

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

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT
HEARING REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF ARIEL
DELORME UNDERTAKEN VIRTUALLY;

DECISION OF THE HEARING TRIBUNAL

I. INTRODUCTION

1. A hearing was held virtually on September 3, 2026 concerning allegations of unprofessional conduct against Ariel Delorme (the “**Member**”), a regulated member of the Alberta College of Social Workers (“**ACSW**”). The hearing occurred virtually with the consent of both parties.
2. This decision sets out the findings, reasons and penalty orders of the Hearing Tribunal concerning the hearing.

II. THE HEARING GENERALLY

3. The September 3, 2026 hearing was held pursuant to the *Health Professions Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c.H-7 as amended (the “**Act**”).
4. The members of the Hearing Tribunal were:

Pat Matusko, (Chair, Public Member)
Judy Tran (Public Member)
Tiffany Fassnidge (RSW)
Jacquie Mastenbroek (RSW)

The Hearing Tribunal was assisted by Blair E. Maxston, K.C. as independent legal counsel.

Also participating in the hearing were Sheryl Pearson (ACSW Complaints Director) and Karen Smith K.C. (legal counsel for the ACSW Complaints Director).

The Member participated in the hearing and was represented by legal counsel, Emily McCartney.

5. The hearing was a public hearing pursuant to s. 78 of the Act. There was no application to hold the hearing in private.

6. There were no objections regarding the timeliness of service of the Notice of Hearing and no objections regarding the composition or jurisdiction of the Hearing Tribunal. As well, there were no preliminary applications.
7. The allegations were set out in a Notice of Hearing dated June 22, 2026 (the “**Notice of Hearing**”). The allegations in the Amended Notice of Hearing arise from the Member’s interactions with client KM while the Member was employed as an SLI Outreach Worker. The allegations in the Notice of Hearing are as follows:

“Sexual Abuse:

1. That prior to being registered with the ACSW on September 25, 2025, and thereafter, you engaged in a personal, intimate and sexual relationship with KM.

Such conduct contravenes ss. F.7(a)(i), G.1(a)(b) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Values 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*.

Professional Relationship:

2. That you engaged in a sexual, romantic relationship with KM while he was a client and subsequent to terminating the professional relationship.

Such conduct contravenes ss., B.3 of the Standards of Practice 2023, Values 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*.

Professionalism:

3. That notwithstanding your professional relationship with KM was terminated and/or you were under the care of the Alberta Hospitals, you continued to engage with KM in a manner that was inappropriate, specifically as follows:

- a. That you continued contact with the client notwithstanding that he was no longer a professional client;
- b. That your ongoing communications with KM were inappropriate;
- c. That you continued to have intimate personal and/or sexual relations with the client;
- d. That you physically assaulted KM;
- e. That you continued to have conversations and dialogue about future relationships with KM;
- f. That you continued communication with KM after self-reporting your conduct to the ACSW.

Such conduct contravenes ss. B.2, E.1(a)(b)(c), E.3(n), F.1, F.3(a)(b), G.1(b) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Values 4 and 6 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*.

Impaired Ability to Perform:

4. That you inappropriately maintained a professional relationship with KM during your employment with Catholic Social Services when your abilities to provide professional services were impaired due to substance use/abuse, addictions and/or a mental or emotional condition, the particulars of which are as follows:

- a. That you continued to feel incapable of managing your emotions with respect to KM;
- b. That you continued to engage in phoning, texting, communicating and social media interactions, including Snapchats, with KM indicating personal feelings for him;
- c. That you continued to engage with KM indicating that you wanted to kill him;
- d. That you reported feeling suicidal, depressed and self-harming and were ultimately admitted to the emergency department at the University of Alberta Hospital (October 10, 2025);
- e. That you had homicidal ideations with respect to your previous Team Lead at Catholic Social Services;
- f. That notwithstanding that you were engaged with a hospital program, you continued inappropriate contact with KM;
- g. That you continued the ongoing use of cannabis, ultimately with indication of a cannabis use disorder.

