

THE MATTER OF THE *HEALTH PROFESSIONS HPA*, R.S.A.
2000, c.H-7;

AND IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING INTO THE CONDUCT
OF KELLY JASON, A MEMBER OF THE ALBERTA COLLEGE
OF SOCIAL WORKERS;

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT
HEARING REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF KELLY JASON
UNDERTAKEN VIRTUALLY;

DECISION OF THE HEARING TRIBUNAL

I. INTRODUCTION

1. A hearing was held virtually on May 4, 2026 concerning allegations of unprofessional conduct against Kelly Jason (the “Member”), a regulated member of the Alberta College of Social Workers (“ACSW”). The hearing occurred by consent via a virtual platform through the Edmonton office of Parlee McLaws.
2. With the consent of the parties, the hearing proceeded as a joint hearing dealing with the following three ACSW complaint files regarding the Member: File #24.013, File #24.038 and File #24.061. Certain documents regarding the hearing refer to File #24.013 while other documents refer to File #24.038 and File #24.061.
3. This decision sets out the findings, reasons, penalty orders and costs order of the Hearing Tribunal concerning the hearing.

II. THE HEARING GENERALLY

4. The May 4, 2024 hearing was held pursuant to the *Health Professions Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c.H-7 as amended (the “HPA”).
5. The members of the Hearing Tribunal were¹:

Pat Matusko – Chair – Public Member
Vince Paniak – Public Member
Mary Berube – RSW

¹ As discussed later in this decision, Kelsey McWilliams was initially a member of the Hearing Tribunal when the hearing commenced but did not ultimately participate in the balance of the hearing or the Hearing Tribunal’s deliberations and decision-making.

Blair E. Maxston, K.C. acted as independent legal counsel for the Hearing Tribunal.

Also present at the hearing were Bruce Llewellyn (ACSW Complaints Director), Karen Smith, K.C. (legal counsel for the ACSW Complaints Director), the Member and the Member's legal counsel, Cory Ryan.

6. The hearing was a public hearing pursuant to s. 78 of the *HPA*. One of the complainants and her support person observed part of the hearing. Two legal assistants from the Parlee McLaws firm were also observers.
7. The allegations concerning File #24.013 were set out in an Amended Notice of Hearing dated April 14, 2026 (the "File #24.013 Notice of Hearing"). The allegations in the File #24.013 Notice of Hearing are as follows:

CONSENT:

1. Notwithstanding that the Court ordered on June 23rd, 2023 and October 23rd, 2023 that you were to provide counseling services to the Children, you failed to obtain appropriate and/or proper consent to provide those services.

Such conduct contravenes ss. B.4(a)(b) and B.5(a) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

COMMUNICATION:

2. That in the circumstances of this case, (a contested separation), that you failed to properly include both guardians in your verbal and/or written communications regarding decisions with respect to family visitation and/or children initiatives.

Such conduct contravenes ss. D.5(b) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

DOCUMENTATION:

3. That you failed to prepare and/or maintain appropriate documentation with respect to your involvement with the family relating to the issues for which professional services were provided.
4. You failed to provide complete and transparent information with respect to your communication practices, particularly as it related to both parents.
5. That you failed to provide complete disclosure with respect to your billing practices.
6. That your billing practices implemented with respect to this family were variable and inconsistent and without appropriate notice and/or justification to the clients. This related specifically to:

- the variable hourly billing rate;
- enforcement of the payment of those rates;
- the activities for which you would properly bill.

Such conduct contravenes ss. C.1 and D.2(a) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

SCOPE OF PRACTICE:

7. That you failed to recognize therapeutic aspects of this matter fell without your competency and accordingly, you failed to limit your role with respect to those matters within your scope and/or competency levels; specifically, relating to the issues of visitation schedules as between the Children and their mother.

Such conduct contravenes ss. E.4(b)(c)(d) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

8. The allegations concerning File #24.038 and File #24.061 were set out in an Amended Notice of Hearing dated April 14, 2026 (the "File #24.038 and File #24.061 Notice of Hearing"). The allegations in the File #24.038 and #24.061 Notice of Hearing are as follows:

INAPPROPRIATE OPINION:

1. That you issued letters on January 18th, 2024 and April 19th, 2024, which contained improper information and information which was unsubstantiated, specifically:
 - You did not verify the information provided by B and LG;
 - You provided an opinion when it was not warranted;
 - You did not interview any other relevant parties to provide your opinion;
 - You provided an opinion which was outside your scope of practice.
2. That in your reporting to the Courts, you shared information about JL that you did not have consent to share.
3. That you failed to have the appropriate qualifications to offer the professional opinions that were provided to the Court.

