statement as a testimonial endorsement) from current clients or from other people who, because of their particular circumstances, are vulnerable to undue influence.

4.08 Acknowledging Credit

(a) Social workers should take responsibility and credit, including authorship credit, only for work they have actually performed and to which they have contributed.

(b) Social workers should honestly acknowledge the work of and the contributions made by others.

5. Social Workers' Ethical Responsibilities to the Social Work Profession

5.01 Integrity of the Profession

(a) Social workers should work toward the maintenance and promotion of high standards of practice.

(b) Social workers should uphold and advance the values, ethics, knowledge, and mission of the profession. Social workers should protect, enhance, and improve the integrity of the profession through appropriate study and research, active discussion, and responsible criticism of the profession.

(c) Social workers should contribute time and professional expertise to activities that promote respect for the value, integrity, and competence of the social work profession. These activities may include teaching, research, consultation, service, legislative testimony, presentations in the community, and participation in their professional organizations.

(d) Social workers should contribute to the knowledge base of social work and share with colleagues their knowledge related to practice, research, and ethics. Social workers should seek to contribute to the profession's literature and to share their knowledge at professional meetings and conferences.

(e) Social workers should act to prevent the unauthorized and unqualified practice of social work.

5.02 Evaluation and Research

(a) Social workers should monitor and evaluate policies, the implementation of programs, and practice interventions.

(b) Social workers should promote and facilitate evaluation and research to contribute to the development of knowledge.

(c) Social workers should critically examine and keep current with emerging knowledge relevant to social work and fully use evaluation and research evidence in their professional practice.

(d) Social workers engaged in evaluation or research should carefully consider possible consequences and should follow guidelines developed for the protection of evaluation and research participants. Appropriate institutional review boards should be consulted.

(e) Social workers engaged in evaluation or research should obtain voluntary and written informed consent from participants, when appropriate, without any implied or actual deprivation or penalty for refusal to participate; without undue inducement to participate; and with due regard for participants' well-being, privacy, and dignity. Informed consent should include information about the nature, extent, and duration of the participation requested and disclosure of the risks and benefits of participation in the research.

(f) When evaluation or research participants are incapable of giving informed consent, social workers should provide an appropriate explanation to the participants, obtain the participants' assent to the extent they are able, and obtain written consent from an appropriate proxy.

(g) Social workers should never design or conduct evaluation or research that does not use consent procedures, such as certain forms of naturalistic observation and archival research, unless rigorous and responsible review of the research has found it to be justified because of its prospective scientific, educational, or applied value and unless equally effective alternative procedures that do not involve waiver of consent are not feasible.

- (h) Social workers should inform participants of their right to withdraw from evaluation and research at any time without penalty.
- (i) Social workers should take appropriate steps to ensure that participants in evaluation and research have access to appropriate supportive services.
- (j) Social workers engaged in evaluation or research should protect participants from unwarranted physical or mental distress, harm, danger, or deprivation.
- (k) Social workers engaged in the evaluation of services should discuss collected information only for professional purposes and only with people professionally concerned with this information.
- (l) Social workers engaged in evaluation or research should ensure the anonymity or confidentiality of participants and of the data obtained from them. Social workers should inform participants of any limits of confidentiality, the measures that will be taken to ensure confidentiality, and when any records containing research data will be destroyed.
- (m) Social workers who report evaluation and research results should protect participants' confidentiality by omitting identifying information unless proper consent has been obtained authorizing disclosure.
- (n) Social workers should report evaluation and research findings accurately. They should not fabricate or falsify results and should take steps to correct any errors later found in published data using standard publication methods.
- (o) Social workers engaged in evaluation or research should be alert to and avoid conflicts of interest and dual relationships with participants, should inform participants when a real or potential conflict of interest arises, and should take steps to resolve the issue in a manner that makes participants' interests primary.
- (p) Social workers should educate themselves, their students, and their colleagues about responsible research practices.

6. Social Workers' Ethical Responsibilities to the Broader Society

6.01 Social Welfare

Social workers should promote the general welfare of society, from local to global levels, and the development of people, their communities, and their environments. Social workers should advocate for living conditions conducive to the fulfillment of basic human needs and should promote social, economic, political, and cultural values and institutions that are compatible with the realization of social justice.

6.02 Public Participation

Social workers should facilitate informed participation by the public in shaping social policies and institutions.

6.03 Public Emergencies

Social workers should provide appropriate professional services in public emergencies to the greatest extent possible.

6.04 Social and Political Action

- (a) Social workers should engage in social and political action that seeks to ensure that all people have equal access to the resources, employment, services, and opportunities they require to meet their basic human needs and to develop fully. Social workers should be aware of the impact of the political arena on practice and should advocate for changes in policy and legislation to improve social conditions in order to meet basic human needs and promote social justice.
- (b) Social workers should act to expand choice and opportunity for all people, with special regard for vulnerable, disadvantaged, oppressed, and exploited people and groups.
- (c) Social workers should promote conditions that encourage respect for cultural and social diversity within the United States and globally. Social workers should promote policies and practices that demonstrate respect for difference, support the expansion of cultural knowledge and resources, advocate for programs and institutions that demonstrate cultural competence, and promote policies that safeguard the rights of and confirm equity and social justice for all people.
- (d) Social workers should act to prevent and eliminate domination of, exploitation of, and discrimination against any person, group, or class on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, political belief, religion, or mental or physical disability.

9/2/2008 FRI 9:12 FAX 607 777-2888 NYS UNIVERSITY POLICE

007/010

Attachment D



NEW YORK STATE UNIVERSITY POLICE
BINGHAMTON UNIVERSITY, P.O. BOX 6000, BINGHAMTON, NY 13902-6000
(607) 777-2193 OFFICE (607) 777-2888 FAX

VOLUNTARY STATEMENT

STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF BROOME
CITY OF BINGHAMTON
PLACE: University Downtown Center

SS:

DATE: 08/28/08
TIME: 01:35pm

I John Fleming am presently employed at Binghamton University. I freely volunteer the following statement regarding an incident that occurred on 08/23/08 at the University Downtown Center, in the City of Binghamton, Broome County, New York State.

On Monday morning 08/25/08, Officer VanLoke reported to me his supervisor that Andre Massena accessed the University Downtown Center. VanLoke stated that Andre was here for lost items such as a flash drive and a cell phone. Andre accessed the building. VanLoke told me that he noticed that once Andre had left the building about ten to fifteen minutes later, there were a large number of flyers in the building. He also told me that he knew that prior to Andre entering the building, he knew there was no distribution of these same flyers. When VanLoke noticed these flyers, he collected some flyers and then began to look at the security camera system to investigate further. When doing so, VanLoke stated he observed Andre Massena dropping the flyers on various office doors through out the building. Given this information, I began to check on Andre's access status to the building due to being a graduate assistant. When checking, I found that he no longer was a graduate assistant but still had access to the building.

On 8/25/08 at or about 1:30pm, while seated at the main desk at the University Downtown Center, I spoke to Andre Massena briefly about the flyers. Andre stated to me that he had nothing to do with the flyers. He stated he was in the building at around 9:30pm to find his girlfriend's cell phone. He also offered to give fingerprint sample to verify his story. I said to Andre basically that ok you did not do this but I will look into this further.

This statement prompted Andre to approach me a second time which was on Tuesday 08/26/08 at about 4pm while I was seated at my work station. At this time, Andre stated he was concerned about my attitude toward him. He also felt that this had something to do with this flyer incident. He could not understand why people were so concerned about this flyer issue and less concerned about skin heads and beer drinkers etc. I informed Andre that people are concerned about the homeless. Andre stated to me that he thinks he knew who possibly distributed the flyers but did not offer names. We briefly touched on the time frame of the incident and there was a controversy what he told me earlier compared to now. I decided to avoid this whole issue and shut down the conversation because things were not adding up.

NOTICE

(PENAL LAW SECTION 210.45)

IT IS A CRIME, PUNISHABLE AS A CLASS A MISDEMEANOR UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, FOR A PERSON, IN AND BY A WRITTEN INSTRUMENT, TO KNOWINGLY MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT, OR MAKE A STATEMENT WHICH SUCH PERSON DOES NOT BELIEVE TO BE TRUE.

