

ALBERTA COLLEGE OF SPEECH-LANGUAGE
PATHOLOGISTS AND AUDIOLOGISTS

IN THE MATTER OF
THE *HEALTH PROFESSIONS ACT*

AND IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING
REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF

SIJU GEORGE THOMAS

**DECISION OF THE HEARING
TRIBUNAL**

INTRODUCTION

1. On December 9, 2024, a Hearing Tribunal of the Alberta College of Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists (the "College") held a hearing under Part 4 of the *Health Professions Act* (the "HPA") regarding the conduct of Siju George Thomas.
2. The members of the Hearing Tribunal were Vince Paniak, Chair and public member; Dianna Jossa, public member; and Laura Ziegler and Christine Beliveau, Regulated Members of the College. Ashley Reid was independent legal counsel to the Hearing Tribunal.
3. Melanie Sicotte, the Interim Complaints Director, attended and was represented by their legal counsel, Vita Wensel. Mr. Thomas was also present. He confirmed he would represent himself at the hearing and that he wished to proceed without legal counsel.

ALLEGATIONS

4. The Allegations in the Notice to Attend a Hearing were as follows:
 - 1) Between March 1, 2023, and September 30, 2023, you failed to maintain appropriate and required documentation relating to assessments of child clients that you conducted and where the documentation impacted, or had the potential to impact, qualification for government funding, the particulars of which include one or more of the following:
 - a. You failed to complete and/or submit approximately 96 required written reports about assessments that were to include assessment findings, diagnoses, recommendations and/or plan of care;
 - b. You failed to complete and/or submit at least 45 required summary letters after conducting their assessments that were to include preliminary assessment findings, a brief description of any diagnoses and/or preliminary recommendations;
 - c. You failed to communicate to clients in a timely manner when you did not complete and/or submit required written reports and summary letters within the expected timelines of your employer.
 - 2) Between March 1, 2023, and September 30, 2023, you failed to demonstrate professional responsibility and integrity in the delivery of SLP services regarding your conduct described in one or more of the particulars of Allegation 1.

IT IS FURTHER ALLEGED that your conduct constitutes "unprofessional conduct" as defined in subsections 1(1)(pp)(i) [displaying a lack of knowledge of or lack of skill or judgment in the provision of professional services] and 1(1)(pp)(ii) [contravention of the Act, a code of ethics or standards of practice] of the HPA including that your conduct:

- 1) Breached your statutory and regulatory obligations to ACSLPA as a speech-language pathologist.
- 2) Failed to fulfill professional and ethical obligations expected and required of a speech-language pathologist.
- 3) Breached one or more of the following:
 - a. The ACSLPA Code of Ethics (Revised June 2022);
 - b. The ACSLPA Standard of Practice (Revised June 2022), Standards 1.3, 1.4, 4.3,
 - c. ACSLPA guideline on Clinical Documentation and Record Keeping, effective 2011 (Revised June 2021); and/or
 - d. ACSLPA guideline supplement, "What Constitutes Timely Documentation?" (July 2011).

(referred to altogether as the "Allegations")

EVIDENCE BEFORE THE HEARING TRIBUNAL

5. The parties presented an Agreed Statement of Facts and Acknowledgment of Unprofessional Conduct, which enclosed the following tabs of documents:

- | | |
|---------|---|
| Tab 1: | ACSLPA Complaint Form |
| Tab 2: | Notice to Attend a Hearing dated September 12, 2024 |
| Tab 3: | Guidelines for Writing Reports |
| Tab 4: | ACSLPA Standards of Practice, revised June 2022 |
| Tab 5: | ACSLPA Code of Ethics |
| Tab 6: | ACSLPA Guideline: Clinical Documentation and Record Keeping, revised June 2021 |
| Tab 7: | ACSLPA Guideline Supplement "What Constitutes Timely Documentation?," July 2011 |
| Tab 8: | List of Children's Names |
| Tab 9: | List of Summary Letters Found on Computer |
| Tab 10: | Documents uploaded by SchoolCloud |
| Tab 11: | Text Messages |
| Tab 12: | HPA Excerpts |

6. The Agreed Statement of Facts and Acknowledgment of Unprofessional Conduct was marked as Exhibit 1. The tabs of documents were entered as Exhibit 2. The parties also presented a Joint Submission on Penalty, which was marked as Exhibit 3.