Such conduct contravenes ss. B.7(a), D.5 and E.1(c)(i)(3) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

MATURE MINOR:

4. That you did not have appropriate information or basis upon which to consider B a mature minor.

Such conduct contravenes ss. D.6, E.1(b)(viii) and G.1(a) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

FAILURE TO REPORT:

5. Given your concerns with respect to the release of JL from the hospital; the potential return to the family home; and the impact on child B, you failed to satisfy your reporting obligations pursuant to the *Child Youth Family Enhancement Act*, RSA 200, c C-12.

Such conduct contravenes ss. D.7(a)(ii) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

FAILURE TO MAINTAIN NEUTRALITY:

6. That in reporting, you demonstrated a lack of impartiality between the parent parties, JL and LG.

Such conduct contravenes ss. B.3(a) and F.1(a) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

9. No conflicts of interest or apprehension of bias were disclosed by the Hearing Tribunal Members and neither party raised any issues regarding the jurisdiction of the Hearing Tribunal. The Hearing was open to the public pursuant to section 78(1) of the *HPA* and neither party made an application to hold the hearing or a portion of the Hearing in private. Neither party had any preliminary applications.
10. However, when the hearing initially commenced, the Chair advised the parties that the Hearing Tribunal had not been provided with copies of all of the documents concerning the hearing. After taking breaks to attempt to have the missing documents provided to the Hearing Tribunal members, the Hearing Tribunal reconvened at 10:30 a.m. Through its independent legal counsel, the Hearing Tribunal advised the parties as follows:
- The Hearing Tribunal was still missing the Admission for File #24.013 but had received all of the other outstanding documents.
 - The Hearing Tribunal recognized the time, effort and cost associated with scheduling the Hearing on May 4, 2026 but was concerned that it had only received some of the Hearing documents on the morning of May 4, 2026.
 - Accordingly, the Hearing Tribunal proposed that the Hearing reconvene at 1:00 p.m. so that the Hearing Tribunal members could properly and fully review all of the documents that had been provided to them.
 - With the exception of Kelsey McWilliams, who had a scheduling conflict, all of the Hearing Tribunal members were available for the afternoon of May 4, 2026 to continue and complete the Hearing.

- The Hearing Tribunal noted that section 16(3) of the *HPA* allows a Hearing Tribunal to proceed if a member of a Hearing Tribunal is not capable of carrying out their powers and duties.
 - The Hearing Tribunal was of the view that section 16(3) gave the Hearing Tribunal the jurisdiction to proceed with the Hearing at 1:00 p.m. on May 4, 2026 without Ms. McWilliams' participation.
11. After a brief break, both parties agreed with the Hearing Tribunal's proposal. Ms. Smith did indicate that her client, Mr. Llewellyn, could not be present during the afternoon of May 4, 2026 due to a prior commitment but that the Hearing could proceed without Mr. Llewellyn being present.
 12. There were no objections regarding the jurisdiction or composition of the Hearing Tribunal.
 13. The Hearing reconvened at 1:00 p.m. on May 4, 2026.
 14. The following documents were entered as Exhibits at the Hearing with the consent of both parties:
 - EXHIBIT 1: Amended Notice of Hearing regarding File #24.013.
 - EXHIBIT 2: Amended Notice of Hearing (combined) for File #24.038 and File #24.061.
 - EXHIBIT 3: Amended Notice to Attend for File #24.013.
 - EXHIBIT 4: Amended Notice to Attend (combined) for File #24.038 and File #24.061.
 - EXHIBIT 5: Investigation Report dated April 1, 2025 for File #24.013.
 - EXHIBIT 6: Expert Report of Dr. Peter Choate dated August 26, 2025.
 - EXHIBIT 7: Investigation Report dated May 21, 2025 concerning File #24.038.
 - EXHIBIT 8: Investigation Report dated May 21, 2025 concerning File #24.061.
 - EXHIBIT 9: Affidavit of Service for File #24.013.
 - EXHIBIT 10: Affidavit of Service (combined) for File #24.038 and File #24.061.
 - EXHIBIT 11: Admission of Unprofessional Conduct for File #24.013.
 - EXHIBIT 12: Admission of Unprofessional Conduct (combined) for File #24.038 and File #24.061.
 - EXHIBIT 13: Consent Order (the "Consent Order")
- The Exhibit 11 and Exhibit 12 admissions of unprofessional conduct are jointly referred to as the "Admission" in this decision.
- The Member acknowledged receiving copies of both Investigation Reports and both Amended Notices of Hearing.