Such conduct contravenes ss. F.4(a)(b)(c) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Values 6 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*.

Registration Misrepresentation:

5. That while you were not initially registered with the ACSW, you were undertaking the ACSW registration process, including providing evidence of good character, while you were maintaining a personal, intimate and/or sexual relationship with KM.

Such conduct contravenes ss. G.8(a)(i) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Values 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 following documents were entered as Exhibits at the Hearing with the consent of both parties:

Exhibit 1: Notice of Hearing.

Exhibit 2: Notice to Attend.

Exhibit 3: Investigation Report (the "**Investigation Report**").

Exhibit 4: Statutory Declaration of Service

Exhibit 5: Admission of Unprofessional Conduct (the "**Admission**").

Exhibit 6: Consent Order (the “**Consent Order**”)¹.

Exhibit 7: Statement by Member.

9. In the Admission, the Member made admissions of unprofessional conduct to the following allegations:

“PROHIBITED RELATIONSHIP:

1. That I engaged in a sexual, romantic relationship with KM while he was a client and subsequent to terminating the professional relationship.

Such conduct contravenes ss., F.7 of the Standards of Practice 2023, Values 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*.

PROFESSIONALISM:

2. That notwithstanding my professional relationship with KM was terminated and/or I was under the care of the Alberta Hospitals, I continued to engage with KM in a manner that was inappropriate, specifically as follows:

- a. That I continued contact with the client notwithstanding that he was no longer a professional client;
- b. That my ongoing communications with KM were inappropriate;
- c. That I continued to have intimate personal and/or sexual relations with my client;
- d. That I physically assaulted KM;
- e. That I continued to have conversations and dialogue about future relationships with KM;
- f. That I continued communication with KM after self-reporting my conduct to the ACSW.

Such conduct contravenes ss. B.2, E.1(a)(b)(c), E.3(n), F.1, F.3(a)(b), G.1(b) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Values 4 and 6 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*.

IMPAIRED ABILITY TO PERFORM:

3. That I inappropriately maintained a professional relationship with KM during my employment with Catholic Social Services when my abilities to provide professional services were impaired due to substance use/abuse, addictions and/or a mental or emotional condition.

Such conduct contravenes ss. F.4(a)(b)(c) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Values 6 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*.

¹ The Hearing Tribunal received an updated Consent Order immediately prior to the commencement of the September 3, 2026 hearing and considered that version of the Consent Order in its analysis and decision-making.

REGISTRATION MISREPRESENTATION:

4. That while I was not initially registered with the ACSW, I was undertaking the ACSW registration process, including providing evidence of good character, while I was maintaining a personal, intimate and/or sexual relationship with KM.

Such conduct contravenes ss. G.8(a)(i) of the Standards of Practice 2023, Values 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**”)

10. The other allegations in the Notice of Hearing were withdrawn.
11. 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

12. The Consent Order contained a “Agreed Statement of Facts”, “Agreed Findings”, “Acknowledgment of Responsibility” and “No Right to Appeal” sections.
13. The Consent Order also contained a “Orders as to Sanctions” section (the “**Sanction Orders**”) and a Costs section which will be commented on further later in this decision.

A. Agreed Statement of Facts

14. The facts in this matter are not in dispute and are described in the Agreed Statement of Facts as follows:
 - “1. Ms. Delorme has been registered as a Registered Social Worker with the Alberta College of Social Workers (“ACSW”) since September 25, 2025.
 2. At all material times Ms. Delorme was employed as an SLI Outreach Worker commencing in 2023 in Edmonton, Alberta.
 3. At all material times KM was a client under Ms. Delorme’s casework responsibilities.
 4. Ms. Delorme was also a practicum student with the University of Calgary and was undertaking a practicum until such time as she was registered with the ACSW on September 25, 2025.
 5. In May 2025, a 21 year old male client, KM, was placed on Ms. Delorme’s caseload. In July 2025, the client informed Ms. Delorme that he was obsessed with her. KM was removed from Ms. Delorme’s caseload on September 18, 2025.
 6. On August 14, 2025, Ms. Delorme spoke to her supervisor requesting that KM be removed from her caseload.