AGREED FACTS

7. The Agreed Statement of Facts set out the facts of this case. The Hearing Tribunal has summarized key facts in the paragraphs that follow.

Background

8. Mr. Thomas became a regulated member of ACSLPA in November 2020. He was previously registered as a speech-language pathologist ("SLP") in Ontario in 2017.
9. Mr. Thomas was hired by the Charity in September 2021. The Charity works with young children and offers programs of early child learning as well as SLP programs. Most of the children clients receive funding through Alberta Education.
10. Mr. Thomas' role as an SLP at the Charity involved conducting SLP assessments on children and collecting data about their speech and language goals. He was responsible for writing a summary letter and a formal assessment report after the assessment.
11. Summary letters were to be sent out to parents and guardians before the reports, and usually within one or two weeks of an assessment.
12. The reports were expected to describe information about the SLP's findings, assessment and concerns. Report writing guidelines provided to Mr. Thomas were before the Hearing Tribunal at Exhibit 2, Tab 3. Generally, reports were to be completed within two weeks of an assessment. There is a deadline for reports at the end of November based on requirements set by the Government of Alberta (Education). If a report is not submitted, a child's funding to receive services is at risk. Therefore, the two-week deadline for reports was a general guideline, and many SLPs would focus on report writing during the summer. The Charity expected SLPs to save a copy of their reports to their computer and SchoolCloud, the Alberta Education database.
13. Mr. Thomas worked closely with his supervisor. They had regular check-ins and update sessions, where they would discuss time management, stress management, performance improvement and goal setting.
14. In April 2023, due to performance concerns, Mr. Thomas was placed on a formal action plan due to concerns about his performance and ability to meet deadlines. The formal action plan was to ensure that he produced documentation in a timely manner.

Allegation 1

15. Mr. Thomas completed assessments on approximately 96 children identified in Exhibit 2, Tab 8. He was required to interpret and implement SLP interventions arising from his assessment. He was expected to communicate with his clients in a timely manner and complete reports describing his assessment findings, diagnoses, recommendations, or plan of care.
16. Mr. Thomas only completed and sent one full report in relation to the 96 children. He completed around 45 summary letters out of 96 children assessed and submitted them to an administrative assistant to be forwarded to parents and guardians. The records of the summary letters and reports completed were included in Exhibit 2.
17. From March to September 2023, Mr. Thomas' supervisor believed the summary letters were being completed and sent to parents, and that the reports were being completed and uploaded to SchoolCloud. However, the records show that Mr. Thomas did not upload any documents to SchoolCloud during this time.

18. Mr. Thomas took no steps to communicate to the children's parents or guardians about submitting the summary letters or assessment reports. Further, Mr. Thomas did not adequately communicate with the Charity about the outstanding reports and summary letters.

Allegation 2

19. Mr. Thomas was supported by management and had regular check-ins with his supervisor. He communicated with the administrative assistant to assist with providing summary letters to parents and guardians. Despite the collaborative team environment, Mr. Thomas was not honest with the Charity about his outstanding reports, nor did he disclose how many reports were outstanding. He provided information to the Charity that the assessment reports were close to being complete in text messages (Exhibit 2, Tab 11).

20. The record and review of Mr. Thomas' laptop and SchoolCloud record do not reflect any assessment reports that were close to being completed.

21. Due to Mr. Thomas' conduct, the Charity was required to hire other SLPs to help complete the outstanding reports, which resulted in a financial impact. Some assessments had to be re-done by other SLPs to write reports.

22. By hiring additional SLPs, the Charity was able to submit all required reports in time to ensure that no clients were directly affected or harmed by Mr. Thomas' conduct.