I have read this statement consisting of 1 page(s) and the facts contained therein are true and correct.

Signed and Affirmed on this

27th day of August, 2008 at 2:00pm

27th day of August, 2008 at 2:00pm


SIGNATURE

WITNESS

Attachment E

Bronstein, Laura

To: Dara Raboy-Picciano
Subject: RE: Andre

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Dara Raboy-Picciano [mailto:piccian@binghamton.edu]
> Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2008 10:42 AM
> To: Bronstein, Laura
> Subject: Andre
>
> Laura,
>
> I am writing to you about Andre. I am also copying in the portion of
> the email he sent me. Andre had set up an appointment with me through
> one of our secretaries as an intake appointment. The only way to get
> an
>
> Intake appointment is to indicate that you are interested in
> counseling. When I saw this on my schedule, I had Barb, the secretary
> get in touch with Andre to switch him to another counselor due to our
> policy that we do not see students when there is a conflict of
> interest. He told Barb that he only wanted to see me and she
> explained to him that it would be a conflict. He replied by asking if
> was able to
>
> get counseling at the Counseling Center and she said yes, she could
> schedule him with another counselor. He then said, he was not
> interested in counseling and said he wanted to see me about a separate
> matter. She told him he would have to email me. I am concerned
> because
>
> of his dishonesty with me and the secretary, and this came after him
> sending me emails about the "academic lynching of Andre" which I had
> already forwarded to you.
>
> This is the emails below:
>
> Dara,
> I asked the secretary there to talk to you and told her I wanted to
> come
>
> in. Then she informed me of the conflict of interest and clarified
> with
>
> her that it was for counseling. Again, I'm not looking for counseling.
>
> If it's ok, let me know when you're going to be on campus. This is
> strictly school related. One or two questions like I said.. 5
> minutes,
>
> no more than 10 minutes.
> Thanks,

> Andre
>
> /"Our deepest fear is not that we are inadequate. Our deepest fear is
> that we are powerful beyond measure. It is our light, not our darkness
> that most frightens us. We ask ourselves, who am I to be brilliant,
> gorgeous, talented, and fabulous? Actually, who are you not to be? You
> are a child of God. Your playing small does not serve the world. There
> is nothing enlightened about shrinking so that other people won't feel
> insecure around you. We are all meant to shine, as children do. We
> were born to make manifest the glory of God that is within us. It's
> not just in some of us; it's in everyone. And as we let our own light
> shine, we unconsciously give other people permission to do the same.
> As we are liberated from our own fear, our presence automatically
> liberates others."/ /-Marianne Williamson (Nelson Mandela's
> inauguration speech)/
>
>
> --- On "Mon, 9/29/08, Dara Raboy-Picciano /<piccian@binghamton.edu>/"
> wrote:
> From: Dara Raboy-Picciano <piccian@binghamton.edu>
> Subject: Re: Meeting
> To: andremassena2003@yahoo.com
> Date: Monday, September 29, 2008, 11:32 AM
>
> Andre,
>
> What are you asking to meet about? You asked for a counseling
> appointment and then said that is not what you need. We have
> counselors
>
> who can meet with you which would be appropriate as I was your
> instructor and could be again in the future.
>
> Dara
> andre massena wrote:
>
>> Dara,
>> I don't know when you will be on campus but I just wanted to ask you
>> some questions. I think Barbara thought I was looking for
>> counseling,
>>
>>
>>
>> but that is absolutely not the case at all. I just want to ask you a
>> question or two, that's all. Let me know your availability. I
>> rather
>>
>>
>>
>> meet at UDC than main campus, but if there works best, I'm ok with it.
>> Peace,
>> Andre
>>
>>
>>
>>

Attachment F



College of Community and Public Affairs

Department of Social Work
CONFIDENTIAL

Laura,

As they say, there are at least two sides to every story. Although I was never given a chance to have my side heard by faculty and was denied due process, I think it is important that you fully understand the matter at hand, it's long history, along with the faculty so we can make better, informed decisions in light of this serious matter.

We will start with the allegations. On September 2nd at 11:30, we met at your office to present the facts of these allegations to me. You had no documents, etc to present to me. Instead you gave me vague statements along with false allegations to expedite the process of removing me from the program. Let's address my first violation:

"Students are expected to demonstrate honesty and integrity in all aspects of their academic program"

You told me that: "Specifically, at a little after midnight on the first day of class, 8/25/08, you entered the UDC under false pretenses..." Security staff, countless staff, as well as your self have seen me in the building in late at night, sometimes 11 or even one in the morning. All of the security staff knows me and they told me I can come in the building and have been in the building last semester and the previous semester between the hours of midnight and 6am. No written policy was presented to me to signed nor has staff of security ever informed me that I cannot be in the building after midnight or any other time. You never discussed that with me or showed be policy to indicate or support that I entered the building under false pretense.

Furthermore you told me that "...and continued then and subsequent to then, to deny and lie about your activities in the building at that time. You have perpetrated lies in this regard with University Police..." "On 8/25/08 at or about 1:30pm, while seated at the main desk at the University Downtown Center, I spoke to Andre Massena briefly about the flyers. Andre stated to me that he had nothing to do with the flyers. He stated he was in the building at around 9:30pm to find his girlfriend's cell phone. He also offered to give fingerprint sample to verify his story"....."Andre stated to me that he thinks he knew who possibly distributed the flyers..."

I want you to show me the proof that I lied to university police. I know it qualifies your allegations better to say that I "lied" to university police but John and the other gentleman you alleged I lied to are both members of security staff. When John approached me disrespectfully, as though something was wrong with me for passing flyers, advocating on behalf of my clients and expressing my concern as a social worker, interrogating me, I

social work. I knew nothing was going to be done by the department so I told them to tell the department how they felt.

One of my clients who is elderly, wheelchair bound, and mentally disabled, evicted after 18 years of living in housing tried coming to your office countless times to visit you with his advocate, but got turned away. As a social worker, the least you could have done is hear them out. They finally got to you late August '08 and she informed me that you told her you had no knowledge about David Tanenhaus and the bad things he does to the poor and disenfranchised in our community.

Ebony Gaspard, who you know of really well, as well as the community, has tried to see you also. As many of you know, she is the young single mother evicted with 3 children under 15 and a 2 week old baby, who is currently living in her car. The real situation is, as tenant of BHA and community activist, she fought for others in her community and even testified against Binghamton Housing Authority on poor people's behalf. That was unacceptable. She tried countless times to set up appointments with you but you were always "busy" or had "meetings." She even came to see you last week of August; I saw her once more turned away because you were "busy". There was no interaction or respect shown to her as a homeless mother with 3 young kids at your office. Instead, she walked by me, turned away once more.

That same week was when the flyers surfaced that I and others distributed around the community. After student body concerns, my field instructor's, numerous client accounts and professionals in the community, along with mine, you chose to do no investigation or even inquired about Mr. Tanenhaus' history, but when you heard about these flyers accusing him, you jumped to conclusion and I suspect the conclusion was derived by the guilty party himself. As soon as I walked in the building, I was approached by security and interrogated. For the well off privileged white man, you took no time to react and investigate but when the poor and people of color in our community cried out and the social workers in our department went to their aid, you tried every effort to dismiss them and protect Mr. Tanenhaus. Furthermore, security outright harassed me and continue give me dirty looks when they see me now, all on behalf of protecting Mr. Tanenhaus.

As you already know, Ebony Gaspard and her babies have been adopted by many in the community now. The community responded and they continue to show her love and support.

