

Notice of Decision of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council's Conduct Committee

Name: Ciara Elizabeth Corrigan

SCR No: 1134500

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Conduct Committee of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council, at its meeting on **01 April 2015**, made the following decision about your registration with the Northern Ireland Social Care Council:

The Committee found the facts proved;

The Committee found that you have committed misconduct;

The Committee decided to admonish you and directed that a record of the admonishment should be placed on your entry in the Register for a period of five years.

Charge:

That, being registered under the Health and Personal Social Services Act (Northern Ireland) 2001 (as amended), and whilst employed as a Social Worker at Queen's Quarter Housing, Belfast:

1. On or about 01 November 2013, you breached Service User A's confidentiality by inappropriately discussing your professional dealings with her and her confidential family matters with a third party.
2. On or about 01 November 2013, you made inappropriate comments about a client group with whom you work to a third party.

And your actions as set out above amount to misconduct, such as to call into question your suitability to remain on the Social Care Register.

Preliminary Matters

The Council was represented by Mr Conrad Dixon, Tughans Solicitors. The Registrant attended and was represented by Mr Dennis Hamill, Edwards & Co Solicitors. The Committee received in evidence an agreed Statement of Facts with an attached appendix. The Committee received no further documentary evidence at the fact finding / misconduct stage.

Background

The Registrant qualified as a social worker in 2010 and is registered on Part 1 of the Register. She was employed as a social worker at Queen's Quarter Housing, Belfast from 02 August 2010 until 31 December 2013. On the latter date, she resigned during the course of a disciplinary investigation. This investigation related to the issues under consideration in the present case. Following her resignation, her employer made a referral that she had breached confidentiality of a service user and had made inappropriate comments about a class of service users.

Evidence

The Committee approved the agreed Statement of Facts, which set out the basis of the case as follows:

1. The Registrant is registered on Part 1 of the Register as a Qualified Social Worker. The Registrant was employed as a social worker at Queen's Quarter Housing, Belfast from 02 August 2010 until 31 December 2013, when she resigned during a disciplinary investigation. Queen's Quarter Housing provides accommodation and support for single homeless people.
2. The Registrant attended a third party's (C) home on 01 November 2013. The Registrant's conversation at the third party's (C) home was recorded. On 01 November 2013 the Registrant:
 - (i) Breached Service User A's confidentiality by inappropriately discussing the Registrant's professional dealings with A and A's confidential family matters with B (third party) when another third party was present (C).
 - (ii) Made inappropriate comments about client groups with whom the Registrant worked to B (third party) when another third party was present (C).
3. A copy of the recording of the conversation was provided to the Managing Director of Queen's Quarter Housing. Queen's Quarter Housing commenced disciplinary proceedings however, the Registrant resigned from her position with Queen's Quarter Housing on 31 December 2013 before the employer's disciplinary investigation was completed.
4. A copy of typed extracts from the recording of 01 November 2013 is attached to this Statement of Facts at Appendix A.
5. The Registrant's actions as set out at paragraph 2 above amount to misconduct.

The Committee heard that the Registrant attended at C's home on 01 November 2013 and engaged in a lengthy conversation with B in which she discussed her professional dealings with A and A's family. She also spoke inappropriately to B about a client group with whom the Registrant worked. C was present during this conversation. The conversation was recorded and was subsequently passed to the Managing Director of Queen's Quarter Housing. A transcript of the conversation was made and the portions relevant to the facts were appended to the agreed Statement of Facts.

Finding of Facts

The Committee approved the agreed Statement of Facts and announced the facts proved by admission in accordance with Schedule 2 Paragraph 18 of the NISCC (Conduct) Rules 2014 (the Rules).

Misconduct

The Committee noted the admission of the Registrant that the facts admitted by her, amounted to misconduct. Nonetheless, the Committee exercised its own independent judgement on whether the Registrant's actions amounted to misconduct. The Committee heard a submission from Mr Dixon on the issue, and a brief submission from Mr Hamill. The Committee also accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who referred it to the definition of misconduct as provided for in the Rules as 'conduct which calls into question the suitability of a Registrant to remain on the Register'. The Committee also had regard to the relevant authorities which included *Roylance v GMC (No.2) [2000] 1 AC 311 at 330* and *Kirk v Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons [2004] UKPC 4*.