15. Since the hearing proceeded as a consent hearing, the Hearing Tribunal heard from no witnesses at the hearing.

III. THE HEARING AND THE CONSENT ORDER

16. The Consent Order contained agreed upon “Agreed Statement of Facts”, “Agreed Findings”, “Acknowledgment of Responsibility” and “No Right to Appeal” sections.

17. The Consent Order also contained a “Orders as to Sanctions” section (the “Sanctions Orders”) and “Costs” section (the “Cost Order”).

a) Agreed Statement of Facts

18. The facts in this matter are not in dispute and are described in the Agreed Statement of Facts in terms of File 24.013 and also File 24.038 and File 24.061 respectively as follows:

ACSW #24.013

1. Ms. Jason has been registered as a Registered Social Worker with the Alberta College of Social Workers (“ACSW”) since 1996.
2. Ms. Jason was initially an independent contractor with Luciak and Associates and later transferred to private practice in August of 2023.
3. Ms. Jason provided professional social work services to MAG, DF and the two children MF and LF (the “Children”).
4. On June 23, 2023 and October 23, 2023, court orders were issued, including a provision that Ms. Jason provide counselling services to the children.
5. One of the purposes of providing professional services was to allow for visitations with MAG and her Children.
6. Ultimately the Court issued an Order on April 11th, 2024, terminating the services to be provided by Ms. Jason to the Children.
7. The services provided for and/or expected from Ms. Jason as a result of the Court Order exceeded her abilities and/or competencies.
8. Ms. Jason did not obtain appropriate informed consent with respect to the services provided to the children which was required irrespective of the Court Order.
9. Ms. Jason was inconsistent in her communications to parents.
10. Ms. Jason was inconsistent and sporadic with respect to her billing practices with Communication with the parents including her hourly rate, enforcement and consistency of the hourly rates and the matters for which she billed.

ACSW #24.038 AND #24.061

11. JL was admitted to hospital in October of 2023. It was a voluntary admission and at the time, she had four minor children.
12. Subsequent thereto, Ms. Jason provided professional social work services to the children of JL (B and, subsequently C) with the consent of the father, LG.
13. At the time of commencing services, the family was an intact family with a separation and EPO Order subsequently being imposed against JL.
14. Subsequent to JL's hospitalization, Ms. Jason provided written opinions regarding the family which were presented to the Court.
15. Ms. Jason did not maintain her neutrality between the parents as the family split.
16. These written opinions were not appropriate as Ms. Jason:
 - (i) Did not verify information provided by the father and one child;
 - (ii) Did not interview parties with relevant information;
 - (iii) Did not obtain information directly from JL.
17. Ms. Jason did not have the appropriate qualifications to offer an opinion to the Court nor was an opinion warranted in this case.
18. Ms. Jason, in writing the opinion letter was practicing outside her competent scope of practice.
19. Ms. Jason received information that gave rise to a duty to report which she did not do.
20. Ms. Jason did not have the proper information on grounds to consider child B a mature minor.

b) Agreed Findings of Unprofessional Conduct

19. The Consent Order set out the following "Agreed Findings" of unprofessional conduct:

AGREED FINDINGS – ACSW #24.013:**CONSENT:**

1. Notwithstanding that the Court ordered on June 23rd, 2023 and October 23rd, 2023 that Ms. Jason was to provide counseling services to the Children, she failed to obtain appropriate and/or proper consent to provide those services.

Such conduct contravenes ss. B.4(a)(b) and B.5(a) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

DOCUMENTATION:

4. Ms. Jason failed to provide complete and transparent information with respect to her communication practices, particularly as it related to both parents.

