

Discipline Committee of the College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario

Citation: ONCRPO v. WENT, 2023 ONCRPO 1

Date of written reasons: February 10, 2023

Docket: C2021-17_C2021-20

IN THE MATTER OF the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991, S.O. 1991, c. 18*, as amended, and the regulations thereunder, as amended;

IN THE MATTER OF the *Psychotherapy Act, 2007, S.O. 2007, c. 10, Sched. R*, as amended and the regulations thereunder, as amended;

AND IN THE MATTER OF a discipline proceeding against John Went, a Registrant of the College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario.

Between: **COLLEGE OF REGISTERED PSYCHOTHERAPISTS AND REGISTERED MENTAL HEALTH THERAPISTS OF ONTARIO**

- and -

JOHN WENT (REGISTRATION #002153)

Before: Panel

**Kenneth Lomp (Chair)
Henry Pateman
Jeffrey Vincent
Radhika Sundar
Kathleen (Kalie) Hewitt-Blackie**

Date of hearing:

January 17, 2023

Appearances:

Rebecca Durcan,

Counsel for College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario

Jennifer Hunter,

Independent Legal Counsel

John Went, Registrant/Member

Lisa Hamilton, Counsel for John Went

DECISION AND REASONS

PRELIMINARY ISSUE

This hearing involved two separate Notices of Hearing in respect of two separate proceedings by the College against John Went (the 'Registrant'). The first proceeding was in respect of matter C2021-17. The second proceeding was in respect of matter C2021-20. On consent of the parties, Counsel for the College asked the Panel to hear the two matters together, pursuant to section 9.1(1)(a) of the Statutory Powers Procedure Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.22. The Panel agreed to this request.

These matters came before a panel of the Discipline Committee (the "Panel") of the College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario (the "College") on January 17, 2023. The hearing proceeded via videoconference on consent of the parties. The hearing was uncontested. It proceeded by way of an Agreed Statement of Facts ("ASF") and a Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs, which were jointly proposed on behalf of the College and the Registrant, John Went (the "Registrant").

The Panel made findings of professional misconduct and, at the conclusion of the hearing, delivered its finding and penalty order orally, with written reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

THE ALLEGATIONS (C2021-17)

The allegations of professional misconduct against the Registrant were listed on the Notice of Hearing, dated February 24, 2022, which was filed as Exhibit 1, and read as follows:

The Registrant

1. John Went (the "Registrant") registered with the College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario (the "College") on or about April 21, 2015. The Registrant is a Registered Psychotherapist that is authorized for independent practice.
2. The Registrant is self-employed and has offices in Bradford and/or Toronto.
3. At the relevant time, the Registrant was the founder and/or owner and/or co-owner

of Integral Healing Centre (IHC).

4. The Registrant was an instructor and/or supervisor at IHC.

Integral Healing Centre

5. It is alleged that the Registrant did the following:
 - a. Provided misleading and/or false and/or inadequate information to applicants and/or students of IHC including but not limited to the following:
 - i. That IHC was registered as and/or in the process of being registered as a private career college;
 - ii. That he needed to apply to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities in order for the College to accredit the IHC program;
 - iii. That IHC was under the control of the College; and/or
 - iv. That graduates of IHC would be prepared to register with the College.
6. It is alleged that the Registrant concurrently treated and taught and evaluated IHC students.

Allegations of Professional Misconduct

7. It is alleged that the above conduct constitutes professional misconduct pursuant to section 51(1)(c) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, being Schedule 2 to the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991 (the "Code") as set out in one or more of the following paragraphs of section 1 of Ontario Regulation 317/12 made under the Psychotherapy Act, 2007:
 - a. **Paragraph 1.** Contravening, by act or omission, a standard of practice of the profession or failing to maintain the standard of practice of the profession including but not limited to the following:
 - i. 1.6 – Conflict of Interest; and/or
 - ii. 1.7 – Dual or Multiple Relationships;
 - b. **Paragraph 16.** Acting in a professional capacity while in a conflict of interest or being in a conflict of interest when acting in a professional capacity;

- c. **Paragraph 26.** Signing or issuing, in his or her professional capacity, a document that the member knows or ought to know contains a false or misleading statement;
- d. **Paragraph 52.** Engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of the profession that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional; and/or
- e. **Paragraph 53.** Engaging in conduct that would reasonably be regarded by members as conduct unbecoming a member of the profession.