Mr Dixon submitted that the Registrant's actions fell short of the standard to be expected of a Registrant in this case. He pointed to the breach of Service User A's confidentiality and the inappropriate and forceful manner in which the Registrant expressed her views about a client group with whom she worked. He argued that the Registrant's actions taken together could result in a loss of confidence with service users and the public in general if they could not expect confidential information obtained in the course of the Registrant's work, not to be shared with third parties.

The Committee considered the agreed Statement of Facts and the attached appendix carefully. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant had acted in a manner which fell short of the standard to be expected of a registered social care worker when she discussed Service User A's confidential information with a third party. In addition, she expressed herself in an inappropriate manner when she discussed her attitude towards a particular client group with whom she worked. The Committee heard that the Registrant's conversation took place outside work, at a party, against a backdrop of her taking alcohol. She was unaware of the fact that her conversation was being recorded. The Committee did not hear any evidence to suggest that this conversation took place on more than one occasion. However, the Committee was satisfied that the Registrant's actions could undermine the trust and confidence which the public and vulnerable service users should have in the social care workforce, that their confidential information will be protected and that they will be treated fairly and professionally regardless of their background circumstances. It is clear that the Registrant should uphold her professional registration and the reputation of the profession in general at all times, both in a work and non-work context. By her actions, as admitted, the Registrant has fallen well below the standard to be expected of a registered social care worker and her actions were serious.

In an effort to assist its determination upon misconduct, the Committee was guided by the Code of Practice for Social Care Workers and is satisfied that the Registrant's actions, as admitted, have breached the following provisions of the Code:

Code 1: As a social care worker, you must protect the rights and promote the interests of service users and carers. This includes:

1.4 Respecting and maintaining the dignity and privacy of service users.

Code 2: As a social care worker, you must strive to establish and maintain the trust and confidence of service users and carers. This includes:

2.3 Respecting confidential information and clearly explaining agency policies about confidentiality to service users and carers.

Code 5: As a social care worker, you must uphold public trust and confidence in social care services. In particular you must not:

5.3 Abuse the trust of service users and carers or the access you have to personal information about them or to their property, home or workplace;

5.7 Put yourself or other people at unnecessary risk; or

5.8 Behave in a way, in work or outside work, which would call into question your suitability to work in social care services.

The Committee has therefore determined that the Registrant's actions amount to misconduct.

Sanction

The Committee heard submissions on the appropriate sanction to be applied in this case from Mr Dixon and Mr Hamill. Prior to this, the Registrant gave evidence to the Committee in relation to this case. The Registrant explained that she had worked in the social care sector for the last eight years in various roles and was currently working as bank staff with Extern, supporting families and working in homeless hostels. The Registrant gave more background detail to the circumstances leading to her referral to the NISCC in the course of her evidence. She explained that in August 2013, she met B in a social context. B acted in an aggressive manner towards her and the Registrant formed the impression that B's aggression was due to the fact that he knew that the Registrant was a social worker. The Registrant went to a Halloween party, after which she attended C's home. The Registrant explained that C had recently moved into the house, and that the Registrant went to stay the night with C who was a long standing childhood friend. The Registrant indicated that when she arrived at C's home, B jumped out at her in the kitchen. The Registrant was not aware that B would be at C's home. She indicated to the Committee that B's presence made her feel very uncomfortable having regard to her previous interaction with him in August 2013. She tried to leave the house but indicated that a combination of alcohol and concern for her friend meant that she felt unable to leave C's home. The Registrant accepted that a long discussion took place between her and B, with C being present. It was during this conversation, that the Registrant stated that she became aware that B and A had been in a previous relationship together. The Registrant told the Committee that this previous relationship was a factor in relation to her disclosures about A, who was B's previous partner. She said that given B's previous hostility towards her, the Registrant felt intimidated and afraid for her own safety.

The Registrant continued that she discussed a client group with whom she worked in a way she felt B would be receptive to. She indicated that she felt intimidated and stated things about this client group which were far removed from her actual beliefs. She explained that her conversation in this regard about this particular client group was aimed at appeasing B and lowering the risk to herself. The Registrant gave detailed evidence about her experiences subsequent to this incident. She expressed remorse and indicated that her life had changed considerably. She confirmed that her alcohol intake had dropped significantly, her friendship with C had ended and she currently socialised with a close and supportive circle of friends and family. She admitted that alcohol played a significant role in relation to this incident. She accepted that she acted naively and fully recognised that what she did was wrong.