My History in MSW program

When I started the MSW program, I thought the level of education to empower and be a great social worker in our community would be superior at Binghamton university and unparallel to other schools offering comparable curriculums. To my surprise, my first year there I had a professor take me aside questioning me and asking me if I was worthy of the program. I was asked if I can "handle such a rigorous" program and if I was aware that this was graduate school. I never imagined I would deal with that kind of language in a social work department and so many racially insensitive experiences from classmates as well from some professors in the program. I received absolutely no support from you as I can remember which was unfortunate. When I had meetings with you to inform you about

asked him to show me the flyers. I have different ones that I made and distributed and wasn't sure which one it was. I asked him what issues he had with them. I asked him if this was about a beer party or some sort of advertisement for some hate group, no one or university staff would have questioned them but when you noticed something like this, a person advocating for a mother who was evicted, among countless, with 2 small children and a two week old baby, you come charging at me? Isn't my right to express these concerns? Students bring hate speeches on campus all the time and even have speakers such as skinheads and racists come on campus and don't get expelled, they are all protected under free speech. They get to stay but I get expelled for advocating for a mother and her babies being homeless?? After he had no response, I told him this is what this building was set in place for, that is what the department of social work was put in place for... To PROTECT and ADVOCATE for those who are disempowered and facing injustice. I told him I completely agree with what's in the flyer and ended with maybe it was me who posted them and maybe it wasn't. That's what John heard. I told him if he wants to go investigate, he should take my fingerprints too (sarcastically). John had me behind security the security desk before showing me that cameras are all over and how good they work. I would be stupid to think I would pass flyers all over the building without anyone knowing. I didn't imagine on campus, in a social work department that I was going to get that kind of reaction and interrogation for my actions. It threw me off so instead I questioned him to see where he was coming from.

My second violation is where the true nature of the situation will be brought to light. My violation is:

You told me that "Students are expected to adhere to the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics in all interactions with clients, peers, staff, full-time and adjunct faculty, practicum instructors, and all other members of the University community."

As a member of this community for over 10 years, having spent over 5 years of it in public housing, under Binghamton Authority, I saw many injustices done to poor people and specially people of color in my community, who mostly make up these communities. Although I wanted to advocate for them, I was not able to because I did not have the knowledge, the tools, or, adequate understanding of the complex systems that we must navigate.

Entering the MSW program was a blessing in many ways, providing me with the tools to help them. My second year in the program, I was fortunate to get a placement at Opportunities for Broome with Stanley Gluck. I was so happy to work directly with my community helping out with various community issues, including evictions. Evictions became my main focus as many families, especially mothers with young children overwhelmed over losing their homes and forced to face homelessness. It appears almost every month I had a new case. Later on, I learned David Tanenhaus had direct involvement with those evictions and Binghamton Authority staff violating HUD regulations.

One day Stan, my field instructor informed me that David Tanenhaus was going to be teaching social work at Binghamton university, in front of some of my clients who heard. They almost broke down in tears and were shocked and appalled. Immediately, I

scheduled a meeting to inform you of what was going on. You just listened and really expressed little to no interest in doing anything. I followed up with another meeting where my field instructor, who has been practicing social work for nearly 40 years and 20 years in our community, provided you with numerous documentation on Mr. Tannenhaus and how he was breaking families in our community.

In addition, I specifically sat in your office telling you not to just go by my word or Stan's, but that I would set up office meetings with people who have served this community for decades with credentials. Some of the people I told you I would bring to your office includes:

A respected community organizer in our community and former professor here of the community organizing course also expressed her concern. She was amazed at the choice you made to have him teach there. You know clearly who she is. She clearly informed me that Dave tried to make her leave the housing projects before because she was trying to organize and empower those people. She was shocked and laughed, thinking it was a joke when I told her the university hired him to teach community organizing.

A respected politician in our community also expressed great concern which I spoke to you about.

I told you if you wanted, I would get both the president and vice-president of NAACP to speak of these concerns in your office if you wanted. There are countless social workers and former graduates who I informed about him there who wanted to come in and talk to you among many, as you knew. Again, you didn't show much interest but said you would look into it the matter. On my 2nd or third meeting, I informed you that I would arrange for my clients to come in. Later on, the co-hort found out what Mr. Tannenhaus was doing. Close to half or more said they would not take Mr. Tannenhaus' class because in the spirit of social work and the spirit of empowerment, it was one of the worst steps backwards the department can take. After many meetings "Chat with Laura," many, if not most of my cohort decided they want another professor or will boycott the class. Many of them tried to inform you about Mr. Tannenhaus' actions in dealing with people in the community and you repeatedly denied you had knowledge of them. They would report back to me after every meeting with Laura denying she heard nothing bad about him. They also informed me that you told them to either take his class or go to Marywood graduate. I'm not sure how the conversation went but I remembered you telling me that you would not have him teach there after you look at all these facts and if they are true he wouldn't be back. The students wanted him gone immediately but because he was already teaching and because of "contractual" complications, you couldn't do it immediately (I will provide countless emails and live witnesses if you wish to validate/prove these concerns). I want to be as accurate as possible with these concerns.

After most of the students learned the news on Tannenhaus, the atmosphere of the program and the respect students had for what we stood for as a Social work department became disappointing and shameful. It was hard for me to go to class and carry my duties in the community, advocating for these people and assisting them with legal processes, with Stan, knowing that the very people we fight against as a social work institution, we were protecting, giving him a prestigious, honorable position of teaching the values and ethics of

those experiences, you seemed to listen and asked me what I thought should be done and what could be done. You offered me no procedural policy as department head or avenues to address my issues, instead as the person dealing with the issue and confused, you wanted me to provide solutions and take the initiative in implementing them.

Spring of '07 was one of my worse experiences giving you once more the opportunity to guide me with concerns I had. I did a presentation in one class in which the professor gave me an F grade while everyone I asked received A's. My presentation was about the racism and the lack of cultural competency in our department. I spoke about a number of experiences I had and the importance of owning and bringing to light our cultural incompetencies. After I emailed the professor and outlined why I received the grade I received and what it was based on, the individual responded back within 15-20 minutes after I sent the email and changed my grade to an A-. I informed the professor that I will not be swept under the carpet and quieted by a descent grade. I informed the professor that what I want is policy change, dialogue, and systems set in place to protect students from backlash for speaking the truth and willing to talk about the topics we rather not discuss. Not only was the cohort mad because I failed, we determined that I followed the specified criteria. When I met with the professor, with you, all I wanted was something done, you did nothing at all. As a student, had I done something half as bad, I would have met great consequences. Rather, as a student, your suspicion and weak undocumented allegations against me for "lying" is getting me dismissed from the program right now (we will get that part later).

Yet, another incident was when I attempted to talk to you and seek support because I was being severely harassed by women in the program. One young lady there would not leave me alone, calling my cell phone constantly and worried me deeply showing emotionally instability, disrupting class, which really scared me. You didn't show me much concern nor did nothing for me. I showed you nasty emails I received and the multiple daily phone calls and you didn't do anything but pretend you would do something. Your favorite thing to say is "what do you think can be done" or "what do you want me to do." I came there looking for support, and for you as department head to direct me about the processes and to inform me of the policies (avenues) set in place to address these issues, offering me options. You turned me away and did nothing once again. This has been a continual process over the years. My clients who came to see you received the same treatment.

Over my time there as a student, the harassing continued. The class witnessed one lady took a full grab of my rear one day without notice. On our way to the NAWS conference, I sat in the back of the bus alone (faculty as well as students know this situation) when one lady proceeded to the back and would not stop harassing me. She was insistent on pulling my penis out to jerk it off. Later on that night, herself and a friend were offering me a threesome. This individual offered to do sexual acts to me in my car and even in the stair way alley on campus. The class watched me withdraw for a whole semester sitting in a corner and not talking to anyone much because of the harassment. I had to walk a fine line because many women in the program had an untra-feminis pretext which scared me a whole lot because if I made a woman cry or "hurt one of them, the cohort would surely gang up on me. It actually happened one day when one started crying. You were not available to talk to nor would you have done anything but brush me off. I dealt with

countless headaches in the program and all you did, and continue to do was ignore my concerns.

