DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE
ONTARIO COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS

Indexed as: Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v Jeff Packer, 2026 ONCSWSSW 9

Date: 20260902

BETWEEN:

THE ONTARIO COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS
AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS

- and -

JEFF PACKER

PANEL:	Charlene Crews	Chair, Professional Member
	Chisanga Chekwe	Public Member
	Kimberley Westfall-Connor	Non-Council Community Member

Appearances: Benjamin Kates, counsel for the College
Lisa E. Hamilton, counsel for the Registrant
Luisa Ritacca, Independent Legal Counsel to the Panel

Heard: August 14, 2026

DECISION AND REASONS FOR DECISION

[1] The Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (the "**College**") alleges that the registrant, Jeff Packer ("**Mr. Packer**" or the "**Registrant**"), has engaged in acts of professional misconduct. A hearing proceeded by video conference before a panel of the Discipline Committee (the "**Panel**") of the College on August 14, 2026. This matter proceeded on the basis of an Agreed Statement of Facts dated April 21, 2026, in which Mr. Packer admitted the allegations of professional misconduct.

---

[1] Mr. Packer resigned from the College prior to the completion of these proceedings. His certificate of registration was cancelled effective December 31, 2025. However, as discussed below, the College retains jurisdiction over the allegations in the notice of hearing. Although Mr. Packer is no longer a registrant of the College, he is referred to in these reasons as the "Registrant".

[2] For the reasons set out below, the Panel finds that the Registrant has engaged in professional misconduct as alleged in the Amended Notice of Hearing dated April 18, 2023 (amended December 4, 2023).

Overview

[3] This is the second of two discipline matters involving the Registrant, Jeff Packer, a formerly registered social worker. The first matter, *Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v Packer*, 2026 ONCSWSSW 4, resulted in findings of professional misconduct on all four allegations following a contested hearing. The penalty hearings for both matters were consolidated pursuant to the order of the pre-hearing conference presiding officer dated August 25, 2023.

[4] This second matter concerns allegations of professional misconduct arising from the Registrant's conduct in his court-appointed role as counsellor for a child ("[A]") pursuant to a Court Order dated January 19, 2022. The allegations relate to an intake telephone call on February 4, 2022, between the Registrant and the complainant, [C1], who is the mother of [A]. During that call, the Registrant is alleged to have engaged in unprofessional communications related to intimate partner violence ("IPV"), failed to accommodate [C1]'s concerns about IPV or modify his Cooperative Parenting and Reunification ("CPR") program, failed to alert the court of limitations preventing compliance with the Court Order, and as a result, the child did not obtain therapy in a timely manner.

[5] Unlike the first matter, this proceeding was resolved by way of an Agreed Statement of Facts dated April 21, 2026, in which the Registrant admitted the allegations of professional misconduct. The Panel noted the written plea inquiry contained in the ASF and conducted an oral plea inquiry. The Panel was satisfied that the Registrant's admissions were voluntary, informed, and unequivocal.

[6] The Panel finds the Registrant guilty of professional misconduct on all allegations in the Amended Notice of Hearing, as admitted in the Agreed Statement of Facts.

Publication ban

[7] The College requested an order with consent of the Registrant banning publication of any information that would directly or indirectly cause the individuals identified in the notice of hearing as [C1], [C2], or [A]. to be publicly identifiable.

[8] The Panel granted the order as requested, pursuant to s. 28(7) of the *Social Work and Social Service Work Act, 1998*, SO 1998, c 31 (the "Act"). The case involves discussions of alleged IPV and the welfare of a child. The Panel was satisfied that those allegations constitute personal matters about [C1], [C2], and [A] that are of such a nature that the desirability of avoiding public disclosure of them outweighs the desirability of adhering to the principle that hearings be open to the public.

Jurisdiction

[9] The Panel is satisfied that the College maintains its jurisdiction, despite the resignation of the Registrant from the College. His certificate of registration was cancelled effective December 31, 2025.

[10] Subsection 13(3) of the Act states that "A person whose certificate of registration is revoked or cancelled or expires continues to be subject to the jurisdiction of the College for professional misconduct, incompetence, or incapacity referable to any time during which the person held a certificate of registration under this Act and may be investigated under Sections 24 and 32." The allegations in this case occurred during a time when Mr. Packer was registered with the College. As such, this proceeding engages the College's jurisdiction for professional misconduct "referable to any time during which [Mr. Packer] held a certificate of registration."