5. Ms. Jason failed to provide complete transparency with respect to her billing practices with respect to the family. This related specifically to:

- The variable hourly billing rate;
- Enforcement of the payment of those rates;
- The activities for which she would properly bill.

Such conduct contravenes ss. C.1 and D.2(a) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

SCOPE OF PRACTICE:

7. That Ms. Jason failed to recognize therapeutic aspects of this matter fell without her competency and accordingly, she failed to limit her role with respect to those matters within her scope and/or competency levels; specifically, relating to the issues of visitation schedules as between the Children and their mother.

Such conduct contravenes ss. E.4(b)(c)(d) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

AGREED FINDINGS – ACSW #24.038 and #24.061:**INAPPROPRIATE OPINION:**

1. Ms. Jason issued letters on January 18th, 2024 and April 19th, 2024, which contained improper information and information which was unsubstantiated, specifically:

- Ms. Jason did not verify the information provided by B and LG;
- Ms. Jason provided an opinion when it was not warranted;
- Ms. Jason did not interview any other relevant parties to provide her opinion;
- Ms. Jason provided an opinion which was outside her scope of practice.

2. In her reporting to the Courts, Ms. Jason shared information about JL that she did not have consent to share.

3. Ms. Jason failed to have the appropriate qualifications to offer the professional opinions that were provided to the Court.

Such conduct contravenes ss. B.7(a), D.5 and E.1(c)(i)(3) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

MATURE MINOR:

4. Ms. Jason did not have appropriate information or basis upon which to consider B a mature minor.

Such conduct contravenes ss. D.6, E.1(b)(vii) and G.1(a) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

FAILURE TO REPORT:

5. Given Ms. Jason's concerns with respect to the release of JL from the hospital; the potential return to the family home; and the impact on child B, Ms. Jason failed to satisfy her reporting obligations pursuant to the *Child Youth Family Enhancement Act*, RSA 200, c C-12.

Such conduct contravenes ss. D.7(a)(ii) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

FAILURE TO MAINTAIN NEUTRALITY:

6. In reporting, Ms. Jason demonstrated a lack of impartiality between the parent parties, JL and LG.

Such conduct contravenes ss. B.3(a) and F.1(a) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Value 4 of the Code of Ethics 2005 and constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to s. 1(1) (pp) (i) (ii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

The allegations referred to above in this paragraph 19 are admitted by the Member to be unprofessional conduct are collectively referred to hereafter as the "Allegations".

c) Acknowledgement of Responsibility and Admission of Unprofessional Conduct

20. It was acknowledged by the Member and the ACSW Complaints Director that the Member's conduct as described in the Agreed Statement of Facts relating to the admitted Allegations constitutes unprofessional conduct.

d) No Right to Appeal

21. The ACSW and the Member agreed that there shall be no appeal from the Consent Order notwithstanding s. 87 of the *HPA*.

e) The Joint Penalty and Costs Proposal

22. The Sanctions Orders advanced by both parties set out the following penalty orders:

1. Two Reprimands shall be issued as against Ms. Jason.

2. Ms. Jason shall be suspended from the practice of social work for a period of 15 days to be undertaken within 60 days from the date of this Order.

3. Upon her return to the practice of social work, Ms. Jason's permit to practice social work shall be subject to supervision for a period of one (1) year from the date of returning to the practice of social work. The cost of this supervision will be the responsibility of Ms. Jason. This supervision may be within or outside the context of Ms. Jason's employment. The supervisor shall be approved by the ACSW, and the ACSW shall be entitled to such reporting and disclosure from the supervisor as the ACSW deems necessary from time to time.

4. Ms. Jason shall be obliged to undertake two (2) consultations, with a period of one (1) year with a senior RSW practitioner, as approved by the ACSW. The cost of these consultations shall be the responsibility of Ms. Jason. The ACSW shall be entitled to any such reporting as it deems necessary from time to time.

5. Ms. Jason shall be required to undertake ten (10) additional hours of continuing education focused on consent, and five (5) hours of continuing education focused on high conflict and professional opinions, within one (1) year of the date of this Order. The courses shall be approved by the Complaints Director and shall be undertaken at the cost of Ms. Jason.