Last semester, towards finals time, I experienced the hardest moments while in the program. In the MPA program, I was dealing with my own battles when I crossed over because one professor there was extremely racist. He would use and express to me and other student's derogatory terms and I organized with the students to partner with affirmative Action and made staff do their job and eventually he was dismissed from the program. As you know, his wife works in the same department. You can imagine the kind of trouble I was in. To make matters worst, a couple weeks later she became the dean of the program. The pressures I was facing was overwhelming. To make matters worst, I was in my office when around midnight when I found drugs in my desk. I immediately called NAACP president and Stan. I informed you also later on, which was useless. I was so afraid and distressed because I thought I was being framed and that people would surely believed it was mine and lose all I worked hard to accomplish in school and especially in this community. After a nearly 2 month long investigation, they informed me that it was sugar. Police have the technology to test drugs on the spot and tell you what it is in less than 5 minutes and the university state troopers needed nearly 1 LONG month to inform me that it was sugar? Currently, the students in the MPA program are shocked and appalled that one of my professors gave me a failing grade last semester, justification is yet to be presented, as I am receiving minimal feedback or support from the dean and the professor as the grievance process is still on going.

It is very clear to me that you do not want me in the program and have no interest in supporting my issues. I always wondered if you had personal issues with me because it certainly didn't present itself as a professional relationship. You know that when it comes to protecting those in the community and my clients, I will support their needs with even more passion.

You know the truth about the long history with Tanenhaus but you continue to lie and deceive staff and faculty into thinking that I have been unethical and violated code of ethics when I have not at all. I'm guilty of having my back against the walls for the almost two years and having to protect my clients at all cost. I'm guilty of challenging the status quo and advocating for justice.

Concerning your plan for my withdrawal

The advancement procedure clearly states "Advancement is a process intended to assure each student maintains adequate progress in gaining the skills, competencies and behaviors required for graduation and ethical professional social work practice. How did you possibly process in light of that statement that dismissing me from the program for doing social work was strengths base? How does destroying my plans to graduate and serve the clients I love in the community full time processed as..." gaining the skills, competencies and behaviors required for graduation and ethical professional social work practice?"

You have a vested interest in removing me out of this program and in your haste and excitement to expedite the process; you violated a number of my rights. They are as follows:

1. According to the advancement procedure "...Additionally, the faculty will review students currently enrolled once each semester. This will be done at a closed meeting in which responses to students' names will be limited to "concern". However, I was not given the right to due process or the right to respond to any allegations as you facilitated the process, knowing clearly there is a conflict of interest, but proceeded to play judge and jury. The student name should have been protected. Some staff in the department are not talking to me or refusing to make eye contact with me. Some don't even say hi to me. This is direct evidence for me to confirm that you did violate policy. It was odd for me to see social workers despise you for doing social work, despite knowing my commitment and integrity over the past two years in the department, they hung me without even inquiring or questioning. It states specifically the name of the student should not be used but rather "concerns." At the meeting, you kept making reference to "people" wanted me "expelled" from the program but you said no. After I asked you what people, you wouldn't say. Later on, again, you mentioned "people" wanted harsher punishment for me but you were being "nice" to me and advocated for something less. Isn't my right to know who was involved in the decision process to have me withdraw from the program? You never exposed who your "people" are but ignored protocol and divulge my identity in discussion of the situation, where my identity according to protocol should have been protected. Even security and police downstairs won't talk to me and give me dirty looks. If you elected to discuss my accusations with them, it is your duty as a social worker to educate/inform them of the importance of confidentiality in this process, as a practicing social worker and Chair of the MSW program. John again discussed the situation with me, interrogating me rudely, asking me why I lied to him in front of other staff as well as students walking by. The look of shame and disgust from security as well as some staff here is outright shameful. To get that kind of treatment because I made flyers and passed them out on behalf of a homeless mother with 3 kids in a social work department is really sad.
2. Secondly, the procedure notes "The person identifying the concern shall meet with the student, the student's adviser, and one of the following: Director of the program or Program Committee Chair. They shall develop a written plan to resolve the academic, professional, or ethical deficiency." You denied me my right to be part of the written process as I had no knowledge of it until it was done and prepared by yourself and a faculty member. The procedure says we are to meet and discuss a written plan. Instead, I met you with a faculty member with a plan already typed and prepared.
3. One thing to note is that you did not want me having knowledge of the appeal process as it was being explained to me. As it was being explained, you raised your voice rudely and tried to quiet the faculty member explaining it to me. You then lied to me telling me that requirements 1 & 2, the harshest, in the appeal process is NON-NEGOTIABLE!! So you decided in the meeting you had without me and whoever else what was going to be negotiable and not? The advancement procedure says I can

challenge everything through the appeal committee, not some of the charges. You made this clear to me again, firmly, that requirements 1 & 2 cannot be negotiated. Interesting how I'm being explained the appeal process by one person while the other one is telling me I can't appeal. It was interesting to note how strong your passion is to dismiss me from the program.

Current State

Right now as it stands, you are choosing to do nothing about my clients and the many people from the social work department, as well as the community who strongly feels Mr. Tanenhaus has violated social work code of ethics and should not be teaching there. As general practice, Mr. Tanenhaus will use any scheme or tactic to quiet those who exposes him. As most of you know, I work in the Mayor's office as VISTA project supervisor. Deputy Mayor Tarick pulled me in to tell me that they are letting me go. I already knew he was on the board of Binghamton Housing and he confirmed it with me, informing me that what I did was a no no and that he really respects Mr. Tanenhaus. Another supervisor agreed with him and stated that "Mr. Tanenhaus is too powerful and that he can have funding for the VISTA project pulled, although your actions and passion for the oppressed in our community is admirable..." I did not hear any specific feedback on my violating policy, at all. I know other people in the community whose jobs are threatened also for supporting me on these issues. Also, you are familiar that I live in Binghamton housing and that I take care of my sister living with Schizophrenia and a sick mother right? I will tape it for the whole community and send you and the social work department personal copies when it happens. I'm sure you can imagine the stress you put me through but even worse to me is the growing community out here who have been victimized and continue to see this stuff go on. The department is letting a lot of people down.

Basically, despite carrying myself with respect and high regard for staff as well as students in the program, some of the faculty has proven themselves to be incompetent in allowing me a voice. I would think knowing me for this long, they would show me the least amount of respect and fairness by keeping an open mind. Instead, you met with them closed doors, knowing the true facts of the matter deceiving them playing judge and jury. To make matters worse, you know clearly there is a conflict of interest with the advancement procedure meeting you want to have on 9/17 with me because of our history, but instead you are taking the lead on bringing the case against me. I asked you for time and a chance to reschedule but you said no. Knowing the seriousness of this situation, you are limiting the meeting to 20 minutes? You think this meeting with you there is fair and justified with a 20 minute time limit? Your intentions are even clearer in demonstrating that this is backlash for my actions because although the "case" you're bringing forward against me is about "lying" and being "unethical," the plan for withdrawal does not address that, but rather, your plan of action is mostly about wanting me apologize to the university, Binghamton Housing Authority, and the community. I have full rights as a student to protest and express all I did. Why are you addressing another entity's issues? You want me to apologize to Binghamton Housing knowing what they have done to my clients? You are clearly advocating on behalf of Dave and Binghamton housing but what about the many clients

I expressed concern to you about, and those who were evicted? You know racists and Nazis have been here at our university, and are protected and have the right to speak on our campus, but you want me to apologize for the content of my flyer advocating on a homeless mothers behalf and her babies? What disturbed me most is that you are (see withdraw plan, #6) requiring me to "make every effort possible and will inform Profs. Bronstein and Wiener of his efforts to end the process whereby students, service providers and community members approach the Dept. of Social Work in an effort to alleviate "wrong" they may see as occurring at the Binghamton Housing Authority." Are you saying here I will promise not to bring concerns such as these to the department and that clients cannot come to the Social Work Department with concerns? I have invited you to come out to community meetings before to listen to these peoples concerns but you won't and instead I had them come to you. The only reason my clients have had to address you personally is because you chose to hire their perpetrator. Are you saying that has to be ceased? If this is true than it will contradict the schools mission statement and just about everything I read in every book and learned in every class about client service. When I look at the corruption in failing me due process, denying me my right of free speech, and your clear intentions to advocate on behalf of Mr. Tanenhaus and BHA, I can see clearly that he is controlling you. Your actions are also hurting the legacy and the true spirit of social work the department have worked hard to earn over the years. Furthermore, some of the faculty there are truly wonderful people who abide by the true spirit of social will also be hurt by your actions. Perhaps most important are the people in the community which the department have failed miserably. You over stepped so many boundaries and policies without regard that my mouth and others who are concerned are left wide open in disbelief. I'm amazed at the justice I'm getting from a social work department. Not only was my due process violated, my rights were violated. On top of that, you out of all people will be bringing the case against me knowing clearly the conflict of interest. Criminals and murderers get to walk when their rights and processes are violated or tainted with, I'm looking forward to seeing you tomorrow and faculty continue on with these charges against me. I never imagined this type of corruption would be in a social work environment. I never imagined how powerful and hateful these institutions and people we talk about in social work are and their resistance to change, and keeping the status quo. I less than about 3 weeks I'm getting kicked out of school, losing my job (blackmailed really), and possibly going to be evicted with my family, all because I won't back up and compromise what I truly stand for and value true social work ethic.