The allegations

[11] In the Amended Notice of Hearing dated April 18, 2023 (amended December 4, 2023), the Registrant is alleged to have engaged in conduct that contravenes the Act, Ontario Regulation 384/00 (the "Professional Misconduct Regulation"), Schedule "A" to By-law No. 66 of the College, being the College's Code of Ethics (the "Code of Ethics"), and Schedule "B" to By-law No. 66, being the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers Standards of Practice Handbook (the "Handbook").

[12] The factual particulars of the College's allegations against the Registrant are set out in the Amended Notice of Hearing as follows:

1. At all relevant times you were registered as a social worker with the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (the "College"). At all relevant times, you provided social work services, including counselling, through your private practice.

2. By way of Court Order dated January 19, 2022, you were appointed counsellor for [A]. The order was made during matrimonial proceedings between [A]'s parents, [C1] and [C2], and it required [C1] and [C2] to jointly retain you as [A]'s counsellor. The intent of the Court Order was to fulfill certain recommendations made by the Office of the Children's Lawyer, including that [A] "be involved in individual therapy" and "participate in day sessions with each of his parents".

3. The Court appointed you as counsellor for [A] based on its review of your curriculum vitae and a description of your proposed therapeutic program. The information provided to the Court did not advise of a limitation that you were unable and/or unwilling to provide individual therapy. Nor did it advise of a limitation that you were unable and/or unwilling to provide therapeutic services to families unless all family members engaged in joint therapy sessions. The information did not stipulate that family members must engage in joint therapy

sessions even in circumstances where one alleges intimate partner violence by another.

4. The Court Order dated January 19, 2022, created a client system and/or client relationship between you and [C1], [C2], and [A]. In the alternative, the Court Order dated January 19, 2022, created obligations between you and [C1], [C2], and [A].

5. On or about February 4, 2022, you held an initial intake call with [C1] during which you advised her that you did not perform individual therapy. You advised [C1] that your "CPR Program" involved joint sessions between [C1] and [C2]. [C1] advised you that your proposed program was inappropriate because [C2] had been abusive towards her. She advised you that, for her safety, she did not have contact with [C2], in-person, virtually, or by phone, including through a no-contact access exchange of [A].

6. During your February 4, 2022, telephone call with [C1], you engaged in unprofessional communications, responded inappropriately to [C1]'s concerns about the abusive nature of her relationship with [C2], and/or provided comments or opinions without sufficient information, including, but not limited to the following statements, or words to their effect:

   (a) You work with families whose situations involve domestic violence, and "it makes no difference";

   (b) The parents involved in situations that involve domestic violence "need to work together for the sake of the child";

   (c) "When are you going to get over [the domestic violence]";

   (d) "You have to get over [the domestic violence] and move on";

   (e) "When are you going to get rid of that", upon learning of a no-contact access exchange of [A];

   (f) "I guess the [abuse] wasn't that bad", upon learning that [C1] did not pursue criminal charges against [C2];

   (g) [C2] cannot be accountable for what he did because he would put himself in "a very bad position." The court system is not set up for him to be accountable without punishment;

   (h) "I don't waste my time working with people who are not committed to doing the work. I decide who I work with"; and/or

   (i) "Think about if you are ready to do the work and then contact my office."

7. The February 4, 2022, telephone call was emotionally distressing to [C1].

8. At no time following the February 4, 2022, phone call did you offer and/or accept proposals to deviate from your therapeutic program in order to accommodate the concerns raised by [C1]. You refused to make any modifications to your "CPR Program" other than by offering for [C1] and [C2] to attend joint therapy sessions virtually.

9. Your unwillingness and/or inability to modify your therapeutic program to accommodate concerns relating to intimate partner violence is not appropriately supported by evidence and/or a credible body of social work knowledge with respect to issues related to intimate partner violence.

10. Notwithstanding that you were unable and/or unwilling to provide individual therapy to [A] and/or to accommodate the concerns expressed by [C1], at no time following the February 4, 2022, phone call did you alert the Court and/or enable [C1] or [C2] to take steps to alert the Court of any limitations that prevented you from giving effect to the Court Order dated January 19, 2022.

11. [C1] and [C2] were unable to obtain therapy for [A] in a timely manner.