THE ALLEGATIONS (C2021-20)

The allegations of professional misconduct against the Registrant were listed on the Notice of Hearing, dated February 24, 2022, which was filed as Exhibit 2, and read as follows:

The Registrant

1. John Went (the “Registrant”) registered with the College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario (the “College”) on or about April 21, 2015. The Registrant is a Registered Psychotherapist that is authorized for independent practice.
2. The Registrant is self-employed and has offices in Bradford and/or Toronto.
3. At the relevant time, the Registrant was the founder and/or owner and/or co-owner of Integral Healing Centre (IHC).
4. The Registrant was an instructor and/or supervisor at IHC.

The Client

5. It is alleged that the Registrant commenced treatment of the Client in or around February 2015.
6. It is alleged that the Client commenced her studies at IHC in or around September 2015.
7. It is alleged that the Registrant did not discuss and/or recommend and/or suggest that the Client be referred to another therapist as a result of the Client registering at IHC.

8. It is alleged that the Registrant continued to treat the Client while she was a student at IHC.
9. It is alleged that the Registrant was the Client's instructor for her final three years at IHC.
10. It is alleged that the Registrant evaluated the Client's work at IHC.
11. It is alleged that the Client felt exposed during class at IHC as the Registrant was aware of her personal life from therapy and/or she could not stand up to the Registrant at IHC in fear of losing him as a therapist.
12. It is alleged that the Registrant referred clients to the Client.
13. It is alleged that the Registrant offered his office to the Client for no cost. It is alleged that despite his offer, he then delivered an invoice to the Client for \$1400.00.
14. It is alleged that during her third and/or fourth year at IHC the Client tried to terminate her therapeutic relationship with the Registrant. It is alleged that the Registrant conceded but then pressured the Client to return.
15. It is alleged that the Client tried again to terminate the therapeutic relationship. It is alleged that the Client communicated her intent in an email to the Registrant. It is alleged that the Registrant did not promptly respond to and/or acknowledge the email. It is alleged that when the Registrant did respond he told the Client that he "felt hurt and dismissed."

Allegations of Professional Misconduct

16. It is alleged that the above conduct constitutes professional misconduct pursuant to section 51(1)(c) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, being Schedule 2 to the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991 (the "Code") as set out in one or more of the following paragraphs of section 1 of Ontario Regulation 317/12 made under the Psychotherapy Act, 2007:
 - a. **Paragraph 1.** Contravening, by act or omission, a standard of practice of the profession or failing to maintain the standard of practice of the profession, including but not limited to:

- i. 1.6 – Conflict of Interest;
- ii. 1.7 – Dual or Multiple Relationships; and/or
- iii. 1.8 – Undue Influence or Abuse;
- b. **Paragraph 16.** Acting in a professional capacity while in a conflict of interest or being in a conflict of interest when acting in a professional capacity;
- c. **Paragraph 52.** Engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of the profession that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional; and/or
- d. **Paragraph 53.** Engaging in conduct that would reasonably be regarded by members as conduct unbecoming a member of the profession.

AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Agreed Statement of Facts was filed as Exhibit 3 and provides (without attachments) as follows:

The Registrant

1. John Went (the “Registrant”) registered with the College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario (the “College”) on or about April 21, 2015. The Registrant is a Registered Psychotherapist that is authorized for independent practice. Attached at Tab A is a copy of the Registrant’s registration history as set out in the College’s public register.
2. The Registrant is currently self-employed and has offices in Bradford and Toronto.
3. The Registrant and the College consent to the two Notices of Hearing dated February 24, 2022 to be heard together pursuant to s 9.1(1)(a) of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*.