NEXT STEP

As you can see clearly, you ignored my client cries and mine, and countless policies. I know the department has been waiting for my reaction over the weeks. I am more interested in working things out and I'm confident that there is a resolution to everything. I rather keep an open mind. I'm actually really proud of the department and the great work we have accomplished. The fact that professors and students got together to champion efforts to assist and reach out to Hurricane victims in New Orleans is something beyond words I will ever be grateful to be a part of. Kudos to recruitment efforts because the department is blossoming with diversity among countless accomplishments. Let's be adults and put your personal issues aside Laura because the department's mission and what the school of social

work is doing is far more important to me. There will be dialogue and I have faith these issues will be addressed and resolved.

I will answer any questions staff or who ever may have concerning this situation. I have countless emails where I brought those issues forward to you, which I can produce if need be and a number of emails which I have from the student body I can produce upon permission. If anyone wants, I will even bring my clients to the office who you interacted with and turned away. I will even bring in at least a dozen or more social workers to testify to staff and entertain questions on the validity of my claims.

I may sound frustrated, as I have the right to be, but my interest is making the program better and supporting the students and making a difference in my community. I will see you on Wednesday at 3:30pm for discussion.

Sincerely,
Andre Massena

Attachment G

Results of my first Hearing

May hearing was amazingly disturbing. Present was Laura, Josephine Allen, Dennis Chapman, Sui Choi, and Diane Wiener as my advisor. I didn't want to bring too many people so I had with me NAACP Vice-President Billie Anderson, Stanley Gluck (my MSW field instructor with over 40 years of practice, an African American community advocate who is a former MSW program student, who dropped out of the program because she experienced what I did and one of my clients and his advocate. Laura started off with saying I lied to Binghamton University police investigator Rossie. I stopped her asked, who is this man, I have never spoken to him or heard of him. She didn't respond and went to the next lie.

To make the story short, every lie they had in there I had an answer for to prove them false. They had no answers to my questions and when I asked them for what policies and procedures I violated, they had nothing to say. Laura knew she lost and had her head down when out of all people, Diane Wiener pulled out and said that according to NASW, I was unethical because I was engaged in "lying by omission." Everyone was shocked. When I came in the building and did not report to security every single thing I came there to do, I was engaged in the unethical act of "lying by omission" and that warrants me getting kicked out of the MSW program. We all asked her for what policy states that, she had no answer. I called NASW ethics department and she informed me that she heard of it but they have NO policy on it. I looked at all of the school policies and procedures, there is nothing on that. I asked my MSW professor in one class and she looked at me odd, and said not that I know of any policy on that. I asked another MSW professor, and he doesn't know either. When I asked the students, they are like "what, I don't know." They have absolutely nothing to hang on but the "lying by Omission" thing. So beware you current and former MSWs, when you get in the building, you are suppose to tell security all you came there to do in the building when asked, if you don't, you can get kicked out of school for it.

I bet you're shocked right now but that was not the worse part of the hearing at all. My client and his advocate who Laura have lied to repeatedly when they asked them about Dave Tannehaus had to hear Laura saying to them, to me at the meeting that "bringing these people here is harassing me." I was like hold up, "these" people? Them coming here is "harassing" you? I was like do you know that this \$29 million dollar building was set in place for the community needs? You have a job to serve them. Our mission is social justice and a voice for the weak and them coming to your office, this building is harassing you? You're going to look at them and say that in their face? You know what you put me through and I never once said you harassed me. Then Dave came up. I told her I'm tired of her telling myself and the student body to call NASW and file charges against Dave Tannehaus. It was her job as department head. She hired him there. Our job is to be students. I told her why she didn't investigate and do a back ground check. She said we don't, they go by merit (something like that). I was like for a job at McDonalds or anywhere, they check your history, I would be hard pressed to think the university, a huge place like this wouldn't. You mean you can hire a murderer or some rapist to teach her. She responded, yes, we don't do background checks. I know it sounds unbelievable but it is all true. They know how much they messed up in there and

are denying me the audio tape. Policy states clearly that the tape is not only for department use as they are telling. Rather it states clearly that I have to pay any and all expenses to get it. I am currently working to secure it now, this is extremely serious. Even if they burn the tape or hide it, it doesn't matter, the NAACP vice president heard it, my field instructor did, and 4 others.

Lets go back to Diane for a second. I bet many of you are shocked, I was too. Trust me As my adviser, when I read the policies on the limits of her role and her strict responsibilities to support me as a student, I was amazed at how she, out of all people put her self on the line to compromise all she worked for. I didn't know that she was bringing charges against me, I was never informed of that. This did not involve her at all. The funny thing is, most of you know where she stood supporting the student body and her high level of ethics when it comes to social justice. Maybe she didn't have conversation with you guys about how she felt about the department not delivering and Laura's incompetence, but she had plenty of those with me. She agreed with me all the way and supported me. She knew about my plans to do something drastic and making these flyers since last semester. She informed me of backlash and explored possible graduating first before I do it because there would be consequences. She knew what Laura has been doing to me all along and supported me as Laura had my back against the wall. She had direct knowledge of my plans. We will see how well she does when this information comes out. It will soon. I think a lot of students will be traumatized because of what Diane did but they need to know. Diane was one of the only hope; the biggest hope to me in this program but she joined them too. She doesn't want to piss off Laura and the department because she wants tenure, but we'll see how that goes. She couldn't even look at me at the meeting when she was lying. I know most of you know or had a sense of where she stood. They are all afraid of Dave. He is more powerful than I thought. He had the deputy mayor pull my job within days. I wont mention names, he did hurt some of the people supporting me.

I think most of you know how New Orleans was special to me. When I went to the trip meeting today, David Tancenhau was there. I was shocked but this guy is going to New Orleans. I think he might back out seeing me there but it is going to be an interesting trip. Jennifer was not responding to my emails for efforts in supporting the trip but not I know why. This is who they honor and give a prestigious job to in our department while I am getting kicked out for doing social work.