SUBMISSIONS REGARDING CONDUCT

Submissions on behalf of the Complaints Director on Conduct

23. Ms. Wensel began by summarizing the Hearing Tribunal's task. First, the Hearing Tribunal will determine whether the alleged conduct has been factually proven. If the Hearing Tribunal has found the conduct proven, it will consider whether the proven conduct constitutes unprofessional conduct as defined in the HPA. If the Hearing Tribunal accepts that there is unprofessional conduct, the next stage is to determine an appropriate sanction.

24. Ms. Wensel reviewed each of the allegations and the related facts set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts and Acknowledgement of Unprofessional Conduct. She further submitted that Mr. Thomas' conduct is unprofessional conduct. She highlighted the significance of Mr. Thomas' conduct in that the assessment reports are critically important for clients and their families to receive funding. There was a high degree of risk to clients and their families if the reports were not ultimately submitted. Ms. Wensel also detailed an SLP's overarching responsibilities as a health professional, which are in addition to their work obligations.

25. Ms. Wensel advised that Mr. Thomas acknowledged that his conduct breached his obligations arising out of ACSLPA's Standards of Practice, Guidelines, and Code of Ethics. She guided the Hearing Tribunal through the specific provisions of the Standards of Practice and the Code of Ethics that were engaged by Mr. Thomas' conduct.

26. Ms. Wensel concluded by submitting that the Allegations were proven based on the evidence before the Hearing Tribunal and that Mr. Thomas' proven conduct meets the definition of unprofessional conduct under the HPA.

Submissions of Mr. Thomas on Conduct

27. Mr. Thomas did not have any submissions regarding the Allegations.

DECISION ON CONDUCT

28. After hearing from both parties and upon reviewing the evidence before it, the Hearing Tribunal finds that Allegations 1 and 2 are proven. The Hearing Tribunal further finds that Mr. Thomas' conduct is unprofessional conduct under subsections 1(1)(pp)(i) and (ii) of the HPA.

REASONS AND FINDINGS ON UNPROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

29. In this case, the facts are not in dispute. There is an Agreed Statement of Facts that described the facts related to the Allegations in significant detail.

30. The Hearing Tribunal finds that the Allegations have been proven on a balance of probabilities based on the Agreed Statement of Facts, Mr. Thomas' admission to the conduct in the Allegations, and the tabs of documents in Exhibit 2.

31. The Hearing Tribunal then considered whether Mr. Thomas' conduct is unprofessional conduct as defined by the HPA:

- (i) displaying a lack of knowledge of or lack of skill or judgement in the provision of professional services, and
- (ii) contravention of the HPA or ACSLPA's code of ethics or standards of practice.

32. Mr. Thomas acknowledged that his conduct was unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 1(1)(pp) of the HPA. Specifically, Mr. Thomas acknowledged that his conduct constituted a lack of knowledge of or a lack of skill or judgment in the provision services. He acknowledged that he breached the following Standards of Practice:

Standard of Practice 1.3 Client Assessment and Intervention

A regulated member of ACSLPA selects and applies appropriate screening/assessment procedures, analyzes/interprets the information gathered to determine diagnosis and implements appropriate interventions to deliver quality services that correspond to clients' priorities and changing needs.

Standard of Practice 1.4 Communication

A regulated member of ACSLPA communicates respectfully, effectively, and in a timely manner in the provision of professional services.

Standard of Practice 4.3 Documentation and Information Management

A regulated member of ACSLPA maintains clear, confidential, accurate, legible, timely and complete records, in compliance with legislation and regulatory requirements.

The fundamental expectation of documentation is that anyone reviewing a client record must be able to determine what care was provided, to whom it was provided, by whom and when the care was provided, why the care was provided, and any evaluation of the care that was provided.

33. Mr. Thomas further acknowledged that his conduct contravened the Code of Ethics:

2.1 Regulated members promote and protect the public's trust, and the reputation of the professions, by acting with honesty, integrity, objectivity, diligence, and courtesy.