Integral Healing Centre

4. The Registrant was the founder and owner of Integral Healing Centre (IHC). IHC was created to provide a professional psychotherapy training program. The Registrant agrees the IHC ought to have been registered as a private career college under the Ministry of Colleges and Universities (the “Ministry”) but this did not occur. As of January 2021, IHC is no longer operating. Attached at Tab B is an excerpt of the IHC website from approximately 2015 onwards. On its website, IHC described its program as follows:
 - a. In-Class therapy sessions are a component of the program;
 - b. Group supervision, clinical supervision and attendance in personal psychotherapy

- are requirements;
- c. "Our goal is to graduate competent beginning therapists who practice safe and effective use of self."
 - d. "Students must seek regular personal therapy with a registered Psychotherapist. Working with a graduate from IHC is strongly encouraged to help students further integrate the teaching and modalities."; and
 - e. "In order to successfully complete the course and receive recognition of completion, each student will complete the academic activities below to the satisfaction of John Went, Founder and Program Director."
5. The application to IHC was located on the website. One of the questions asks if the applicant "intend[s] to complete all of the requirements for registration in the CRPO?"
 6. The Registrant was listed as an available therapist on the website of IHC.
 7. The Registrant was an instructor and supervisor at IHC. It is agreed that the Registrant would evaluate and grade the final papers of IHC students even if he had provided therapy to them as part of the IHC academic requirements.

Student 1

8. In August 2018, the Registrant advised Student 1 and all Year IV students that IHC comes "under the control of the College of Registered Psychotherapists of Ontario and the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, Private Career Colleges Division." It is agreed that this was not correct. However, if the Registrant were to testify, he would state that he honestly believed that the pending application to the Ministry for accreditation of IHC as a private career college would be accepted, and that CRPO would register graduates of the IHC program. If he were to testify, the Registrant would admit that he never asked the Ministry to confirm his incorrect assumption. He would further testify that but for [REDACTED], he would have continued the process of seeking the College's recognition of IHC. Note that the College's process of recognition never resulted in an endorsement or recommendation of an educational program. Rather, the process was intended to inform graduates that the education requirements for registration would be met upon completion of the program. Included at Tab C is a copy of the email correspondence between the Registrant and Student 1.

9. In or around 2018 and/or 2019 Student 1 sought documentation from the Registrant as she was applying to the College. In 2018 and/or 2019, the Registrant provided Student 1 with the application to the Ministry to achieve private career college designation for IHC. The Registrant admits that he prepared and issued this application and that he had not yet received any indication from the Ministry that it would be accepted or rejected. The Registrant provided this to Student 1 so that she could include it in her application to the College but agrees that it would have no relevance to College applications for registration.

The application was incomplete and unsigned. In the application, the Registrant listed the program code for psychologists (4151) yet describes how the program will prepare graduates to become registered psychotherapists. If the Registrant were to testify, he would state that the final copy of the application was delivered to the Ministry by courier, and that version had a signature and enclosures. It was his honest belief that if the Ministry had the authority to approve private career colleges that taught psychology, it followed that the Ministry also had the authority to approve private career colleges that taught psychotherapy, and that the Ministry's application form simply had not yet been updated to reflect that Registered Psychotherapist was a very newly created profession. The Registrant admits that he never asked the Ministry to correct his assumption. Included at Tab D is a copy of the application.

Student 2

10. In or around the summer of 2015 a person contacted the Registrant and asked if IHC was accredited with the College. The Registrant advised the person that IHC was in the process of applying to become accredited. If the Registrant were to testify, he would say that he honestly believed that this statement was true, as he had not yet heard from the Ministry that it was in fact the College that determined whether programs would be "accredited" for purposes of College registration. The Registrant now realizes that the College never accredited educational programs. The Registrant also advised the person that other graduates had become registered with the College, which was true, i.e. pursuant to the "grandparenting" registration process that continued until April 2017. However, the Registrant admits that the grandparenting process was distinct from the process that would have been in place by the time Student 2 would have graduated from IHC. If the Registrant were to testify, he would state that he honestly believed that since the College

had registered prior graduates of IHC, this was a strong indication that graduates of this program would continue to be registered once the grandparenting period ended in April 2017, consistent with section 6(1)(1)(iii) or (iv) of the Registration Regulation. He now recognizes that his belief was simply incorrect. The Registrant's comments reassured the person who then registered with IHC in September 2015 (and became Student 2). It is agreed that the Registrant provided misleading or inadequate information to Student 2.