The Committee paid careful attention to the submissions made by both Mr Dixon and Mr Hamill. Mr Dixon submitted that the Registrant had breached a fundamental tenet of the profession and reminded the Committee that the public and service users would be concerned that the Registrant had acted in the manner in which she did; in breaching Service User A's confidence and using language about a service group which was offensive and inappropriate. Mr Dixon submitted that the Registrant had failed to uphold the appropriate professional standards expected of social workers.

Mr Hamill sensibly recognised in his submission that the Registrant's actions could have had an adverse impact and could have resulted in indirect harm to Service User A. He submitted however, that whilst the Registrant had engaged in a serious misjudgement, the behaviour complained of was an isolated incident in an otherwise unblemished career. Mr Hamill also emphasised the remedial steps taken by the Registrant since November 2013.

The Committee had regard to the seriousness of the misconduct which had been committed in this case. The Committee first had regard to the mitigating factors present. It acknowledged that the Registrant had been working in the social care sphere for the previous 18 months in a relief role and had cooperated at all stages with the NISCC investigation into her conduct. The Committee gave the Registrant credit for her early admission as to the facts and also her early recognition that those failings amounted to misconduct. The Committee was also persuaded that the incident in question was isolated. The Registrant did not act in a pre-planned manner and did not realise that B was covertly recording her conversation with him. The Committee was also prepared to accept that the Registrant was genuine in her expression of regret and her apology for her actions, but noted in that regard that there was no evidence that the Registrant had made good on her remorse by, for example, writing personally to Service User A to express her regret directly. The Committee was told that the Registrant had an otherwise good history and also had regard to various personal and professional testimonials which were adduced at the sanction stage of the proceedings. These documents spoke highly of the Registrant. In this regard, a manager with Extern confirmed that the Registrant had worked with that body since 2007. He expressed the view that the circumstances leading to her hearing were not a 'true reflection of [the registrant's] character or her ability as a professional.' This testimonial continued that the Registrant had worked with 'many

and varying (sic) service user groups to a high standard, with integrity and has on many occasions been an advocate for those more marginalised service users’.

The Committee paid very careful attention to the Registrant while she gave evidence and closely observed her demeanour, listened to her answers under oath and sought to assess her credibility as a witness. The Committee focused on the Registrant’s evidence touching upon her insight into her behaviour. The Committee was persuaded that the Registrant had insight in a general sense that her behaviour on the evening in question was unacceptable, but that it was not developed in any meaningful sense and to an acceptable level. In that regard, the Registrant made the case that her actions were motivated by a sense of being intimidated by B. From its careful examination of the available documentary material and assessing her evidence, the Committee was not persuaded by this and could not find any other evidence to corroborate that she was intimidated by B. The Registrant accepted that she was in conversation with B for between two and three hours. She took no steps to remove herself from C’s home when she realised that B was there. The Committee was therefore not convinced that the Registrant was acting under duress or out of fear from being intimidated by B. The Committee concluded rather, that the Registrant’s actions were attributable to her excessive alcohol intake on the evening in question.

The Committee then turned to the aggravating features in the case. In disclosing confidential information about a vulnerable service user to a third party, the Registrant abused the trust placed in her as a social worker. Moreover, in making disclosures to an ex-partner of Service User A, the Registrant’s actions had the potential to cause indirect harm to Service User A and could have resulted in B exploiting the information which he had gathered from the Registrant for his own particular purposes. Although the conversation which the Registrant had with B was far removed from the working environment, it was directly related to the Registrant’s practice as a social worker and had the potential to damage the reputation and high standing which service users and the public should expect at all times from a Registrant in her position, both in work and outside of it.

The Committee reminded itself that it was not required to adhere to any standard of proof. At the sanction stage, the Committee exercised its own independent judgement on the appropriate sanction to impose and applied a sanction which adequately protected the public. In so doing, the Committee recognised that it was not the function of these proceedings to punish the Registrant, but to protect the public and vulnerable service users, to maintain proper standards of conduct and behaviour, and to uphold the reputation of the social care workforce in general.