[13] The College alleges that by reason of engaging in some or all of the conduct outlined above, the Registrant is guilty of professional misconduct as set out in section 26(2)(a) and (c) of the Act, as follows:

(a) In that you violated Section 2.2 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation by failing to meet the standards of the profession and in particular:

i. Principle II of the Handbook (commented on in Interpretations 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, and 2.1.5) by:

A. failing to be aware of the extent and parameters of your competence and to limit your practice accordingly;

B. failing to remain current with emerging social work knowledge and practice relevant to your areas of professional practice with respect to issues related to intimate partner violence;

C. failing to ensure that any professional recommendations or opinions you provide are appropriately substantiated by evidence and supported by a credible body of social work knowledge with respect to issues related to intimate partner violence;

D. failing to engage in the process of self-review and evaluation of your practice and seeking consultation when appropriate, as part of maintaining competence and acquiring skills in social work practice; and

ii. Principles II and/or III of the Handbook (commented on in Interpretations 2.1.1, 3.1 and/or, in the alternative, 3.5) by:

A. failing to inform a client of the option to be referred to another professional when that client's needs fall outside your usual area of practice and/or ensuring that the services you provide are competently provided by seeking additional supervision, consultation and/or education;

B. failing to provide clients with accurate and complete information regarding the extent, nature, and limitations of any services available to them;

C. ***(allegation withdrawn)***; and

(b) In that you violated Sections 2.2 and 2.36 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation and Principle II of the Handbook (as commented on in Interpretation 2.2.8) by engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of the profession that, having regard to all circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable, or unprofessional, and/or by failing to avoid conduct in the practice of social work that could reasonably be perceived as reflecting negatively on the profession of social work.

Registrant's position

[14] Mr. Packer admits the allegations of professional misconduct in the Amended Notice of Hearing dated April 18, 2023 (amended December 4, 2023), as set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts dated April 21, 2026.

[15] The Panel conducted a plea inquiry to satisfy itself that the Registrant's admissions were voluntary, informed, and unequivocal. The Panel was satisfied on all three counts. The Registrant confirmed that he understood the allegations, that he had the benefit of legal counsel, that his admissions were made freely and without duress, and that he understood the consequences of his admissions.

The evidence

[16] This matter proceeded on the basis of the Agreed Statement of Facts dated April 21, 2026 ("ASF"). The following is a summary of the key facts admitted by the Registrant.

Background

[17] The Complainant, [C1], was involved in a family law proceeding that commenced in 2020. [C1]'s relationship with her former common-law spouse ([C2], referred to as the "Father") ended

on December 25, 2019. They have a child together, [A], born [date]. Both parents raised allegations that the other had been abusive, including physical and verbal abuse.

[18] An Office of the Children's Lawyer ("OCL") Report dated April 21, 2021, recommended individual therapy for [A] and day sessions with each parent.

The Court Order

[19] On January 19, 2022, the Court made a temporary order requiring the parents to immediately jointly retain Jeff Packer as counsellor for [A]. Paragraph 3 of the order stated: "Pursuant to Rule 17(8), the parents shall immediately jointly retain, Mr. Jeff Packer as counsellor for [the Child], and follow that therapist's recommendations as to the structure, arrangements and schedule for the child's counselling."

[20] The Court had before it the Registrant's CV and a description of his proposed program. The CV and program description did not advise of a limitation that the Registrant was unable or unwilling to provide individual therapy or that all family members must engage in joint sessions even where one alleges IPV.

The intake call – February 4, 2022

[21] On or about February 4, 2022, [C1] spoke to the Registrant by telephone. During the call:

(a) The Registrant advised he did not do individual therapy for children without parental involvement;

(b) He described the "family as a whole" as the "only correct approach" and did not recommend alternatives;

(c) [C1] advised the Registrant that [C2] had been abusive towards her and that she did not have contact with [C2] for safety reasons; and

(d) The Registrant made the unprofessional communications set out in particular 6 of the Amended Notice of Hearing, including statements that "it makes no difference" regarding domestic violence, that parents "need to work together for the sake of the child," asking "when are you going to get over [the domestic violence]," and stating "I guess the [abuse] wasn't that bad."

[22] The call was emotionally distressing to [C1].

Post-call conduct

[23] Following the February 4, 2022, consultation, the Registrant refused to alter his CPR Program, offering only virtual joint sessions as an alternative. This refusal to implement substantive modifications lacks both empirical support and alignment with credible social work knowledge regarding intimate partner violence (IPV).