6. The Complaints Director shall maintain the discretion to suspend Ms. Jason's permit to practice pending a Hearing should the Complaints Director, in his sole discretion, conclude that Ms. Jason has breached this Order.

7. There shall be publication of this decision and reasons on a with names basis.

23. The parties also jointly proposed a costs order as follows:

1. Ms. Jason shall pay costs of this matter in the amount of \$1,000.00 within one (1) year of the date of this Order.

(the "Costs Order")

IV. LIABILITY MATTERS

a) Submissions from the Complaints Director

24. Ms. Smith's submissions regarding the liability phase of the Hearing on behalf of her client can be summarized as follows:

- After investigations and referral to hearing, the Member, the Complaints Director and respective legal counsel met on March 20, 2026 to engage in without prejudice dialogue regarding settlement of these matters (including acceptance of responsibility by the Member). That in turn resulted in the consent hearing documents.
- Ms. Smith reviewed both Admission documents and the admitted Allegations.

- Section 70 of the *HPA* gives the Hearing Tribunal the ability to accept those admissions. The other allegations in the File #24.013 Amended Notice of Hearing and the File #24.038 and File #24.061 Amended Notice of Hearing are withdrawn.
- In order to accept the Admissions, the Hearing Tribunal needs two things: the facts must be proven and the facts must fall within the definition of unprofessional conduct in section 1(1)(pp) of the *HPA*. In this hearing, the definitions in section 1(1)(pp)(i)(ii) and (xii) apply.
- The Hearing Tribunal can also rely on the Expert Reports prepared by Peter Choate.
- Ms. Smith urged the Hearing Tribunal to accept the Admission of Unprofessional Conduct on a consent basis.

b) Submissions from the Member

25. Mr. Ryan had no submissions.

c) The Hearing Tribunal's Decision

26. After caucusing in private, the Hearing Tribunal advised the parties that it had no questions and that it was accepting the admissions concerning the Allegations and was making findings of unprofessional conduct regarding the Allegations. The Chair of the Hearing Tribunal invited the parties to make submissions regarding penalty.

V. PENALTY ORDER MATTERS

a) Submissions from the Complaints Director

27. Ms. Smith's submissions regarding the penalty phase of the Hearing on behalf of her client can be summarized as follows:
- The statutory authority for the Hearing Tribunal to make findings of unprofessional conduct is set out in section 80 of the *HPA*.
 - The objectives of sentencing are: protection of the public, deterrence to the Member and deterrence to the profession, rehabilitation of the Member, fairness and protecting the integrity of the profession.
 - Ms. Smith reviewed the *Jaswal* factors in terms of the Member's unprofessional conduct.
 - In terms of the nature of the unprofessional conduct, there are a broad range of allegations but some involve quite serious unprofessional conduct. This is an aggravating factor.
 - The Member was not a new member of the profession. She was a senior practitioner.

- In terms of the character of the Member, there were no prior complaints or findings of unprofessional conduct. The Member immediately accepted the settlement invitation and made admissions of unprofessional conduct.
- In terms of impact on the patients, patients occupy a position of vulnerability and there was an adverse impact on persons affected by the Member's actions.
- The Hearing Tribunal's authority to make penalty orders and a costs order is set out in s.82 of the *HPA*.
- Ms. Smith reviewed the Consent Order and jointly advanced penalty and costs orders.
- A fifteen-day suspension is warranted due to the seriousness of the unprofessional conduct (particularly on File #24.038) and because a mature minor was involved.
- Supervision involves liaising with a professional on a regular basis. The consultations should be referred to as "centering" as they are not therapy supervision or mentoring. Instead they are a discussion of how the Member got offside of the core responsibilities of her profession.
- The continuing education requirements are justified and the Consent Order reflects the *HPA* in that it also allows for the power to suspend the Member if there is a breach of the penalty orders.
- Publication with name is required because of the suspension of the Member's practice permit.
- Pursuant to the *Charkhandeh* decision², the \$1,000.00 costs order is separate and apart from a sanction order. \$1,000.00 in costs is the ACSW's "universal amount" for unprofessional conduct generally.
- Ms. Smith reviewed the *R. v. Anthony-Cooke* Supreme Court of Canada case regarding deference to joint submissions regarding penalties. Ms. Smith also reviewed the public interest test which establishes that a decision-maker should not depart from a joint penalty proposal unless it brings the administration of justice into disrepute or is otherwise contrary to the public interest.
- The joint penalty proposal from the parties meets the public interest test, satisfies the objectives of sentencing and is consistent with the *Jaswal* criteria.