3.2 Regulated members communicate in a collaborative, open, and responsible manner to support effective team functioning.

4.1 Regulated members are responsible and accountable for their actions and decisions.

4.7 Regulated members ensure the safety of clients, other safety providers, and themselves by taking appropriate actions, including documenting and reporting, to prevent and/or manage risks in relation to the provision of services.

34. The Hearing Tribunal reviewed the Agreed Statement of Facts and Acknowledgment of Unprofessional Conduct and the tabs of documents in Exhibit 2 and finds that Mr. Thomas' acknowledgment is supported by the evidence.

35. The Hearing Tribunal agrees that Mr. Thomas' conduct displayed a lack of knowledge, skill, or judgement in the provision of professional services. He knew or should have known about the Charity's guidelines for report writing and the expected deadlines. It is important that SLPs document assessments and communicate with clients in a timely manner. The assessments were very important in this case as they could impact funding.

36. Mr. Thomas' conduct was particularly troubling because he had opportunities to communicate to the Charity and to his supervisor about the outstanding letters and reports. Despite the meetings, his supervisor believed the reports and letters were being submitted. Mr. Thomas should have communicated that he was overwhelmed or behind on the documentation.

37. The Hearing Tribunal agrees that Mr. Thomas' conduct breaches the above sections of the Standards of Practice and the Code of Ethics. Specifically, Mr. Thomas breached Standards 1.3 and 1.4, which require an SLP to analyze or interpret the information gathered in an assessment and then communicate effectively and in a timely manner. Mr. Thomas did not provide his clients with the necessary services, nor did he communicate in a timely manner.

38. The Hearing Tribunal also finds Standard 4.3 was breached. SLPs must maintain clear, confidential, accurate, legible, timely and complete records. Mr. Thomas failed to meet his documentation and information management responsibilities when he did not complete and submit the written assessment reports and summary letters.

39. With respect to the ACSLPA Code of Ethics, the Hearing Tribunal finds that Mr. Thomas' conduct was a significant breach of his duty to promote and protect the public's trust, and the reputation of the profession by acting with honesty, integrity, objectivity, diligence, and courtesy; communicate in a manner to support effective team functioning; to hold himself

responsible and accountable for his actions; and to ensure the safety of clients, other service providers, and themselves by taking appropriate actions, including documenting and reporting, to prevent and/or manage risks in relation to the provision of services.

40. For all of these reasons, the Hearing Tribunal finds that Mr. Thomas' conduct is unprofessional conduct as defined under subsections 1(1)(pp)(i) and 1(1)(pp)(ii) of the HPA.

SUBMISSIONS REGARDING PENALTY

The Joint Submission on Penalty

41. The parties presented a Joint Submission on Penalty to the Hearing Tribunal, which set out the penalties that the parties considered fair and appropriate in the circumstances. The proposed penalty orders can be summarized as follows:

- 1) Mr. Thomas shall receive a reprimand and the Hearing Tribunal's decision shall serve as a reprimand;
- 2) Mr. Thomas shall pay a fine of \$2,000.00;
- 3) Mr. Thomas shall complete two educational courses related to documentation obligations and professionalism and ethics;
- 4) Mr. Thomas shall submit a written reflective essay to the Complaints Director titled "The Importance of Report Writing and Other Professional Obligations: What it Means to my Practice and Profession as an SLP";
- 5) For a period of 18 months after the Hearing Tribunal's decision, Mr. Thomas shall provide a letter from his employment confirming that his supervisor was aware of and had read the Hearing Tribunal's decision;
- 6) Mr. Thomas shall pay 35% of the total costs of the investigation and hearing to a maximum of \$2,800.00.

Submissions on behalf of the Complaints Director on Penalty

42. Ms. Wensel explained that the purpose of sanctioning in professional regulation is to ensure that the public is protected from unprofessional conduct. This goal is achieved by ensuring that the public is not at risk of harm from continuing conduct, by ensuring that the public has confidence in the profession, and by sending an appropriate message to the profession more broadly that they should not engage in unacceptable unprofessional conduct.