Right now, I am still in classes, I have my next grievance hearing in a couple of weeks. Although stressed right now, I am doing ok. Please don't feel sorry for me, no sad hugs. You guys would be shocked at how many people in the community are supporting me on this. Professors as well as high ranking professionals are behind me on this. The school knows what they did wrong. They are trying to quiet this and negotiate with me to stay in classes while sweeping it under the carpet but it is not going to happen. I am sorry for not letting you guys know about this sooner because this went on for a long time, but I didn't think it would escalate that high and I didn't think they would jeopardize the programs legacy and compromise their positions so much just to get rid of me. Those of you who are people of color in the program, be very careful. As a black man, this is the

experience I must walk through. I went all the way through college with honors, I got every major scholarship I applied for, I helped promote and diversity the MW program doing countless presentations, locally and out of town. I mobilized and started programs in the community, I sit on many committees and board of agencies, through the NAACP I have helped countless families out of despair and social injustice, in the paper promoting social justice, I was even working in City Hall as one of the supervisors on a nation wide program, among many others. For a black man knowing what we face, I thank God that I am going so well, so young. I came a long way, from poor kid in the streets of Haiti with 8 brothers and sisters all the way to America finishing two masters degree. I learned quickly what the culture in America was and how the black man was viewed. That's why I worked so hard and forced myself to be so careful. You will truly lost it all for one screw up, I didn't know mere suspicion would go so far. Knowing this, that's why my record is nothing but honorable...even my license is clean. The problem is, I was getting too influential in the community and mobilizing too many people. People out here who don't understand these complex systems and how to navigate them being abused were learning from me and increasingly demanding accountability, they had a voice and confidence now. The agencies out here get lots of money but if the people are ignorant and don't know, they get to give them mediocre service. Like Binghamton Housing, I live in the projects, I did the research and know what they should be doing. You will be amazed at what they are doing to these people. When I go to meetings, its about informing them of the facts and asking for accountability. They don't like that because they know they are wrong. Mr. Tanenhaus knew my influence and even tried to bribe me, giving me money here and there visiting my office, pretending it's donation money for my trip or motorcycle club. He tried to win me over many times to quiet me. At our meeting with Laura, he offered me Co-chair of one of his major programs and a big spots on his committee boards, in hopes of quieting me but it didn't work. The solution then became: get rid of Andre. Since they have nothing, that's what brings me to my present state, in which they have to make something up. I played my cards right all along because I knew what was going on...although I didn't think they would get this dirty. I don't know too many people in this community that don't know about my work and who I am. They know getting rid of me won't be easy. Don't listen to me, look into it and investigate yourself. I had professors and professionals in our community warn me about getting in the MSW program and advised me not to because the type of person I am and my progressive nature, along with my ability to questions and challenge their stance on social issues would not fair too well. Don't worry, I am doing ok and things will work out. I have respectful people within the university community who have been there for years and countless in the community who are monitoring this and doing their homework strategically to make sure this works out. The MSW faculty is extremely divided right now. Some have sent me their "im sorrys" but no one is doing nothing knowing how wrong and messy this is. Maybe they are in the background, but nothing I see yet.

So If worse comes to worst, I will have to finish my TWO classes to graduate in another state. I would like a break from Binghamton for one and two, I'd be honored to say I have an MSW degree from another university than Binghamton. I'm surprised they would be willing to put so much on the line just to get rid of me. I wont get into details but you will see a VERY different MSW program in the coming years. PROMISE you

that! I was planning on leaving after graduation to head to Florida, but I'm finding strong reasons to stay here now. While the MSW program is giving me an F for my work and kicking me out, The community is giving me nothing but hugs and As for my work. God is working everything out for me beautifully, despite all you are seeing. My work in the community and NAACP got me nominated for NAACP vice-president. We'll see in November how the election turns out but I'm pretty sure I got it. God always works things out, no matter how ugly they may seem for the person doing the right thing, despite the consequences. I'll be fine, I'm sure. So no sad words from anyone or sorry talk. This has made me stronger, taught me so much, and I'm getting one of the biggest honors of my life, serving the NAACP, possibly in capacity as vice president.

Again, I think this is important for you guys to know given what this school is about and especially for some of you still there. Please don't be concerned about client confidentiality violated; I have permission from all of them. Even more of my clients wanted me to tell the community about their abuses as an example and how I was there to assist them. Some of you guys got this email and not all of the students, so please don't share it yet. I have plenty of professional support on this; I am just strategizing and working things out with my team. There is a right time for everything. The time will come for the community and everyone to know...soon it will be.

Well, now that we know how well I'm doing, how are you guys ☺

Attachment H

On Mon, 10/6/08, andre massena <andremassena2003@yahoo.com> wrote:
From: andre massena <andremassena2003@yahoo.com>
Subject: Binghamton University student right's violation and removal
To: president@gso-binghamton.edu; vicepresident@gso-binghamton.org; treasurer@gso-binghamton.org; assistant@gso-binghamton.org
Date: Monday, October 6, 2008, 12:36 AM

To those concerned,

My name is Andre Massena. I am currently finishing my final year as a graduate student in the MPA and MSW program.

As a student in the MSW program, Many of my fellow students felt unheard and some were even dismissed from the program for reasons that had no merit for challenging professors. Last year, the department hired a professor, David Tannenhaus who has continued to engage in unprofessional conduct in the community, not adhering to the principles of the NASW code of ethics, which requires social workers to empower the poor and helpless, and advocate for justice. After informing the student body with other professions in the community, they wanted to boycott his class, which they did. After so much pressure, Laura the Department Director had informed me that they would take steps to remove him but never did.

A number of my clients who were evicted from Binghamton Housing projects, under this professor's authority, and dealing with various injustices, came to my office for assistance. The worse act of injustice this year I had to experience was when a young mother was evicted with 2 small kids and a baby. I had to do something; I wanted the community to know. I made over a 1000 copies of her eviction process, witnessing them trash her apartment while the community watched. The flyers were distributed all over the community on 8/25.

As a consequence, the school of social work is kicking me out for it 1 year, and, maybe I might get consideration to return. If you read the department's reason for kicking me out, it is all based on the content of the flyer... ALL of it. According to our First Amendment rights and the student department, as well as university policies, I have not violated any policies. They said I entered the building under false pretense. Here is what school policy says about student activity and free speech:
<http://ombudsman.binghamton.edu/freespeech.html>

After I kept proving them wrong and asking for policy I violated, the charges went from I entered the building under false pretense, to lying to university policy investigator Rossie (who I never spoke to or saw before), now to "lying by omission," which they claim is prohibited by NASW code of ethics and also school policies. The students as well as professors in the program I asked know nothing of this policy. NASW ethics department who I called, do not have policy either. School policy links:

<http://ccpa.binghamton.edu/academics/msw/Handbook-%207-31-08%20revision.pdf>

<http://gradschool.binghamton.edu/fs/handbook.asp?dt=fs&lv=2&tid=172#173>

<http://gradschool.binghamton.edu/fs/handbook.asp?dt=fs&lv=2&tid=172#177>

I have professors, students in the program, as well as many in the community supporting me with this issue. It is important to build support, but most importantly to me is that people, the students within the university setting are aware of what is going on and are aware of how this affects them. At a cost of \$29million dollars, the University Down Town Center was put in place to build community relations and the Social Work Department especially has the charge to promote social justice and empower the community, which they are not doing. Students who have a progressive mindset and who want change in the community, willing to stand up and challenge the status quo are not welcomed and are punished for it. Many students in the program are afraid to stand up to them. This situation should not only concern the university community, but the whole community as a whole.

This situation concerns us all because it can happen to any of us at any given time if our university is allowed to carry out such abuse unchecked in our community. Please see eviction flyer below and download.

Thanks,
Andre

Sent by: andremassena2003@yahoo.com
File to pick up: HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATION OR PUR...
File will remain active for: 7 days

Link to file:
<https://rcpt.yousendit.com/610538854/fbbcc2b974c626f4d84ed2278adc3eed>

Error! Filename not specified.
[YouSendIt Inc.](#) | [Terms of Service](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [DMCA Policy](#) | [Opt Out](#)
1919 S. Bascom Avenue, 3rd Floor Campbell, CA 95008
Error! Filename not specified.

Attachment I

Bronstein, Laura

From: Archie-Brown, Christina [clarchiebrown@nyseg.com]
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2008 1:31 PM
To: Bronstein, Laura
Subject: Meeting

Good Afternoon Laura,

It was very nice making your acquaintance this morning - long overdue I might add. Although you were not at liberty to speak at length regarding student Andre Messina, I wanted to reiterate my position in this matter as the President of the NAACP, Broome/Tioga Branch. I have known Andre for several months (possibly a year) and I find him to be very ambitious and dedicated to his community. He is quite a Humanitarian which, I believe, is an asset in the field of social work. It may be that very passion of which I speak that has Andre in this compromising situation today.