[24] The Registrant did not alert the Court or enable the parents to alert the Court of limitations preventing compliance with the Court Order. He did not offer to resign as court-appointed

therapist. He did not recommend that [C1] seek another service provider. As a result, [A] did not obtain therapy in a timely manner.

Admissions

[25] At paragraph 41 of the ASF, the Registrant admits he is guilty of professional misconduct under ss. 26(2)(a) and (c) of the Act, specifically:

(a) Violating Section 2.2 of O. Reg. 384/00 by failing to meet the standards of the profession, including:

(i) Principle II (Interpretations 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, 2.1.5) by failing to be aware of the extent and parameters of his competence, failing to remain current with emerging social work knowledge regarding IPV, failing to ensure recommendations are substantiated by evidence and a credible body of knowledge regarding IPV, and failing to engage in self-review and seek consultation;

(ii) Principles II and/or III (Interpretations 2.1.1 and 3.1) by failing to inform [C1] of the option to be referred to another professional and failing to provide accurate and complete information regarding services available; and

(b) Violating Sections 2.2 and 2.36 by engaging in conduct that would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable, or unprofessional.

Decision of the Panel

[26] On the basis of the Registrant's admissions in the Agreed Statement of Facts, and having conducted a plea inquiry, the Panel finds the Registrant guilty of professional misconduct as set out in the Amended Notice of Hearing.

[27] Specifically, the Panel finds that the College has established, on the basis of the Registrant's admissions, that:

(a) The Registrant violated Section 2.2 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation and Principle II of the Handbook, as commented on in Interpretations 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, and 2.1.5, by failing to be aware of the extent and parameters of his competence, failing to remain current with emerging social work knowledge regarding IPV, failing to ensure his recommendations were substantiated by evidence and a credible body of knowledge regarding IPV, and failing to engage in self-review and seek consultation;

(b) The Registrant violated Section 2.2 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation and Principles II and III of the Handbook, as commented on in Interpretations 2.1.1 and 3.1, by failing to inform [C1] of the option

to be referred to another professional and failing to provide accurate and complete information regarding services available; and

(c) The Registrant violated Sections 2.2 and 2.36 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation and Principle II of the Handbook, as commented on in Interpretation 2.2.8, by engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of the profession that, having regard to all circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable, or unprofessional, and/or by failing to avoid conduct in the practice of social work that could reasonably be perceived as reflecting negatively on the profession of social work.

Reasons for decision

[28] Where a registrant admits to the allegations of professional misconduct through an Agreed Statement of Facts, the Panel is not required to weigh competing evidence or make credibility findings. The Panel's role is to satisfy itself that: (a) the admissions are voluntary, informed, and unequivocal; (b) the admitted facts support the allegations of professional misconduct; and (c) the admitted conduct meets the legal definition of professional misconduct under the Act.

[29] Having conducted a plea inquiry, the Panel is satisfied on all three counts.

[30] With respect to the substance of the admissions, the Panel is satisfied that the admitted facts support findings of professional misconduct on each allegation:

Allegation (a) – Section 2.2, Principle II (Interpretations 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, 2.1.5)

[31] The Registrant admits that he failed to be aware of the extent and parameters of his competence and to limit his practice accordingly. He was appointed by the Court as counsellor for a child, yet he was unable or unwilling to provide individual therapy as contemplated by the Court Order. He failed to remain current with emerging social work knowledge regarding IPV, failed to ensure that his recommendations were substantiated by evidence and a credible body of social work knowledge regarding IPV, and failed to engage in self-review and seek consultation. His insistence on his CPR Program, despite [C1]'s clearly communicated safety concerns regarding IPV, demonstrates a failure to meet the standards set out in Principle II of the Handbook.

[32] This finding is consistent with the Panel's findings on similar issues in the first Packer matter (2026 ONCSWSSW 4), as well as the decision in *Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v Scott*, 2020 ONCSWSSW 5, where the Discipline Committee found that a registrant's failure to conduct proper screening and use of an inappropriate therapeutic approach in an IPV situation constituted professional misconduct.

Allegation (a) – Section 2.2, Principles II and/or III (Interpretations 2.1.1, 3.1)

[33] The Registrant admits that he failed to inform [C1] of the option to be referred to another professional when her needs fell outside his usual area of practice and failed to provide accurate and complete information regarding the extent, nature, and limitations of services available.