43. Ms. Wensel explained that a joint submission on penalty is an agreement that carries weight. She described the legal principles that the Hearing Tribunal should consider when evaluating the Joint Submission on Penalty, and the high threshold that must be met to reject a joint submission. The Hearing Tribunal should give a high level of deference and depart from the joint submission only if the proposed penalties would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or would be contrary to the public interest. She referred to the case of *Timothy Edward Bradley v. Ontario College of Teachers* in support of her summary of the law.

44. Ms. Wensel described each of the penalties that the parties proposed in the Joint Submission on Penalty and explained how they served public protection purposes. She further advised that the Hearing Tribunal could assess the penalties in light of relevant sanctioning factors described in the case of *Jaswal v. Medical Board (Nfld.)* ("Jaswal"). Ms. Wensel made submissions on each of the factors:

- a. *Nature and gravity of the proven allegations:* Mr. Thomas' conduct involved an SLP's fundamental obligations to perform assessments, analyze the assessments, complete a report, and communicate with a client. Mr. Thomas' lapses could have had a very serious impact for many clients who needed services. Therefore, the severity of his unprofessional conduct is on the higher end of the spectrum.
- b. *Age and experience of the member:* Mr. Thomas became an SLP in 2017, and although he became a member of ACSLPA in 2020, he had sufficient experience that he should have been aware of his professional obligations.
- c. *Age and mental condition of the offended patient:* The patients involved were children under the age of six years old, and there is an inherent vulnerability involved with child patients.
- d. *Number of times the offence was proven to have occurred:* Mr. Thomas' conduct occurred over a period between March and September.
- e. *The role of the member in acknowledging what occurred:* Mr. Thomas acknowledged his unprofessional conduct, was cooperative with the hearing, was remorseful, and accepted the consequences of his actions. This factor is mitigating.
- f. *Impact on the offended patient:* The Charity and other SLPs stepped in to address the concerns. However, there was a serious risk to the children's funding because of Mr. Thomas' unprofessional conduct.
- g. *The need to promote specific and general deterrence and the need to maintain the public's confidence in the profession:* The reprimand and the fine will serve specific and general deterrence purposes. These orders will also tell the public that the failure to complete reports and letters is an unacceptable lapse of professional integrity and responsibility, which will attract consequences for the regulated member.
- h. *The range of sentence in other similar cases:* The Complaints Director provided two cases for the Hearing Tribunal's consideration: *College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario v. Lochrie* and *College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario v. Ezzat Ghazal*.

45. Lastly, Ms. Wensel noted that the parties jointly proposed that Mr. Thomas be responsible for a portion of the costs of the investigation and hearing to a maximum of \$2,800, payable over 24 months. She advised that the total costs as of the date of the hearing was approximately \$9,000. Ms. Wensel further submitted that the proposed costs order was consistent with the Court of Appeal's decision in *Jinnah v. Alberta Dental Association and College* ("Jinnah") which set out a framework for costs orders.

46. Ms. Wensel concluded by submitting that the proposed orders were appropriate and reasonable and that the Joint Submission on Penalty should be accepted.

Submissions of Mr. Thomas on Penalty

47. Mr. Thomas indicated he had no additional submissions on the Joint Submission on Penalty.

DECISION ON PENALTY

48. The Hearing Tribunal adjourned to consider the Joint Submission on Penalty. It carefully considered the parties' submissions and decided to order the proposed penalties.

REASONS AND FINDINGS ON PENALTY

49. The Hearing Tribunal finds that the proposed orders in the Joint Submission on Penalty are reasonable and appropriate to the unprofessional conduct found in the circumstances.

50. The Hearing Tribunal recognizes the high degree of deference it owes concerning the Joint Submission on Penalty. The proposed orders are not so unhinged that they would cause a reasonable member of the public to lose confidence in the ACSLPA's discipline process.