I sincerely hope that the MSW program and Mr. Messina can come to a compromise that will enable him (Andre) to continue pursuing his goals and dreams of completing his academic effort(s) in the MSW program. I support Andre completely as a community member recognizing the need for young men and women to succeed and attain higher learning. However... as the President of the NAACP, I have not been properly briefed or kept abreast of the particulars surrounding the unfortunate situation Andre is currently in. I never had a conversation with anyone (Andre included) where I stated I would be present at a hearing on campus as Andre's advocate. This was a falsehood or a misunderstanding, for this conversation never took place. Before I would consider attending a hearing of any kind, I would first meet with Andre to gather all facts relevant to this case; this has not happened.

To summarize our discussion earlier... I completely support Mr. Andre Messina and I am hopeful that the administration will reconsider its motion to suspend him from his studies. As President of the NAACP, I am not involved in this situation, for no other reason than I am not familiar with

all the facts surrounding this unfortunate dilemma. Again, I trust a peaceful resolution to this matter will take place in the very near future. If a reference letter would help, I will gladly write one on Andre's behalf. Please advise me of what I can do to remedy this situation.

Sincerely,

Christina Archie-Brown

What the mind can conceive,

The hands can

achieve...

Attachment J



College of Community and Public Affairs

Department of Social Work

10.20.08

To whom it may concern:

I am submitting this testimony in regards to a concern that I have with the recent conduct of Andre Massena. A letter that was recently distributed to students and I believe others in the community in which Andre related his impression of the results of his first hearing. He made an accusation about me that was untrue and misleading. I am hoping to seek clarification directly from Andre, although he is responding to emails, we have not yet been able to find a time that works for us both.

In Andre's letter he indicated that I was not responding to his email. I had actually tried to reach out to Andre in an email, indicating that I had hoped that things could be resolved and tried to be supportive. Andre sent one email that he wrote where he did not request a response, and had indicated that he wanted to help with the New Orleans Trip however he could. I did not respond as I knew he was on the blackboard site where students were organizing the trip this year were posting information. He wrote me again saying that he wanted to help, and I immediately wrote back indicating that the students were organizing, he should get information regarding the trip and how to help from the Blackboard site. Not only did he make false allegations publically about me, he did so in a way that was divisive and manipulative. He provided misinformation indicating that there were multiple correspondences that I was not responding to, and that I had a motive- which is untrue.

Given FERPA confidentiality laws I cannot respond publically. As he warns other students particularly those of color in the program to not trust faculty in the program, his words have the potential to damage relationships with students, who may believe him and limit my ability to respond.

Furthermore, he had signed a contract and is a member of a professional association which requires him to adhere to a national code of ethics. I am deeply concerned about his behaviors as of late. He has used clients to further his own agenda. I can't imagine that his clients were seeking services from him and complaining to him about who we ask to teach in our classes. Even if the fact that Mr. Tanenhaus was teaching in our program, was brought to his client's attention, Andre was not able to demonstrate boundaries between practice and his personal life (school). The ability to set boundaries and see where his professional relationship with clients is separate from his role as a student is

integral to practice. The NASW code of Ethics clearly indicates that social workers need to behave in a "trustworthy manner" and much time is spent teaching students about another ethical responsibility to clients- self determination. Andre made his own concerns about Dave Tanchhaus an area of intervention with clients. Additionally the Code of Ethics addresses disputes involving colleagues. It specifically cites that social workers should not exploit clients in disputes with colleagues or engage clients in any inappropriate discussion of conflicts between social workers and their colleagues. I worry that the code of ethics that Andre signed and agreed to uphold may have been violated.

Jennifer Marshall, LMSW
Director of Field Education

Attachment K

Bronstein, Laura

From: David Tanenhaus [dtanenhaus@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 18, 2008 11:10 PM
To: Bronstein, Laura
Subject: FYI

Laura,

Two items regarding Andre Massena have come up recently.

As an Executive Board member of the NAACP, I was interested in that organization's official position on Andre's appeal process at the university. My inquiry revealed that the local NAACP has no position on this issue. Any implication by Andre that the NAACP as an organization is supporting his appeal process is reportedly false.

In addition, Andre and I are planning on participating with the MSW Student Organization in their New Orleans trip in January 2009. After Andre wrote a statement detailing his displeasure about my participation, some students wondered whether his feelings would create a problem in the planning and implementation of the trip. A student reported to me that she questioned Andre about this and that he replied that there had been a misunderstanding with me in the past, but this had been resolved.

Let me know if you need any further information.

Dave

Attachment L



State University of New York

College of Community and Public Affairs

Department of Social Work

CONFIDENTIAL

October 20, 2008

To whom it may concern, re: the confidential matter of Andre Massena:

I met Mr. Massena during his first semester-in-residence in the MSW program at BU, at which time I was assigned to be his Academic Advisor. I was his Academic Advisor until last week, at which time he met in person with Mr. Brian Flynn, Director of Admissions and Student Services for the Dept. of Social Work, to request that he be assigned a new advisor, effective immediately (Mr. Flynn is now Mr. Massena's advisor). Mr. Massena had recently emailed Dr. Laura Bronstein, Dept. of Social Work Chair and Mr. Flynn regarding this request; I was "copied" on the message. Mr. Massena did not directly inform me that he wanted a new advisor, although he had recently emailed me prior to his message to Dr. Bronstein and Mr. Flynn, in order to request information about what an advisor is supposed to do for her/his/their advisees and other students. I responded in detail to his request, via email, and included information regarding the role of an academic advisor in the MSW program, as well as within BU graduate education, broadly construed. As far as I am concerned, I fulfilled all of the features of the role to which I had been assigned as an advisor, and went well beyond what had been expected of me. The fact that Mr. Massena did not have the professional courtesy to explain to me why he no longer wanted me as an advisor is evidence of what I perceive to be a recent change in his willingness to communicate directly with other people, including me, unless he thinks, it seems, that these individuals will agree with everything that he seems to be saying. Given the legacy of my largely excellent relationship with Mr. Massena, this conduct on his behalf (as I have assessed it, based upon my own experiences and observations of Mr. Massena since the beginning of this academic term) constitutes unprofessional behavior at the worst and rudeness at the least.

Until the very beginning of this academic term (Fall 2008), in fact, I had found and perceived that Mr. Massena and I had a very strong rapport, and that we had communicated quite effectively about many different academic and professional matters, although, admittedly, we did not always agree with one another. Many of our conversations over time revolved around my encouraging Mr. Massena "not to burn bridges" with others, due to his frequent and understandable experiences of frustration with power structures, and his particular concerns with processes not working as smoothly as many of us might like to be the case, in an ideal world. I wrote Mr. Massena many letters of recommendation and supported him throughout his learning process in every way that I could.

In particular, over time, I attempted to support Mr. Massena in "working within the system, despite the system," as I put it, while acknowledging that, at times, certain strategies work better under certain circumstances than others, and, importantly, that certain strategies and approaches are necessarily more appropriate for social workers to address and utilize than others, due to our professional obligation to ethics and practice principles as undergirded by the NASW Code of Ethics.

Last academic year, Mr. Massena became very angry that Mr. David Tanenhaus was hired as an adjunct instructor for the Dept. of Social Work because Mr. Massena believed and alleged that Mr. Tanenhaus had behaved unethically and therefore that he should not be teaching in a social work program. Dr. Bronstein and I advised Mr. Massena to bring this matter to the attention of the NASW board that handles ethics and integrity cases. Mr. Massena flatly refused, indicating that this was not his responsibility as a student, but, rather, was the responsibility of the department. We had this conversation many, many times, and it seems that we were "going in circles," but, on the whole, I had the distinct impression that Mr. Massena understood that this choice was his to make, not ours, if an investigation was going to occur, since it was based upon his allegation and information, not ours.