7. For a period late August to September 8, 2025, Ms. Delorme was in Paris on holiday. She continued to be in contact with KM.
8. On September 8, 2025, Ms. Delorme returned from Paris. She paid for an Uber for KM to attend at her apartment and engaged in a sexual relationship with KM.
9. On September 25, 2025, Ms. Delorme became registered with the ACSW having completed her practicum in August 2025, and commencing the registration process at that point.
10. On September 26, 2025, Ms. Delorme commenced a medical leave from CSS.
11. Ms. Delorme continued to engage in a personal, romantic, and sexual relationship with KM.
12. On October 16, 2025, Ms. Delorme went to the Emergency Department at the University of Alberta Hospital. She was not admitted but was referred to the Alberta Day Hospital commencing October 17, 2025.
13. Subsequent to attending at the University of Alberta Hospital, Ms. Delorme met with a social worker, Ms. Buziak.
14. Ms. Delorme continued to engage in a relationship with KM.
15. Notwithstanding that KM had been removed from Ms. Delorme's caseload:
 - She continued contact with him;
 - She continued ongoing communications with him that were inappropriate;
 - She maintained an intimate, personal, and sexual relationship with KM;
 - She continued to have conversations with KM about their future relationship;
16. During the course of her relationship with KM, Ms. Delorme physically assaulted KM.
17. Ms. Delorme was aware that her personal wellbeing was impaired commencing in August 2025. She did seek assistance from her supervisor, went on holiday, and subsequently went on medical leave. However, notwithstanding these steps, she continued to be employed with CSS providing professional services. She acknowledges that she was impaired both mentally and with respect to the use of marijuana in her personal life.
18. When commencing the ACSW registration process in August 2025, Ms. Delorme submitted proof of good character while actively engaged in an inappropriate relationship with KM and with knowledge that she was in violation of the Standards of Practice.
19. The ACSW received a complaint regarding Ms. Delorme's conduct from her treating social worker, Ms. Buziak, on November 4, 2025.
20. On November 5, 2025, Ms. Delorme self-reported her conduct."

B. Acknowledgment of Responsibility and Unprofessional Conduct

15. It was acknowledged by the Member and the ACSW Complaints Director that the Member's conduct as described in the Agreed Statement of Facts and the allegations in the Admission constitutes unprofessional conduct.

C. No Right to Appeal

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

D. Submissions from the Parties

17. Ms. Smith's comments on behalf of her client can be summarized as follows:
- After receiving the complaint, the Complaints Director appointed an investigator who prepared an investigation report. Ms. Smith briefly reviewed the Investigation Report.
 - In August of 2026 and after the Investigation Report was provided to the Member, candid discussions were held between the Member, the Complaints Director and their respective lawyers which resulted in the Admission and Consent Order.
 - The Member has made admissions to four charges set out in the Admission. The Member's conduct is not characterized as sexual abuse. This is a professional boundary case.
 - The Hearing Tribunal's job is to determine whether there are factual underpinnings for unprofessional conduct for the admitted Allegations and then to look at the definition of unprofessional conduct under section 1(1)(pp) of the *HPA* to determine whether proven facts constitute unprofessional conduct.
 - The Hearing Tribunal has ample facts in paragraphs 1 to 20 of the Agreed Statement of Facts to establish the relevant facts. Although the Investigation Report is not entered for the truth of its contents it provides important context to support the facts.
 - In this case, the Member's conduct is clearly unprofessional conduct.
 - If the Hearing Tribunal accepts the Admission, it needs to consider five factors in terms of the consequences for the Member and the objectives of sentencing: public protection, deterrence to the Member and members at large, rehabilitation, fairness (comparable consequences for comparable conduct) and the integrity of the profession. The Hearing Tribunal should also review the *Jaswal* factors.
 - In terms of the *Jaswal* factors, the conduct is serious and is at the top-end of allegations of unprofessional conduct. This is an aggravating factor.
 - In terms of the Member's age, this was a young member of the profession.
 - In terms of the age and mental condition of the patient, the patient was vulnerable and this is an aggravating factor.