Having been appointed by the Court to provide counselling for [A], and having determined that he was unable or unwilling to provide the services contemplated, the Registrant was obliged to inform [C1] of alternatives and to take steps to assist her in obtaining other services. He failed to do so, and as a result, [A] did not receive therapy in a timely manner.

Allegation (b) – Sections 2.2 and 2.36, Principle II (Interpretation 2.2.8)

[34] The Registrant admits that his conduct would reasonably be regarded by members of the profession as disgraceful, dishonourable, or unprofessional. The statements made during the February 4, 2022, telephone call – including dismissing the significance of domestic violence, pressuring [C1] to "get over" the violence, and suggesting that the abuse "wasn't that bad" – are egregious and far below the standard expected of a social worker. These statements were made to a person who had disclosed IPV and who was in a vulnerable position as a party to family law proceedings involving her child.

[35] The Panel adopts the definitions of "disgraceful", "dishonourable" and "unprofessional" set out in *Ackermann v Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers* (2003) and applied in the first Packer decision. The *Ackerman* decision and its expanded definitions of the terms "disgraceful", "dishonourable" and "unprofessional" provided valuable guidance to the Panel.

> Disgraceful conduct is conduct that has the effect of shaming the Member and by extension the profession as a whole. In order to be disgraceful, the conduct should cast serious doubt on the Member's moral fitness and inherent ability to discharge the higher obligations the public expects professionals to meet. Dishonorable conduct is similar but need not be as severe. Both dishonourable and disgraceful conduct have an element of moral failing."

[36] The Panel finds that the Registrant's conduct, as admitted, was disgraceful, dishonourable and unprofessional. His statements during the intake call demonstrated a disregard for [C1]'s safety concerns and minimized the impact of IPV. He disregarded the obvious and inherent power imbalance that exists between a member of this College and a vulnerable client who is seeking their services. His subsequent failure to alert the Court or assist [C1] in obtaining alternative services demonstrated a persistent disregard for his professional obligations in his court-appointed role. The Registrant's conduct casts serious doubt on his moral fitness and inherent ability to discharge the obligations the public rightly expected of social workers.

Penalty

[37] Having found the Registrant guilty of professional misconduct on all allegations, the Panel turns to the question of penalty. The parties presented a Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs, which applies to both this matter and the first matter (2026 ONCSWSSW 4). The penalty hearing was consolidated for both matters pursuant to the pre-hearing conference order dated August 25, 2023.

[38] The Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs provides for the following:

(a) The Registrant shall be reprimanded by the Discipline Committee, and the fact and nature of the reprimand shall be recorded on the College's Register;

(b) The findings and order of the Discipline Committee shall be published, in detail or in summary, with the name of the Registrant, online and/or in print, including, but not limited to, in the official publication of the College, on the College's website, and on the College's public register. Such publication shall include the Undertaking and Acknowledgement of the Registrant, dated May 4, 2026, which shall be published in the manner described above and posted on the public portion of the Register maintained by the College. The Register shall reflect that the Registrant entered into this Undertaking and Acknowledgement as part of a resolution of Discipline Committee proceedings;

(c) The Registrant shall pay costs to the College in the amount of $100,000 to be paid in 19 monthly instalments beginning on August 14, 2026, and in accordance with the payment schedule at Appendix A ($10,000 first payment, then $5,000 per month);

(d) If the Registrant fails to make any of the monthly payments on or before the due dates set out in the payment schedule at Appendix A, the entire amount of costs outstanding will become due immediately; and

(e) The College and the Registrant agree that if the Discipline Committee accepts this Joint Submission as to Penalty unconditionally and in full, the order will be effective immediately and there will be no appeal or judicial review of the decision or order to any forum.

[39] In addition, as part of the resolution of these proceedings, the Registrant signed an Undertaking and Acknowledgement dated May 4, 2026, pursuant to which he:

(a) Permanently resigns from the College and surrenders his certificate of registration;

(b) Refrains from engaging in the practice of social work or social service work, except insofar as it falls within his scope of practice as a Registered Psychotherapist with the College of Registered Psychotherapists of Ontario;

(c) Refrains from using the restricted titles set out in sections 46 and 47 of the Act;

(d) Permanently refrains from re-applying to the College to be registered and/or in any way seeking the reinstatement of his certificate of registration; and

(e) Acknowledges that the Undertaking and Acknowledgement will be recorded on the public register.