The Client

Treatment

11. The Registrant commenced treatment of the Client in or around February 2014. Her treatment included discussion of personal matters including [REDACTED].
12. The Client had learned of the Registrant via the IHC website. Attached at Tab E is a copy of the website as it looked in March 2015. The website described an "affiliation" between IHC and Canadian Association for Psychodynamic Therapists, Ontario Society of Psychotherapists, and the College and the Ministry of Human Resources and Skills. The Registrant agrees that despite this information on the IHC website, the references to CRPO and ISO related to him individually and not the IHC.

Registering at IHC

13. Following her commencement of treatment with the Registrant, the Client advised the Registrant that she was interested in attending IHC. The Client did commence her studies at IHC in or around September 2015. She also continued to see the Registrant for treatment while she was a student at IHC.
14. The Registrant never discussed with or recommended to or suggested that the Client be referred to another therapist as a result of the Client registering at IHC.
15. The Registrant was the Client's instructor for her final three years at IHC with the exception of the period from February 2019 to July 2019 when the Registrant was [REDACTED]. During this time, the class was taught by another registrant. In July 2019, the Registrant, in consultation with the other RP, read the final papers submitted by the Client and other students and together they decided whether the students (including the Client) had completed the training at a satisfactory level. If the Registrant were to testify, he would state that he verily believed that the

involvement of the other RP in assessing the Client was a safeguard against any concern of conflict-of-interest in relation to the objective assessment of the Client. The Registrant and the other RP did concur that the Client had met the standards to complete the training. The Registrant now understands that it was not appropriate for him to be involved – in any capacity – in the evaluation of the Client’s work at IHC.

In-Class Therapy

16. The curriculum for IHC included class therapy. Students would take on the role of client and therapist and then vice versa. The Registrant would observe students take on these roles and provide feedback to the students. The Client felt exposed during in-class therapy as the Registrant was aware of her personal life from their private therapy sessions. The Registrant acknowledges that he should have ensured that all students, including the Client, were aware that any personal information that had been shared would not be disclosed to the class unless the student decided to share. The Registrant acknowledges that had he done so, the Client would likely not have felt exposed.
17. It is agreed that despite the fact that the Registrant provided private therapy to the Client, the Registrant evaluated the Client’s academic and performance at IHC.
18. If the Client were to testify, she would state that she felt she could not stand up to the Registrant at IHC in fear of losing him as a therapist.

Registrant offers his office to Client

19. In her third year at IHC, the Registrant referred clients to the Client. The clients were incoming IHC students and were being treated under the supervision of another RP. The Client was given the use of the Registrant’s office ([REDACTED]) when the Registrant was not using it, i.e. on weekends and evenings rent free, to assist her in establishing a private practice. By the end of September 2017, the Client’s practice had grown sufficiently that she also needed an office all day Friday. As she was charging the clients that she saw, she could afford to pay rent, and she agreed to pay \$150 per month for the use of [REDACTED] every Friday. This arrangement continued in 2018, at which point the Client was given a receipt for \$1400 representing the amount that she had paid.

Client’s attempts to terminate relationship

20. The Client tried to terminate her therapeutic relationship with the Registrant but he

encouraged her to remain. She did so. However, in approximately November 2018, the Client did terminate her therapeutic relationship with the Registrant via email. He did not respond. If the Registrant were to testify, he would state that the intention to terminate was expressed in such a definitive manner that it seemed a response was not expected.

21. In April 2019, the Registrant emailed the Client about outstanding payments (for IHC and therapy). The Client expressed her concern that he had not responded to her email of November 2018. He did not respond until May 2019 and said he expected more from her and that he “felt hurt and dismissed.” Attached at Tab F is a copy of this email exchange. If the Registrant were to testify, he would state that his May 2019 email was sent in the context of being very recently [REDACTED].