- In terms of the number of times that the offence occurred, there was a systemic pattern of behaviour over a period of time which is an aggravating factor.
- In terms of the Member's role, she did acknowledge her conduct and did agree to a consent hearing which avoids the challenges of a contested hearing. This is a mitigating factor.
- The Hearing Tribunal's powers are set out in section 82 of the *HPA*. Ms. Smith reviewed the Consent Order and the proposed penalty orders and costs order.
- Ms. Smith reviewed the Sanctions Orders and the Costs Order.
- Ms. Smith reviewed the *R. v. Anthony-Cook* Supreme Court of Canada case and the public interest test. This means that the Hearing Tribunal should not depart from the joint submission on penalty unless it brings the administration of justice into disrepute or is otherwise contrary to the public interest. The Hearing Tribunal's discretion is therefore fettered in terms of ordering sanctions.
- That is a high bar and here the Tribunal should give significant deference to and respect the work that has been done by the parties concerning the joint penalty proposal.

18. Ms. McCartney's submissions can be summarized as follows:

- Ms. Smith fairly and clearly summarized the facts, issues and authorities in this case.
- The Member's acceptance of findings of unprofessional conduct are unqualified and there is no excuse to excuse her conduct.
- Ms. McCartney reviewed the public interest test and submitted that the Sanctions Orders fall within a reasonable range of sanctions.
- Ms. McCartney submitted that the Hearing Tribunal should carefully consider that (i) the Member made unqualified admissions to all four of the Allegations, (ii) the Member self-reported to the College, (iii) the Member cooperated fully with the College, (iv) a contested hearing and (v) the testimony of a vulnerable person was avoided and the Member has demonstrated genuine insight into her unprofessional conduct.
- Ms. McCartney reviewed the Member's Exhibit 7 statement including the Member's mental health conditions and extreme isolation and submitted that this was a factor in causing the unprofessional conduct.
- The Member sought urgent medical care and has now established safeguards for a safe return to practice including to avoid her previous extreme personal isolation.

- At the time of the unprofessional conduct, the Member was suffering from a number of medical conditions including PTSD, ADHD and cannabis use disorder. That does not excuse her conduct but she has engaged in sustained and reflective work to ensure the unprofessional conduct will never be repeated.
 - Importantly, the Member asked that the client be removed from her care.
 - There is information in the Investigation Report that the client engaged in coercion including threats, blackmail and manipulative conduct. These are important contextual factors.
 - The proposed penalties impose substantial and meaningful consequences that are in line with the seriousness of the unprofessional conduct and support public protection including through specific and general deterrence.
 - The jointly submitted penalties are reasonable and proportionate and fall within the public interest test.
19. After receiving submissions from the parties, the Hearing Tribunal deliberated privately. When the hearing reconvened, the Chair advised the parties that the Hearing Tribunal was accepting the Consent Order, was accepting the Admission and was accepting the jointly recommended Penalty Orders and Costs Order.

IV. REASONS FOR DECISION: THE ALLEGATIONS

A. Generally

20. The ACSW is a self-governing professional body established under the Act 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.
21. The Hearing Tribunal sees protection of the public as the primary consideration in this matter.
22. After carefully considering all of the information and evidence presented during the Hearing, the Hearing Tribunal accepts all of the admissions of unprofessional conduct by the Member.
23. The factual basis for the Allegations was proven as the result of uncontradicted evidence presented to the Hearing Tribunal. Giving deference to the joint submission and bearing in mind the Admission signed by the Member and the other evidence before it, the Hearing Tribunal also concluded that the proven actions of the Member constituted unprofessional conduct as they were a clear breach of the Member's ethical and professional obligations.