Mr. Massena had wanted to distribute a flyer about his opinions regarding Mr. Tanenhaus last academic year, and I advised him strongly against taking this approach. We again discussed strategies and approaches, at that juncture, and, at the time, he thanked me for helping him to deepen a stronger internal locus of control (these are my words, not his). I told him that while he was a student that it was and would continue to be important for him to be very careful about the ways in which he expressed his distress at situations that he perceived to be distressing. I articulated that once he had an MSW it would likewise be incumbent upon him to find ways to express himself so as not to alienate others, unintentionally, due to his rage and upset, however understandable these emotions might be, at times. Again, he thanked me, at the time and since, for my candid approach and for the feedback that I shared with him.

At one point, I told Mr. Massena on the telephone, during one of our many (sometimes hours-long) conversations about his ongoing upset regarding Mr. Tanenhaus, that part of me thought that it might have been relevant to contact NASW, myself, based upon the evidence that he had verbally presented to me concerning Mr. Tanenhaus, but I decided and informed him directly that I would not do this, as it was his concern, based upon evidence that he had, not evidence that I had, directly. I noted at the time, with my typical candor and honesty, that "if I knew now what I knew then," that I might not have hired Mr. Tanenhaus, again, until further investigation had taken place. However, I likewise noted that I respected Dr. Bronstein's decision in her role as the Chair not to investigate this matter, believing, as I did, that this was Mr. Massena's concern, and, as such, that it was his responsibility, not the department's, to launch an investigation, if he saw fit, or, rather, to encourage NASW to do so, that is to say (as noted above). Otherwise, it seemed to me, to Dr. Bronstein, and to others, that it could be perceived that we were or would be discriminating against Mr. Tanenhaus, based upon hearsay, which would, of course, be unethical and wholly problematic for a host of reasons. After all, a social work program ought not to conduct "a witch hunt," as it came to be described, by some, informally, at that time.

Unfortunately, since that time, Mr. Massena has taken it upon himself to negatively portray and distort my prior comments (to him) in email messages that have been distributed by him to alumni, students, and community members, in which (in my opinion) he defames my character, alleges that all I care about is getting tenure, and warns alumni and students who previously trusted me that they ought not do so, as my values are essentially irrelevant, in his view, and that I will be supplanting my own values, he alleges, for the sake of my career. Needless to say, this set of remarks is potentially defaming not only of my character but of my professional and academic reputation, as well as the reputations of the department and Dr. Bronstein, who is likewise named in some of these offensive documents. In at least one of these inflammatory messages, Mr. Massena also alleges that I think that Dr. Bronstein is "incompetent," and I assume that this is his inappropriate and incorrect re-narration of my having acknowledged to him in the past that while I might have handled things differently than did Dr. Bronstein vis-à-vis Mr. Tanenhaus, if I had been the Chair, I nevertheless indeed supported her decision. I told Mr. Massena that we must seek to find ways to work collaboratively when we disagree with others, in order to come to a fair and equitable set of responses to challenging situations (this is part-and-parcel of being a social worker, after all). He has claimed throughout the term that the department is treating people unfairly while claiming that it fights for social justice. Meanwhile, he has sent out email messages about me, Dr. Bronstein, the department, the college, and the university, and in these email messages he has misrepresented what occurred in meetings with me, and in meetings between himself, Dr. Bronstein, and me. His behavior shows a serious lack of professional judgment and accountability, in my opinion. Even if he truly believes, in private, that I have betrayed my values (an egregious sentiment, to say the least, and wholly untrue), he has no right whatsoever to "spread that" notion of his all over town, without giving any consideration to the harm that it may cause to me and others. If he did give consideration to the harm that it could cause, and then he still did so, regardless, this differently illustrates his poor judgment and lack of professional accountability, for I do not believe that professional social workers should seek to humiliate and shame their colleagues, under any circumstances.

One of the many incorrect and ill-informed misrepresentations that have been "shared" by Mr. Massena with others is the view that Mr. Massena has regarding his status in the program, at present. Mr. Massena was not expelled nor refused continuance in the program. In contrast, Dr. Bronstein and I created a tentative contract to be discussed with him, according to the procedures and guidelines outlined in our "Advancement" protocols, to try to address the events that allegedly transpired on the first day of the semester (in the middle of the night) and subsequently. It is correct that two of the features of the contract that we drafted were, as Dr. Bronstein put it, "non-negotiable," and that one of these was his being willing to take a leave of absence, in order to reflect upon his unprofessional conduct, poor behavior, and the like. All of the other features of the contract were not only negotiable, but, indeed, might have been removed, as we explained to him at the hearing chaired by Dr. Josephine Allen, in the next "step" of our Advancement protocols (engaged because we could not come to consensus, as Mr. Massena refused to even discuss let alone finesse or otherwise revise the contract that we had drafted initially). As social work faculty and staff, we reserve the right and have the obligation as professional educators who act as "gatekeepers" to a profession that is responsible in part for the livelihood of others to have indicated what was not negotiable in the tentative contract that we drew up, and about which Mr. Massena refused to speak when we met with him in person earlier in the semester. However, since that time, he has had private audience with the Graduate Student Organization,

as well as sent out a series of inflammatory email messages, as noted, and in these interactions and messages he has stated, incorrectly, that we threw him out of school, which is patently false and is a misrepresentation of what actually transpired.

This past summer, Mr. Massena and I had several email exchanges and telephone conversations about his disappointment with a member of the Public Administration faculty from whom he received a grade that was unsatisfactory. Mr. Massena shared specific content of an email message that he intended to share with this person, and wanted my feedback before submitting the information to this person. I advised him not to send the email message in its then-current form, and explained (online and on the telephone), as I often did, that while he is entitled to his strong feelings, individuals who receive messages that may be easily construed as inflammatory and hurtful are less likely to be present for what he wants them to "hear" than might be the case were he to use a different approach in asserting his needs and sharing his views, to which, of course, he is duly entitled. I told him forthrightly that if I received the message that he intended for this faculty member that I would be offended and likely put on the defensive. Mr. Massena thanked me for my candid feedback and said, in particular, that he was glad that I helped him, as always, in negotiating his distress so that he could express it more clearly to others without alienating them. Never did I imagine that I and my Dept. Chair, Dr. Laura Bronstein, would have since become the focus and brunt of the very kinds of messages that in the recent past I had tried to support Mr. Massena in not sending to other people, and about which he had thanked me -- for having helped him not to send them, because of how hurtful and unhelpful they could be or become, as he himself acknowledged, at the time.

Mr. Massena is accusing the department of unethical behavior, but it is he who has been demonstrating unethical behavior, since August 25, 2008, when he allegedly entered the UDC building under false pretenses to distribute flyers (without following the university's poster rules and guidelines) that were distorted in content and design, and then denied having done so, by misrepresenting the truth to security officers, and later invoking his first amendment rights to express a dissident opinion. Mr. Massena, an individual whom I had and have supported since his very first moments in the MSW program, has "gone over the line," professionally-speaking, to put it mildly. In my opinion, he is not suited to hold an MSW at this time, which is why I continue to support and encourage his taking a leave of absence to reflect upon his conduct, in order to be reconsidered for possible continuance in the future (as stipulated in the contract that Dr. Bronstein and I drafted). In consultation with the University Ombuds, Ms. Francine Montemurro, I devised a special writing assignment that would utilize a "strengths-based" approach to help Mr. Massena to reflect upon social work strategies in "macro" practice. This assignment was among the suggestions included in the contract that had been written. Since August 25, 2008, Mr. Massena has demonstrated what I consider to be a serious lack of insight, weak to very poor professional judgment, as well as a clear usurpation regarding the very values that he claims to uphold, and about which he is railing against the department, inappropriately.

Thank you for your attention.

Dr. Diane R. Wiener, Ph.D., L.M.S.W.
Assistant Professor

Attachment M

Bronstein, Laura

From: Flynn, Brian
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2008 9:46 PM
To: Bronstein, Laura
Subject: andre massena

In my role as Andre's advisor, I am concerned about his unprofessional behavior. Andre has demonstrated a lack of self-reflection and a lack of integrity in his approach to expressing his concerns. I feel Andre inappropriately involved consumers during his advancement hearing as a vehicle to promote his own agenda. Andre has expressed inaccurate and disparaging accusations about department personnel and community members to unwilling parties, including students, alumni and members of the University community and the community at large.