51. In determining the appropriate penalties, the Hearing Tribunal considered the *Jaswal* factors. The Hearing Tribunal took note of the submissions concerning the severity of Mr. Thomas' conduct as a breach of fundamental SLP obligations and the extended period over which the unprofessional conduct took place.

52. The Hearing Tribunal not only considered the impact on the offended patients, but also the impact on the Charity. The Charity was required to address issues caused by Mr. Thomas to mitigate the potentially adverse consequences on the children Mr. Thomas assessed.

53. The Hearing Tribunal recognized Mr. Thomas' cooperation and acceptance of responsibility throughout the hearing process was a significantly mitigating factor.

54. The Hearing Tribunal finds that the proposed orders appropriately balance the need to deter future conduct and the opportunity to remediate Mr. Thomas' behaviour through further education. The Hearing Tribunal trusts that Mr. Thomas will learn about his professional obligations and how to better his documentation practices by completing the courses.

55. The Hearing Tribunal finds that requirement that Mr. Thomas notify his employers and have his supervisors be aware of the Hearing Tribunal's decision will protect the public and ensuring the public's ongoing confidence in the integrity of the profession.

56. Lastly, the Hearing Tribunal considered the appropriateness of the proposed costs order and the law in *Jinnah*. The Hearing Tribunal was advised that the parties agreed Mr. Thomas should pay 35% of the total cost to a maximum of \$2,800 and has agreed to payment within 24 months of receiving the decision. The Hearing Tribunal did not hear submissions on whether Mr. Thomas has incurred any other financial penalties arising from this matter. The Hearing Tribunal finds that the assignment of costs is appropriate and reasonable in the circumstances.

57. On this basis, the Hearing Tribunal accepts the Joint Submission on Penalty.

CONCLUSION

58. The Hearing Tribunal finds that the Allegations against Mr. Thomas are proven and constitute unprofessional conduct.

59. Having accepted the Joint Submission on Penalty for the reasons outlined above, the Hearing Tribunal makes the following orders:

- 1) Mr. Thomas shall receive a reprimand and the Hearing Tribunal's decision shall serve as a reprimand;
- 2) Mr. Thomas shall pay a fine of \$2,000.00 (the "Fine") and on the following terms:
 - a. the Fine is due 24 months after the date that Mr. Thomas receives a copy of the Hearing Tribunal's written decision;
 - b. the Fine must be paid to the College, whether or not Mr. Thomas holds an active practice permit with the College; and,
 - c. the Fine is a debt owed to the College and if not paid by the deadline indicated, may be recovered by the College as an action of debt.
- 3) Within 90 days of receiving the Hearing Tribunal's decision, Mr. Thomas shall complete the following remedial education, at his own cost, and shall provide proof of completion to the Complaints Director:
 - a. Education on documentation: Ethical Documentation and Billing for SLPs (Speechpathology.com) (<https://www.speechpathology.com/slp-ceus/course/ethicaldocumentation-and-billing-for-10747>).
 - b. Education on professionalism and ethics: IPHE201- Professionalism and Ethics for Healthcare Professionals (NAIT) (<https://www.nait.ca/nait/continuing-education/courses/iphe201-professionalism-and-ethics-for-healthcare>).

If any of the required education becomes unavailable, Mr. Thomas shall make a written request to the Complaints Director to be assigned alternative education. Upon receiving Mr. Thomas' written request, the Complaints Director, in her sole discretion, may assign alternative education in which case, Mr. Thomas will be notified in writing of the new education requirements.


- 4) Within 90 days of receiving the Hearing Tribunal's decision, Mr. Thomas shall submit a written reflective essay (the "Essay") to the Complaints Director on the following terms and conditions:

- a. The Essay must be titled "The Importance of Report Writing and Other Professional Obligations: What it Means to my Practice and Profession as an SLP";
 - b. The Essay must be at least 1200 words;
 - c. Mr. Thomas must review the following documents prior to writing the Essay:
 - i. ACSLPA's Standards of Practice (<https://www.acslpa.ca/members/standards-of-practice/>);
 - ii. ACSLPA's Code of Ethics (<https://www.acslpa.ca/code-of-ethics/>);
 - iii. ACSLPA's Guideline on Clinical Documentation and Record Keeping (June 2021) (<https://www.acslpa.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Clinical-Doc-and-Rec-Keeping-Guideline-Jan2023.pdf>); and,
 - iv. ACSLPA's Resources on What Constitutes Timely Documentation (June 2020) (<https://www.acslpa.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/What-Constitutes-Timely-Documentaiton-Jun2020.pdf>).
 - d. The Essay must be typed and comply with professional formatting guidelines (e.g. APA);
 - e. The Essay must demonstrate:
 - i. at least six goals of improvement on Mr. Thomas' report writing and other professional obligations as an SLP;
 - ii. reflect learnings and insights from ACSLPA's Standards of Practice, the Code of Ethics, the Guideline on Clinical Documentation and resource, What Constitutes Timely Documentation; and
 - iii. describe Mr. Thomas' strategies, plans and supports for improving his report writing, meeting his professional obligations, and ensuring that he complies with ACSLPA's expectations.
- 5) For a period of 18 months following receipt of the Hearing Tribunal's decision (the "Notification Period"), Mr. Thomas shall provide a letter from any current or prospective employment setting (the "Notification Letter(s)") to the Complaints Director on the following terms and conditions:
- a. Each Notification Letter shall confirm:

- i. The location of Mr. Thomas' employment setting, including the unit(s), if applicable (the "Employment Setting");
 - ii. The anticipated start date of employment, if the Employment Letter is from a prospective employer;
 - iii. The name, contact information and professional designation (if applicable) of the supervisor, anticipated supervisor, or other such manager of Mr. Thomas at the Employment Setting; and
 - iv. That the supervisor, anticipated supervisor, or other such manager of Mr. Thomas has read and reviewed the Hearing Tribunal's decision.
- 6) Mr. Thomas shall pay 35% of the total costs of the investigation and hearing, to a maximum of \$2,800.00 (the "Costs") and on the following terms:
 - a. the Costs are due 24 months after the date that Mr. Thomas receives a copy of the Hearing Tribunal's written decision;
 - b. the Costs must be paid to the College, whether or not Mr. Thomas holds an active practice permit with the College; and,
 - c. the Costs are a debt owed to the College and if not paid by the deadline indicated, may be recovered by the College as an action of debt.
- 7) Should Mr. Thomas fail to comply with any of the orders above within the deadline specified or within the period of the extended deadline granted by the Complaints Director, the Complaints Director (or her delegate) may do any or all of the following:
 - a. Treat Mr. Thomas' non-compliance as information for a complaint under section 56 of the HPA;
 - b. In the case of failure to complete the course, or pay costs within the timelines referred to above, or within the amended deadline agreed to by the Complaints Director, Mr. Thomas' practice permit will be suspended until he has complied with the outstanding order(s); or,
 - c. Refer the matter back to a hearing tribunal for further direction.
- 8) The parties agree that the orders set out above at paragraphs 2-6 will appear as conditions on Mr. Thomas' practice permit and ACSLPA's online public register until they are completed and notice of the conditions may be provided pursuant to section 119 of the HPA, as follows:
 - a. Conduct requirement - Fine arising from a disciplinary matter;

- b. Conduct requirement - Coursework required arising from a disciplinary matter;
 - c. Conduct requirement - Essay arising from a disciplinary matter;
 - d. Conduct requirement - Costs arising from a disciplinary matter;
 - e. Conduct requirement - Notifications required from employer for 18 months arising from a disciplinary matter.
- 9) Where mutual agreement is required between Mr. Thomas and the Complaints Director relating to an outstanding requirement, and an agreement cannot be reached by Mr. Thomas and the Complaints Director on the implementation of the outstanding requirement, the Complaints Director (or her delegate) may refer the matter back to a hearing tribunal for further direction.

Signed on behalf of the Hearing Tribunal by:



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'V. Paniak', written over a horizontal line.

Vince Paniak, Chair

Dated January 31, 2025