B. Analysis

24. The Hearing Tribunal concludes that the Member's admitted unprofessional conduct was very serious in nature and agrees with the Complaints Director that it is at the higher end of the range of unprofessional conduct as it involves a clear professional boundary issue.
25. As a registered social worker, the Member occupied a position of trust and authority and breached the core ethical obligations that she owed to client KM.
26. The Member's actions were clearly unprofessional conduct. This was not a "grey area". Instead, the Member's choices were deliberate and were a marked departure from the professional and ethical obligations of a Social Worker.
27. Based on this evidence, the Hearing Tribunal finds the admitted Allegations are factually proven and that the admitted Allegations constitute unprofessional conduct.

V. REASONS FOR DECISION: SANCTIONS AND COSTS

A. The Joint Sanctions Proposal

28. As part of the Consent Order, the parties also jointly presented the Sanction Orders
29. At the hearing, both parties agreed to provide the Hearing Tribunal with a fully executed Consent Order which would contain changes to the Sanction Orders to provide clarification. During the hearing that document was emailed to the Hearing Tribunal by Ms. Smith.
30. The Sanction Orders in the Consent Order are:
 - "1. A Reprimand shall be issued as against Ms. Delorme.
 2. Ms. Delorme's permit to practice will be cancelled for a minimum of three (3) years, from the date of this Order. During this suspension period, Ms. Delorme shall not be entitled to work as a social worker or work within the scope of practice.
 3. Prior to Ms. Delorme's return to the practice of social work, and prior to any application for registration, Ms. Delorme will be obliged to successfully complete a university level Ethics course. The course shall be approved by the Complaints Director and shall be undertaken at the cost to Ms. Delorme
 4. The Hearing Tribunal recommends that:
 - i. The Registration Committee obtain a fitness to practice report prior to determining any application for registration by Ms. Delorme, the nature and extent of which shall be in the discretion of the Registration Committee;
 - ii. The Registration Committee should properly review the Decision of the Hearing Tribunal and investigation report relating to and as in regard to this matter;
 - iii. Upon a return to the practice of social work (should an application for

registration with the ACSW be successful), the Hearing Tribunal recommends Ms. Delorme's permit to practice social work shall be subject to supervision for a period of five (5) years from the date of returning to the practice of social work. The cost of this supervision will be the responsibility of Ms. Delorme. This supervision may be within or outside the context of Ms. Delorme'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.

5. Ms. Delorme shall be obliged to continue ongoing therapeutic counselling for a 12 month period from the date of this Order. The cost of counselling shall be the responsibility of Ms. Delorme. The ACSW shall be entitled to any reporting it deems necessary from time to time with respect to attendance. Ms. Delorme shall provide verification as to attendance at the conclusion of the one year period.

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

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

1. Ms. Delorme 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**")

32. The Hearing Tribunal confirms that it is accepting the Sanction Orders and the Costs Order for the reasons described below.

B. The Sanction Orders and the Public Interest Test

33. The Hearing Tribunal acknowledges the significant 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.

34. 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.

35. For the reasons set out in this decision, the Hearing Tribunal finds that the public interest test for accepting the Sanction Orders and the Costs Order was met.

36. 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 in terms of its public protection mandate and its obligation to uphold the integrity of the profession of social work in the eyes of the public.

37. Ultimately, the Hearing Tribunal concludes that the proposed sanctions are reasonable and

appropriate and reflect the very serious nature of the Member's conduct, the rehabilitation of the Member should she choose to apply for registration with the College as per Order 3 and her clear acceptance of responsibility for her actions. Very importantly, by the Member admitting unprofessional conduct and agreeing to the terms of a consent hearing, both parties avoided the time, cost and uncertainty associated with a contested hearing which could have been very lengthy. A contested hearing would also have required KM to testify including examination and cross-examination.