b) Submissions from the Member

28. Mr. Ryan had no submissions.

² *Charkhandeh v College of Dental Surgeons of Alberta*, 2025 ABCA 258 (CanLII)

29. The Member made a statement to the Hearing Tribunal which can be summarized as follows:

- The Member thanked the Tribunal for the opportunity to resolve these matters through a Consent Order.
- The Member never intended to harm anyone or practice outside her scope.
- The Member acknowledged her errors and misjudgments and stated that she planned to meet the Consent Orders.
- A perfect storm of family matters converged to negatively impact her skills and judgment as a social worker.
- The expert reports accurately reflect her actions.

-
- She has made adjustments concerning her work practice.

c) Hearing Tribunal Decision

30. After caucusing privately, the Hearing Tribunal had one question and then advised the parties that it was accepting the penalty orders as presented.

VI. REASONS FOR DECISION: THE ADMITTED ALLEGATIONS

a) Generally

31. The ACSW is a self-governing professional body established under the *HPA* and is responsible for regulation of the Social Work profession in the public interest. This includes ensuring that all ACSW regulated members practice their profession in a manner that protects the public from unsafe, incompetent or unethical acts.
32. The Hearing Tribunal sees protection of the public as the primary consideration in this matter.
33. After carefully considering all of the information and evidence presented during the Hearing, the Hearing Tribunal accepts the admissions of unprofessional conduct by the Member.
34. The factual basis for the admitted Allegations of unprofessional conduct was proven as the result of uncontradicted evidence presented to the Hearing Tribunal. Bearing in mind the Admissions of Unprofessional Conduct signed by the Member, the Hearing Tribunal also concludes that the proven actions of the Member constituted unprofessional conduct as they were a clear breach of the Member's broader ethical obligations as a professional and harmed the integrity of the profession of Social Work.
35. The Member occupied a position of trust in terms of a mature minor and her actions were a clear departure from the ethical and professional obligations that she owed to that individual.

36. The Member's failure to obtain appropriate and proper consent to provide counselling services to the children and her failure to provide complete and transparent information was inconsistent with her duties of honesty and transparency.
37. The Agreed Statement of Facts and the Admissions clearly established that the Member failed to recognize her personal and professional limitations in terms of the scope of practice that she could properly perform. Failing to recognize the limitations on her professional abilities and failing to limit her role was serious unprofessional conduct.
38. The Member's Admissions represent marked departures from a social worker's obligation to ensure that accurate, complete and substantiated information is communicated, that appropriate consent to disclose information is obtained and that professional opinions are only provided where the social worker has appropriate qualifications to provide those opinions.
39. The Member's failure to meet her reporting obligations under the *Child Youth Family Enhancement Act*, RSA 200, c C-12 and her failure to maintain neutrality in reporting was inconsistent with the core principles of social work.
40. Importantly, the Hearing Tribunal recognizes that the Member has clearly demonstrated her understanding and recognition that her actions did not meet applicable standards and constituted unprofessional conduct.
41. In summary, the Member's conduct negatively impacted the profession, the integrity of the profession and the public interest. It represented a departure from the expected competence and ethical obligations of a member of a healthcare profession.
42. Based on all of the evidence, the Hearing Tribunal finds the admitted Allegations factually proven and that those Allegations constitute unprofessional conduct.

VII. REASONS FOR DECISION: SANCTIONS AND COSTS

a) The Joint Sanctions Proposal

43. After considering submissions from the parties, at the May 4, 2026 hearing the Hearing Tribunal confirmed that it was accepting the Sanction Orders for the reasons described below.
44. The Hearing Tribunal acknowledges the efforts of the parties in preparing the Consent Order and the Sanction Orders. The Hearing Tribunal is also aware of the well-established legal principles indicating that deference should be shown to joint submissions on penalties as they promote certainty for both the member and the regulatory body, reduce the time and cost associated with contested hearings and are the result of careful negotiation.
45. Although the Hearing Tribunal retains ultimate discretion in terms of making penalty orders, it is aware of the legal principles which establish that a decision-maker (such as this Hearing Tribunal) should not depart from a joint submission on sanction unless the joint submission is unfit, unreasonable or contrary to the public interest.
46. The Hearing Tribunal found that the public interest test for accepting the Sanction Orders was met.