The Legal Adviser referred the Committee to Paragraph 25 (1) of Schedule 2 of the Conduct Rules which sets out the statutory disposals available. He reminded the Committee that, upon a finding of misconduct, it may: (a) admonish the Registrant and direct that a record of the admonishment should be placed upon her entry in the Register for a period of up to five years; or, (b) make an Order suspending the Registrant’s registration for a period not exceeding two years (a Suspension Order); or, (c) make an Order for removal of the Registrant’s registration from the Register (a Removal Order).

The Legal Adviser informed the Committee that, by virtue of Paragraph 25 (2), it was obliged to take into account the following factors in its determination on sanction, namely: (a) the seriousness of the Registrant's misconduct; (b) the protection of the public; (c) the public interest in maintaining confidence in social care services; and (d) the issue of proportionality.

The Legal Adviser referred the Committee to the NISCC Indicative Sanctions: Guidance for Conduct Committees document, and in particular to the following provisions:

Paragraph 2.5: 'the principle of proportionality requires that the consequences of the sanction which a Committee imposes must not be disproportionate to the harm from which the sanction is intended to protect the public and social service users. The interests of the public and social service users have to be weighed against those of the Registrant. There is a wider public interest to be served in the approach to sanctions. A Committee ought not to have only a particular client or client group in mind'.

Paragraph 2.6: 'A Committee must ensure that measures taken to limit the fundamental right to practise one's profession are no more than is necessary in all the circumstances'.

Paragraph 2.4: 'There is a duty on Conduct Committees to act fairly. What constitutes the standard of fairness in any proceedings is not fixed and may change over time and depends on the circumstances of each case'.

Paragraph 2.2: 'The public should have confidence that the NISCC, as the regulator of social care workers, will uphold proper standards of behaviour and conduct. The public interest requires that the public and social care users are protected from unsafe practice and that confidence in the profession of social work and the social care work force in general is maintained. It is part of the NISCC's role to maintain the standards and to protect the public from social care workers who, for any reason, whether competence, character or conduct, are not fit to practise. Any social care worker registered with the NISCC agrees to abide by the Code of Practice for Social Care Workers'.

Paragraph 2.3: 'In serving the public interest, the primary purpose of sanctions is to ensure, firstly, that the social care worker does not have the opportunity to repeat the misconduct and secondly, to maintain the reputation of the profession'.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

The Committee then turned to the question of which sanction to impose in this case.

Admonishment – the Committee paid careful attention to the available documentary and oral evidence in the case. As indicated above, there was evidence in a general sense that the Registrant had insight into her failings on the evening in question. This insight was partial but this was balanced by the Registrant's stated willingness to make changes in her behaviour. The Committee heard from the Registrant that she has undertaken a profound examination of her behaviour and has taken steps in terms of alcohol intake and peer group associations which will lessen the likelihood of the behaviour complained of being repeated. The Committee was satisfied that the risk of the Registrant repeating this behaviour was low, and that she had taken positive and

meaningful steps to change her behaviour. This stance was confirmed in a testimonial provided to the Committee by the Registrant's father. He confirmed that the Registrant's actions on the evening in question, fuelled by alcohol, had caused the Registrant to 'rethink her use of alcohol and to be more careful about whom she socialises with.' The Committee was also satisfied that the incident in question, while serious, was not a deliberate act and was isolated. In addition, having carefully assessed the Registrant's evidence, the Committee found her to be credible in relation to her commitment to maintaining high standards in her practice in the future, as well as being genuine and sincere in taking rehabilitative steps to ensure that the misconduct found against her is not repeated in the future. For the reasons given above, the Committee has decided to impose an admonishment in relation to this case. The Committee however, had concerns about the extent to which the Registrant had a developed insight into this incident. It was not persuaded that the Registrant's insight was to the extent desired having regard to the circumstances of the case. It was for this reason, and in order to adequately protect the public, that the Committee decided to impose an admonishment upon the Registrant for the maximum period available, namely five years.

The Committee considered whether it would be appropriate to impose a Suspension Order in this case. It decided that this would not be a proportionate sanction to apply. There was no evidence of a harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal difficulty with the Registrant. In addition, while the incident in question was serious, the Committee did not feel that the Registrant's behaviour was fundamentally incompatible with continuing to be a registered social care worker.