38. The three (3) year minimum cancellation of the Member's practice permit as set out in Order 2 is a serious consequence but is proportionate and justified having regard to the serious nature of the unprofessional conduct.
39. The completion of a University level Ethics course prior to any future registration or practice as a social worker and the obligation to continue therapeutic counselling in Orders 3 and 5 are appropriate. Specifically, return to practice includes protection the public and also assists the Member in terms of rehabilitation.
40. One of the major factors in the Hearing Tribunal reaching its decision to accept the Admission was Order 4 and the recommendations to the Registration Committee. The Hearing Tribunal recognizes that those are only recommendations and that the Registration Committee will independently exercise its discretion should the Member seek registration with the College in the future. However, the recommendations in Order 4 are critically important in terms of ensuring safe, ethical and competent practice by the Member should she return to practice. The Hearing Tribunal expects that the Registration Committee will thoroughly and carefully consider the nature, extent and seriousness of the proven unprofessional conduct in this hearing and will carefully consider the good character requirement when assessing any future application for registration by the Member.
41. Those same comments apply to Order 5. The Hearing Tribunal recognizes that, as Ms. Smith stated, the College has no jurisdiction over the Member to compel her to continue with the therapeutic counselling since she will no longer be a regulated member of the College during that time. As a result, whether or not the therapeutic counselling is continued for a twelve month period will be a voluntary choice by the Member. The Hearing Tribunal concludes that voluntary compliance with Order 5 by the Member could be a positive factor in terms of any future reinstatement application with the College. Similarly, a failure to comply with Order 5 could be a negative factor for the Registration Committee to consider.
42. 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 very serious nature of the unprofessional conduct and the accountability and transparency duties that the College has to the public.
43. 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.
44. The \$1,000.00 in costs payable by the Member represents a proportionate financial impact and is fair and reasonable having regard to her deliberate actions.
45. In summary, the Hearing Tribunal concludes that the Sanctions Orders 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.

46. Accordingly, the Hearing Tribunal makes the following orders in accordance with s. 82 of the Act:
 1. A Reprimand shall be issued as against Ms. Delorme.
 2. Ms. Delorme's permit to practice will be cancelled for a minimum of three (3) years, from the date of this Order. During this suspension period, Ms. Delorme shall not be entitled to work as a social worker or work within the scope of practice.
 3. Prior to Ms. Delorme's return to the practice of social work, and prior to any application for registration, Ms. Delorme will be obliged to successfully complete a university level Ethics course. The course shall be approved by the Complaints Director and shall be undertaken at the cost to Ms. Delorme
 4. The Hearing Tribunal recommends that:
 - i. The Registration Committee obtain a fitness to practice report prior to determining any application for registration by Ms. Delorme, the nature and extent of which shall be in the discretion of the Registration Committee;
 - ii. The Registration Committee should properly review the Decision of the Hearing Tribunal and investigation report relating to and as in regard to this matter;
 - iii. Upon a return to the practice of social work (should an application for registration with the ACSW be successful), the Hearing Tribunal recommends Ms. Delorme's permit to practice social work shall be subject to supervision for a period of five (5) years from the date of returning to the practice of social work. The cost of this supervision will be the responsibility of Ms. Delorme. This supervision may be within or outside the context of Ms. Delorme'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.
 5. Ms. Delorme shall be obliged to continue ongoing therapeutic counselling for a 12 month period from the date of this Order. The cost of counselling shall be the responsibility of Ms. Delorme. The ACSW shall be entitled to any reporting it deems necessary from time to time with respect to attendance. Ms. Delorme shall provide verification as to attendance at the conclusion of the one year period.

6. There shall be publication of this decision and reasons on a with names basis.
7. Ms. Delorme 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 21st day of October 2026

P.A. Matusko

Pat Matusko
Chair on behalf of the Hearing Tribunal