Standards of Practice

22. The College maintains Standards of Practice that assist registrants and clients understand the role of the registrant. It is agreed that the following standards of practice (excerpts of which have been included below but can be found at Tab G) have been breached by the above noted conduct:

a. Standard 1.6 – Conflict of Interest

- (1) A conflict-of-interest exists when a member is in any arrangement or relationship where a reasonable person could conclude that the exercise of the member’s professional expertise or judgment may be compromised by, or be influenced inappropriately by, the arrangement or relationship. A conflict-of-interest may be actual, potential or perceived.

a. Examples include:

1. Entering into an agreement or arrangement that interferes with the member’s ability to properly exercise his/her professional judgment.

b. Standard 1.7 – Dual or Multiple Relationships

- (1) Whenever possible, members should avoid dual or multiple relationships with clients in addition to their professional one (e.g. relative, friend, student, employee). In remote areas with few other psychotherapists, it may be impossible not to have some other relationship with a client (if only as a member of the same small community). In those circumstances, the member must use his/her professional judgment, and ensure that safeguards are in

place, e.g. appropriate supervision, ensuring that any conflict-of interest concerns are addressed, etc.

- (2) Multiple relationships are prone to cause confusion for both the member and the client. For example, the therapist or client may not know in which relationship certain information is being provided.
- (3) If the member is in a position of authority over the client (e.g. as employer), the client (e.g. as employer), the client may feel the need to acquiesce to a request from the member as a therapist. Dual or multiple relationships may also affect the member's professional judgment (e.g. the member might say things to a client who is also a friend that s/he would not otherwise say to a client).
- (4) Note: Students in some psychotherapy training programs undertake personal psychotherapy as part of program requirements. In this instance, teachers in the program may engage with students in therapy. An important safeguard would be to ensure that a member engaged in such therapy does not also evaluate the students' academic or other performance in the program.

c. Standard 1.8 – Undue Influence and Abuse

- (1) Clients and/or their representatives may be emotionally and otherwise vulnerable. At the same time, clients may be particularly influenced by the views or suggestions of their psychotherapist. It is important therefore to ensure that clients feel safe with their therapist, and that they are not subjected to inappropriate influence or abuse.
- (2) A member demonstrates compliance with the standard by, for example:
 1. practising the profession with integrity and professionalism;
 2. refraining from any form of verbal, physical, emotional, psychological or sexual abuse;
 3. being cognizant of the individual vulnerabilities of clients and/or representatives;
 4. being respectful of the best interests of clients;
 5. apologizing for minor lapses in courtesy or inappropriate language;
 6. ensuring that the member's influence does not affect the personal decision making of a client, particularly in financial matters and end of life decision making;

7. consulting another member or the College if the member finds him/herself in questionable circumstances.

Admission of Professional Misconduct

23. It is admitted that the above conduct constitutes professional misconduct pursuant to section 51(1)(c) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, being Schedule 2 to the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991 (the "Code") as set out in one or more of the following paragraphs of section 1 of Ontario Regulation 317/12 made under the Psychotherapy Act, 2007:

- a. **Paragraph 1** – Contravening, by act or omission, a standard of practice of the profession or failing to maintain the standard of practice of the profession, including but not limited to the following:
 - i. 1.6 – Conflict of Interest;
 - ii. 1.7 – Dual or Multiple Relationships; and
 - iii. 1.8 – Undue Influence or Abuse;
- b. **Paragraph 16** – Acting in a professional capacity while in a conflict of interest or being in a conflict of interest when acting in a professional capacity;
- c. **Paragraph 26** – Signing or issuing, in his or her professional capacity, a document that the member knows or ought to know contains a false or misleading statement; and
- d. **Paragraph 52** – Engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of the profession that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as unprofessional.