47. The proposed penalty orders must and do convey to the Member, the profession and the public that this conduct will not be tolerated by the ACSW having regard to its public protection mandate.
48. Ultimately, the Hearing Tribunal concluded that the proposed sanctions are reasonable and appropriate and reflect the serious nature of the Member's conduct, the rehabilitation of the Member and her acceptance of responsibility for those actions.
49. Written reprimands serve as a deterrent to the Member and serve to protect the public. Reprimands are appropriate given the nature of the Member's unprofessional conduct.
50. Publication of the Member's name with the Hearing Tribunal's decision is a significant sanction but it also justified and appropriate bearing in mind the ordering of suspension, the serious nature of the unprofessional conduct and the accountability and transparency duties that the College has to the public.
51. Publication with name in concert with the other penalty orders will serve as a specific deterrent to the Member as well as a general deterrent to other social workers that this type of conduct will not be tolerated and will result in significant penalty orders.
52. The \$1,000.00 in costs payable by the Member represents a proportionate financial impact and is fair and reasonable having regard to her actions and the past practices of the Complaints Director in terms of costs orders.
53. Protection of the public and preserving the integrity of the profession in the eyes of the public are paramount to the ACSW in the regulation of the social work profession in Alberta. Remediation is an important process in the rehabilitation of a member found guilty of unprofessional conduct. As a result, the Member being ordered to engage in supervised practice when she returns to practice, undergo consultations and complete additional continuing education are justified. The Hearing Tribunal finds that these orders are remedial and will assist in facilitating safe and competent practice by the Member.
54. The Hearing Tribunal concludes that the sanctions recommended by both parties and the Costs Order are fair, reasonable and appropriate and reflect the seriousness of the Member's conduct as well as her acceptance of responsibility for those actions. They also reflect remediation and the Member's efforts in resolving these matters by way of a consent hearing.
55. Ultimately, the Hearing Tribunal concludes that the sanctions set out in this decision are fair, reasonable and appropriate and reflect the seriousness of the Member's conduct as well as her acceptance of responsibility for those actions. They also reflect her efforts in resolving these matters by way of a consent hearing.
56. In summary, the Hearing Tribunal makes the following orders in accordance with s. 82 of the *HPA*:
 1. Two Reprimands shall be issued as against the Member.

2. The Member shall be suspended from the practice of social work for a period of 15 days to be undertaken within 60 days from the date of this Order.
3. Upon her return to the practice of social work, the Member's permit to practice social work shall be subject to supervision for a period of one (1) year from the date of returning to the practice of social work. The cost of this supervision will be the responsibility of the Member. This supervision may be within or outside the context of the Member's employment. The supervisor shall be approved by the ACSW, and the ACSW shall be entitled to such reporting and disclosure from the supervisor as the ACSW deems necessary from time to time.
4. The Member shall be obliged to undertake two (2) consultations, with a period of one (1) year with a senior RSW practitioner, as approved by the ACSW. The cost of these consultations shall be the responsibility of the Member. The ACSW shall be entitled to any such reporting as it deems necessary from time to time.
5. The Member shall be required to undertake ten (10) additional hours of continuing education focused on consent, and five (5) hours of continuing education focused on high conflict and professional opinions, within one (1) year of the date of this Order. The courses shall be approved by the Complaints Director and shall be undertaken at the cost of the Member.
6. The Complaints Director shall maintain the discretion to suspend the Member's permit to practice pending a Hearing should the Complaints Director, in his sole discretion, conclude that the Member has breached this Order.
7. There shall be publication of this decision and reasons on a with names basis.
8. The Member shall pay costs of this matter in the amount of \$1,000.00 within one (1) year of the date of this Order.

Dated this 3rd day of June 2026.

P.A. Matusko

Pat Matusko
Chair on behalf of the Hearing Tribunal