Legal Advice Given

Finding of Facts

There has been an agreed Statement of Facts submitted for your attention and for the attention of your colleagues and being mindful of the provisions of the second Schedule of the Rules under which this case is conducted, any agreed Statement of Facts shall be subject to your approval and to the approval of your Committee. So therefore my advice to you at this stage is very simple, and that is that you should retire with your colleagues to consider the agreed Statement of Facts and if, and only if, you approve the agreed Statement of Facts should you then move to consider whether the facts as admitted are proved and also to consider separately the question of misconduct.

Misconduct

Before you and your colleagues retire at the second stage of the proceedings in relation to Ciara Elizabeth Corrigan, I am required to give you some advice in relation to what matters you can now properly take into account at this stage of the proceedings. While the admission of the Registrant may weigh heavily with you and your colleagues, you have rightly pointed out at the commencement of the proceedings a short while ago, that the issue of whether misconduct has been committed by the Registrant is a matter for you and your colleagues to consider in the exercise of your own independent professional judgment.

The 2014 Rules do not require any burden or standard of proof to be adhered to. It is, as I have indicated, a matter for your independent professional judgment.

The Charge in this case, like other Charges before the Social Care Council, is founded in misconduct and if you do not consider that misconduct has been committed then that is the end of the case. You can only move to the sanction and mitigation stage if, and only if, you are satisfied that the Registrant, by her actions, has committed misconduct in the context of the facts of this particular case.

The term "misconduct" is defined for you in the 2014 Rules and it is defined as 'conduct which calls into question the suitability of a Registrant to remain on the register.'

There is also a helpful authority on the question of misconduct. Most regulators are careful not to precisely define misconduct because it can encompass a broad variety of circumstances, but in the leading case on the question of misconduct, the case of *Roylance v the General Medical Council*, a 2000 case heard by the House of Lords, the Privy Council indicated as follows: "*Misconduct is a word of general effect involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances. The standard of propriety may often be found by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required to be followed by a medical practitioner in the particular circumstances.*"

While the case of *Roylance* dealt with an allegation of serious professional misconduct under the Medical Act, that portion of Lord Clyde's speech in *Roylance* has been held to have universal application in the health care regulatory sphere and has been used by the Social Care Council and its Conduct Committees in determining whether misconduct can be said to have been committed in relation to the vast majority, if not all cases, considered by it.

You must also have regard to the provisions of the Rules which makes it clear that where misconduct is being argued, you must have regard to the applicable Code of Practice which is currently in place, to determine whether the actions of the Registrant can be said to have fallen short of that conduct, and that is provided for by virtue of Paragraph 23 (3) at page 50 of the Rules.

You should also be reminded that such conduct as amounts to misconduct must be serious. It is also right to say that misconduct does not necessarily require to be connected to the individual work circumstances of a Registrant. Indeed the case of *Roylance* is a case in point and the Privy Council endorsed the view that serious professional misconduct may arise where the conduct was "*quite removed from the practice of medicine but is of sufficient immoral or outrageous or disgraceful character.*"

The Court continued: "*The duties of a doctor exist out with the course of his professional practice. A consequence of a doctor's moral turpitude is the decline of the standing of the profession as a whole and the loss of public confidence in the profession.*"

Further guidance on that point was provided by the Privy Council in the case of *Kirk v Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons* in which the Privy Council stated: "Veterinary surgeons as professionals have wider duties than the

care of animals, they are expected to conduct themselves generally in accordance with the standards of professional men and women and failure to do so may reflect upon the reputation of the profession as a whole."

Having regard to the particular circumstances of this case and the agreed Statement of Facts which have been submitted for you and your colleague's attention, I thought it wise to remind you of that aspect of misconduct and of course to remind you again that it is of course a matter for your judgment and that of your colleagues.

Sanction

Before you and your colleagues retire to consider the sanction to be imposed in relation to this Registrant, Ciara Elizabeth Corrigan, I am required to give you some advice in relation to those matters which you can now properly consider.

The starting point in relation to that is the Indicative Sanctions Guidance document issued and published by the Northern Ireland Social Care Council and the edition is that from April 2014.

You must remember and you should always guard against falling into error that the purpose of a sanctions hearing in regulatory proceedings is not to punish a practitioner for any past wrongdoing, nor, indeed, is the sanctions hearing akin to a plea in mitigation, which is dealt with commonly by the Criminal Court. The purpose of a sanction is to safeguard, hold and maintain the public interest.