Withdrawal of Allegations

24. The College seeks leave to withdraw the allegation in the Notices of Hearing of contravention of section 51(1)(c) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, being Schedule 2 to the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991(the "Code") as set out in one or more of the following paragraphs of section 1 of Ontario Regulation 317/12 made under the *Psychotherapy Act, 2007*:

- a) **Paragraph 53.** Engaging in conduct that would reasonably be regarded by members as conduct unbecoming a member of the profession.

Admission of Facts

25. By this document, the Registrant admits to the truth of the facts referred to in paragraphs 1 to 22 above (the “Agreed Facts”).

26. By this document, the Registrant states that:

- a. he understands that by signing this document he is consenting to the evidence as set out in the Agreed Facts being presented to the Discipline Committee;
- b. he understands that any decision of the Discipline Committee and a summary of its reasons, including reference to his name, will be published in the College’s annual report and any other publication or website of the College;
- c. he understands that any agreement between himself and the College with respect to any penalty proposed does not bind the Discipline Committee; and
- d. he understands and acknowledges that he is executing this document voluntarily, unequivocally, free of duress, free of bribe, and that he has been advised of his right to seek legal advice.

REGISTRANT’S PLEA

The Registrant admitted the acts of professional misconduct as set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts.

The Panel conducted an oral plea inquiry and was satisfied that the Registrant's admissions were voluntary, informed, and unequivocal.

SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES ON FINDING

Counsel for the College submitted that the facts and admissions contained in the Agreed Statement of Facts constitute professional misconduct admitted to by the Registrant.

The Registrant agreed with College Counsel’s submissions, namely that the facts admitted in the Agreed Statement of Facts support a finding of professional misconduct as set out therein.

DECISION

On reading the Notices of Hearings, considering the Agreed Statement of Facts, and on hearing the submissions of counsel for the College and the submissions of the Registrant, the Panel finds that the Registrant has committed acts of professional misconduct pursuant to:

1. Section 51(1)(c) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, being Schedule 2 to the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991 (the “Code”).
 - a. **Paragraph 1** – Contravening, by act or omission, a standard of practice of the profession or failing to maintain the standard of practice of the profession, including but not limited to the following:
 - i. 1.6 – Conflict of Interest;
 - ii. 1.7 – Dual or Multiple Relationships; and
 - iii. 1.8 – Undue Influence or Abuse;
 - b. **Paragraph 16** – Acting in a professional capacity while in a conflict of interest or being in a conflict of interest when acting in a professional capacity;
 - c. **Paragraph 26** – Signing or issuing, in his or her professional capacity, a document that the member knows or ought to know contains a false or misleading statement; and
 - d. **Paragraph 52** – Engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of the profession that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as unprofessional.

REASONS FOR DECISION

Having considered the Registrant’s admission of professional misconduct and the facts contained in the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Panel concluded that the College had provided clear, cogent and convincing evidence in support of the allegations and succeeded in proving on a balance of probabilities that the Registrant had committed the acts of professional misconduct. The Panel was satisfied the Registrant’s admission was voluntary, informed, and unequivocal.

THE JOINT SUBMISSION ON PENALTY AND COSTS

The Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs was filed as Exhibit 4. Counsel for the College and the Registrant agreed and jointly submitted that the following would be an appropriate order as to penalty and costs in the matter:

1. The Registrant is required to appear before a Panel of the Discipline Committee to be reprimanded immediately following the hearing.
2. The Registrar is directed to suspend the Registrant's certificate of registration for a period of five months, to commence on the date of this order, with the ability to remit three months in the event that the Registrant successfully completes the terms, conditions and limitations in subparagraphs 3(a) and 3(b) within the timeframes indicated therein:
 - a. The Registrant shall serve the first two months of the suspension consecutively; and
 - b. If the remitted portion of the suspension is required to be served by the Registrant because he fails to complete the remedial requirement specified in subparagraphs 3(a) and 3(b), that portion of the suspension shall be served consecutively and shall commence on the day immediately after the timeframes for completing the requirements in subparagraphs 3(a) and 3(b) have expired, whichever is later.
3. The Registrar is directed to immediately impose the following specified terms, conditions and limitations on the Registrant's certificate of registration, all of which shall be fulfilled at the expense of the Registrant and to the satisfaction of the Registrar:
 - a. The Registrant shall successfully complete the College's Jurisprudence e-Learning Module within six months of the date of this order;
 - b. The Registrant shall successfully complete a course with a professional ethics consultant chosen by the Registrar, regarding the issues raised by the facts and findings of professional misconduct in this case, within twelve months of the date of this order; and