Reasons for accepting the Joint Submission

[40] The leading authority on the approach to be taken with respect to joint submissions on penalty is *R. v. Anthony-Cook,* 2016 SCC 43. Although *Anthony-Cook* was decided in the criminal law context, the public interest test articulated therein has been adopted and applied in the regulatory discipline context by the Ontario Superior Court of Justice: see *Ontario College of Teachers v. Merolle*, 2023 ONSC 3453; *Timothy Edward Bradley v. Ontario College of Teachers*, 2021 ONSC 2303.

[41] In *Anthony-Cook*, the Supreme Court of Canada held that a joint submission on sentence should not be departed from unless the proposed sentence would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or would otherwise be contrary to the public interest. This is a high threshold. The Court emphasized that joint submissions are vitally important to the proper functioning of the justice system and that trial judges should not reject them lightly.

[42] The same principles apply in the regulatory discipline context. Joint submissions reflect a negotiated resolution between the parties, often involving significant concessions on both sides. They promote certainty, efficiency, and finality. A discipline panel should not depart from a joint submission unless it brings the administration of justice into disrepute or be contrary to the public interest.

[43] The Panel has considered the Joint Submission in light of this test and is satisfied that it does not bring the administration of justice into disrepute and is not contrary to the public interest. The Panel accepts the Joint Submission unconditionally and in full, for the following reasons:

(a) Mr. Packer has permanently resigned from the College and surrendered his certificate of registration. He has undertaken never to re-apply. This effectively removes him from the profession of social work, which is the most significant protective measure available;

(b) The Registrant's admissions of professional misconduct in this matter, represent a comprehensive acknowledgment of wrongdoing across both proceedings;

(c) The reprimand serves the purpose of denouncing the Registrant's conduct and expressing the profession's disapproval;

(d) The publication of the findings, order, and Undertaking and Acknowledgement serves the purposes of transparency, public protection, and general deterrence;

(e) The costs award of $100,000 is substantial and reflects the significant expense incurred by the College in prosecuting both matters, including the contested hearing in the first matter;

(f) The Undertaking and Acknowledgement provides ongoing protection to the public by restricting the Registrant's practice to his scope as a

Registered Psychotherapist and preventing him from using restricted titles or re-applying to the College; and

(g) The Joint Submission represents a reasonable and proportionate resolution of both matters, balancing the seriousness of the misconduct with the Registrant's cooperation in resolving this second matter by way of an Agreed Statement of Facts.

[44] The Panel notes that this Discipline Committee has accepted joint submissions in comparable cases involving professional misconduct in the context of IPV and inappropriate communications with vulnerable clients: see *Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v. Direnfeld*, 2019 ONCSWSSW 8; *Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v. Goulard*, 2020 ONCSWSSW 6; *Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v. Marangwanda*, 2019 ONCSWSSW 1.

[45] The penalty in this case is, in the Panel's view, appropriate and proportionate given the totality of the circumstances, including the seriousness of the misconduct across both matters, the Registrant's permanent withdrawal from the profession, and the substantial costs award.

Conclusion

[46] For the reasons set out above, the Panel has made findings of professional misconduct against the Registrant in respect of all allegations of professional misconduct in the Amended Notice of Hearing dated April 18, 2023 (amended December 4, 2023).

[47] The Panel accepts the Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs unconditionally and in full. The Panel orders:

(a) The Registrant shall be reprimanded, and the fact and nature of the reprimand shall be recorded on the College's Register;

(b) The findings and order of the Discipline Committee shall be published, in detail or in summary, with the name of the Registrant, including the Undertaking and Acknowledgement dated May 4, 2026;

(c) The Registrant shall pay costs to the College in the amount of $100,000 in accordance with the payment schedule at Appendix A to the Joint Submission;

(d) If the Registrant fails to make any payment on or before the due date, the entire outstanding amount becomes due immediately; and

(e) As the Panel has accepted the Joint Submission unconditionally and in full, the order is effective immediately and there shall be no appeal or judicial review.

I, Chisanga Chekwe, sign this decision as chairperson of the Panel and on behalf of the Panel members listed below.

Date: Sept. 2, 2026_____ Signed : _____

Chisanga Chekwe, Chair
Charlene Crews
Kimberley Westfall-Connor