The public interest is defined for you and your colleagues in the Guidance document at Paragraph 2.3 as: "Having a primary purpose to ensure, firstly, that the social care worker does not have the opportunity to repeat the misconduct and secondly, to maintain the reputation of the profession."

Paragraph 2.2 reminds you that, "the public should have confidence that the Northern Ireland Social Care Council as the regulator of social care workers will uphold proper standards of behaviour and conduct. The public interest requires that the public and social care users are protected from unsafe practice and that confidence in the profession of social work and the social care workforce in general is maintained."

You must also remember that in reaching a decision in relation to this Registrant, you must have regard to all of the available documentary evidence, which should hopefully shortly be tendered to you in relation to character testimonials.

You must also pay particular regard to the submissions which you have heard from both Mr Dixon, and Mr Hamill on behalf of the Registrant. You also must pay particular regard to the evidence which you have heard from the Registrant herself. She has decided to give evidence in relation to her case and she has decided to give evidence fully knowing, or being at least alive to the possibility, that she might have been subject to cross examination by the Council and also to questions from you and your colleagues.

All of those matters must be analysed carefully, and you must also in weighing up this matter, assess the credibility of the Registrant and the evidence that you have heard in relation to the incident, and in relation to insight and in relation to any perceived risk of repetition of the behaviour complained of.

Once you and your colleagues have done that you must then seek to categorise or to contextualise the seriousness of the misconduct which you have found to have been made out in this case. As a useful starting point in that regard I would commend to you and your colleagues an analysis of the evidence in light of the mitigating and aggravating factors, which have already been identified for you by Mr Hamill, and which are set out at pages 7 and 8 of the Indicative Sanctions Guidance document.

Once you have assessed the seriousness of the misconduct should you then move on to decide the appropriate sanction to apply. You must remember that you do not have any discretion in relation to these Rules not to impose a sanction, you must impose a sanction and you must do that in accordance with the Guidance issued to you.

The available sanctions available are the imposition of an admonishment in respect of the Registrant for a period of between one and five years; a Suspension Order up to a maximum of period of two years; or a Removal Order which will remove the Registrant from the Register and prevent her from practising the profession of which she is now a member.

You must remember that in relation to your approach, you must at all times remember that you must approach the matter proportionately. Proportionality is also dealt with in the Indicative Sanctions Guidance document and it reminds panels that proportionality requires that the consequences of the sanction which a Committee imposes must not be disproportionate to the harm from which the sanction is intended to protect the public and social service users.

The interests of the public and social service users have to be weighed against those of the Registrant. There is a wider public interest to be served in the approach to sanctions. The Committee ought not to have only a particular client or a client group in mind.

You must obviously balance the interests of the Registrant, not only in terms of her reputation and potentially any financial consequences the imposition of a sanction might entail, but you must properly balance those interests with the general public interest which, of course, includes the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

Proportionality also comprises the need to ensure that you start with the least restrictive sanction in relation to your deliberations, in other words you must begin the approach with considering the imposition of an admonishment. Only in circumstances where you feel that the sanction would not adequately protect the public should you move then through the other sanctions, moving to suspension and, if appropriate, moving to removal. You and your colleagues must carefully analyse the factors present in this case and the Guidance issued to you and your colleagues which seeks to identify the circumstances in which a particular sanction might be appropriate, but you should adopt the bottom upwards approach in that regard.

Where you identify a sanction which in your professional judgment adequately protects the public you must not proceed to consider any furthermore restrictive sanction as that would then result in the imposition of a

punishment which a sanction avowedly not to be.

You should also remember that you are not required to adhere to any particular burden or standard of proof. Again, this is a matter for the exercise of your judgment in collaboration with your colleagues, properly striking a balance between the Registrant's interests and the public interest to arrive at a sanction which properly balances those interests and which strikes an appropriate accommodation between the Registrant's interests and those of the general public interest.

You have the right to appeal this decision to the Care Tribunal. Any appeal must be lodged in writing within 28 days from the date of this Notice of Decision.

You should note that the Conduct Committee's decision takes effect from the date upon which it was made.

The effect of this decision is that you have been admonished and a record of the admonishment will be placed on your entry in the Register for a period of five years. This admonishment does not affect your ability to work in social care.

Melissa Au

Clerk to the Conduct Committee

03 April 2015

Date