- c. The Registrant shall agree to clinical supervision, by a supervisor, pre-approved by the Registrar, to address dual relationships, conflict of interest, and undue influence and abuse for twelve months immediately following the Registrant's return to practice after the completion of the suspension described in paragraph 2.
 - i. Before the supervision commences, the Registrant shall provide the supervisor a copy of the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Joint Submissions on Penalty and Costs, and the reasons of the Panel;
 - ii. The Registrant shall co-operate with the supervisor and abide by all the terms of the clinical supervision agreement put into place by the supervisor and the College; and
 - iii. Within thirty days of the completion of the supervision, the Registrant shall ensure that the supervisor submits a written report to the Registrar which confirms that the Registrant co-operated and complied with the supervision, incorporated advice from the supervisor, and which sets out the position of the supervisor as to the Registrant's skills for addressing dual relationships, conflict of interest, and undue influence and abuse.
 - iv. If the remitted portion of the suspension is required as described above, clinical supervision shall resume immediately after the Registrant has served the remitted portion.
4. The Registrant is required to pay costs fixed in the amount of \$6,055.00 payable within thirty days of the date of this order.

DECISION ON ORDER

The Panel accepted the Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs as submitted by the parties and makes an Order in accordance with the terms set out above.

REASONS FOR DECISION ON ORDER

The panel considered the Registrant's apparent willingness to cooperate with the College, the Registrant's voluntary admission of the acts noted in the Agreed Statement of Facts and other mitigating factors noted by Counsel and the Registrant's recognition that his conduct was unprofessional. The panel concluded that the Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs is reasonable, serves the public interest and provides reasonable remediation opportunities for the Registrant. Public safety is addressed by both general and specific deterrence.

REPRIMAND

At the conclusion of the hearing, having confirmed that the Registrant waived any right to appeal, the panel delivered its oral reprimand. A copy of the reprimand is attached at Schedule "A" of these reasons.

I, Kenneth Lomp, sign this Decision and Reasons for the decision as Chairperson of this Discipline panel and on behalf of the Registrants of the Discipline panel as listed below:

Kenneth Lomp, RP

Chair, Discipline Panel

February 10, 2023

Radhika Sundar, Professional Member
Kathleen (Kali) Hewitt-Blackie, Professional Member
Henry Pateman, Public Member
Jeffrey Vincent, Public Member

Schedule "A"**Oral Reprimand**

Mr. Went,

You are required to appear before this panel of the discipline committee for an oral reprimand. The committee has found that your conduct constitutes unprofessional behaviour. Maintaining boundaries by not engaging in multiple relationships with clients is integral to keeping the therapeutic relationship safe.

You're continuing to maintain a therapeutic relationship with your client after they became a student at IHC and failing to refer them to another therapist created a situation that put an already vulnerable individual at risk of harm. As a registered psychotherapist, the panel reminds you that it is your responsibility to be aware of the inherent power imbalances that exists both in your role as a teacher, as well as a registered psychotherapist. This places a greater onus on you as a professional to be mindful that your conduct reflects on the profession as a whole and has put the profession in ill repute.

The panel reminds the registrant that lack ill intent, does not excuse misleading information presented as fact. Such behaviour can cause significant harm to the public in a broad sense and more specifically to vulnerable individuals. We wish to make clear to you that, although the Order we imposed is appropriate in relations to our findings, a more significant Order will likely be imposed by another Discipline panel in the event that you are ever found to have engaged in further professional misconduct.

Discipline Panel:

Kenneth Lomp, Chair, Professional Member

Radhika Sundar, Professional Member

Kathleen (Kali) Hewitt-Blackie, Professional Member

Henry Pateman, Public Member

Jeffrey Vincent, Public Member