

ACC's Indicative Sanctions Policy

Introduction

This document sets out ACC's policy on how sanctions should be applied by its disciplinary Panels in fitness to practice cases. It takes into account the document produced by the Council for Regulatory Excellence (CHRE) published in 2008 which recommended a common sanction set for regulated professions and ACC recognises that this is also appropriate for itself as an Accredited Register holder.

The decision regarding what sanction, if any, is imposed on an ACC registrant whose fitness to practice is found to be impaired is properly a matter for the Panel which heard the case. Disciplinary Panels operate at 'arm's length' from the ACC Board and it would be inappropriate for the Board to set a fixed 'tariff' of sanctions. This policy is only guidance and Panels must apply it as such. Panels must decide each case on its merits, and that includes deciding what, if any, sanction to impose.

This policy is intended to aid Panels in their deliberation and assist them in making fair, consistent and transparent decisions.

1. Purpose of Sanctions

- 1.1 The purpose of fitness to practice proceedings is not to punish registrants, but to protect the public. Inevitably, a sanction may be punitive in effect, but should not be imposed simply for that purpose. The Panel's task is to determine whether, on the basis of the evidence before it, the registrant's fitness to practice is impaired. In effect, the task is to consider a registrant's past acts, determine whether the registrant's fitness to provide professional services is below accepted standards, and to consider whether he or she may pose a risk to those who may need or use his or her services in the future. Where such a risk is identified, the Panel must then determine what degree of public protection is required.
- 1.2 It is important for Panels to remember that a sanction may only be imposed in relation to the facts which a Panel has found to be true or which are admitted by the registrant. Equally, it is important that any sanction addresses all of the relevant facts which have led to a finding of impairment.
- 1.3 The primary function of any sanction is to address public safety from the perspective of the risk which the registrant concerned may pose to those who use or need his or her services. However, in reaching their decisions,

Panels must also give appropriate weight to the wider public interest, which includes

- the deterrent effect to other registrants
- the reputation of the profession concerned
- public confidence in the regulatory process.

1.4 If further action is to be taken then a range of sanctions is available which enables a Panel to take the most appropriate steps to protect the public and they are

- mediation
- apology
- caution - written warning
- removal from committee, position or office
- explanation of learning from counsellor
- further training, supervision or therapy
- conditions of practice
- suspension
- removal from registration and membership.

1.5 Even if a Panel has determined that fitness to practice is impaired, it is not obliged to impose a sanction. This is likely to be an exceptional outcome but, for example, may be appropriate in cases where a finding of impairment has been reached on the wider public interest grounds identified above but where the registrant has insight, has already taken remedial action and there is no risk of repetition or a safeguarding risk.

2. Proportionality

2.1 In deciding what, if any, sanction to impose, Panels should apply the principle of proportionality, considering the following questions in order to balance the interests of the public with those of the registrant:

- is the sanction an appropriate exercise of the Panel's powers?
- is it a suitable means of attaining the degree of public protection identified by the Panel?
- does it take account of wider public interest issues, such as maintaining public confidence in the profession?

- is it the least restrictive means of attaining that degree of public protection?
- is it proportionate in the strict sense, striking a proper balance between the protection of the public and the rights of the registrant?

3 Insight and Sorrow

- 3.1 The Board is committed to promoting equality and valuing diversity and Panels are expected to adhere to that commitment and to conduct proceedings in a fair and non-discriminatory manner.
- 3.2 The primary purpose of fitness to practice proceedings is to identify and secure a proportionate measure of public protection rather than to punish. A key factor in many cases will be the extent to which a registrant recognises his or her failings and is willing to address them.
- 3.3 In taking account of any insight, explanation, apology or remorse (and in our Christian context we would use the word repentance) offered by a registrant, Panels are reminded that there may be cultural differences in the way that these may be expressed - both verbally and non-verbally - and especially where the registrant may not be using his or her first language.
- 3.4 There is a significant difference between insight, remorse and repentance. In deciding what, if any, sanction is required, the issues which the Panel need to consider are whether the registrant has genuinely recognised his or her failings, has taken or is taking any appropriate remedial action to address them and whether there is a risk of repetition. Those issues should be addressed by consideration of the evidence on those issues rather than focusing on the exact manner or form in which they may be explained or expressed.
- 3.5 Registrants are expected to be open and honest with service users and, generally, Panels should regard registrants' candid explanations, expressions of empathy and apologies as positive steps. Importantly, they will rarely amount to an admission of liability by the registrant concerned and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, should not be treated as such by Panels.

4. Procedure

- 4.1 The range of sanctions available to Panels should not influence the decision as to whether or not fitness to practice is impaired. The finding of impairment and sanctioning stages of a hearing should be (and be seen to be) separate elements of the process.

- 4.2 To reinforce this point, Panels should retire to determine whether or not fitness to practice is impaired and then return to announce their decision and the reasons for that decision. Where the Panel has decided that fitness to practice is impaired it should then hear any submissions on behalf of the parties in relation to mitigating or aggravating factors before retiring again to consider (in ascending order) what, if any, sanction to impose. The Panel should then return to announce that sanction and the reasons for that sanction.
- 4.3 Panels must ensure that registrants fully understand any sanction which is being imposed upon them. The Panel Chair should carefully explain what sanction, if any, the Panel has imposed, the reasons for doing so and the consequences for the registrant in clear and direct language which leaves no room for misunderstanding or ambiguity. In particular, Panel Chairs should avoid the temptation to give lectures, which often obscure clear communication of the Panel's decision.

5. Sanctions

5.1 Mediation

Mediation may only be used if the Panel is satisfied that the only other appropriate course would be to take no further action. Thus, a case may only be referred to mediation if the Panel considers that no further sanction is required.

Generally this will only be where impairment is minor and isolated in nature and unlikely to recur, where the registrant fully understands the nature and effect of that impairment and has taken appropriate corrective action.

Mediation is not really a sanction as such but is a consensual process and will be most appropriate where issues between the registrant and another party (e.g. the complainant or an employer) remain unresolved.

Examples include where one counsellor has reason to complain about another; where a client believes the counselling provided did not meet their expectations and/or when a breach of ethics and practice is not clear.

5.2. Apology from Counsellor/Psychotherapist

An apology from the therapist to the complainant, where the therapist has acknowledged mistakes.

5.3. Written warning

A letter of warning to the therapist in relation to specific conduct or misjudgement.

5.4. Removal from committee, position or office

If the therapist is a member of a committee or, for example, provides training, they can be removed from office.

5.5. Counsellor/Psychotherapist explanation of learning

A written report by the therapist, to be submitted to the panel within a certain timescale, to explain what the therapist has learned from the experience

5.6. Further training, supervision or therapy

Further training, supervision or therapy for a minimum length of time to achieve goals identified by the panel.

5.7. Caution sanction

A caution sanction may be the appropriate sanction for slightly more serious cases, where the lapse is isolated or of a minor nature, there is a low risk of recurrence, the registrant has shown insight and taken remedial action. A caution sanction should also be considered in cases where the nature of the allegation (e.g. dishonesty) means that meaningful practice restrictions cannot be imposed but where the risk of repetition is low and thus suspension from practice would be disproportionate. A caution sanction is unlikely to be appropriate in cases where the registrant lacks insight and, in that event, conditions of practice or suspension should be considered.

At the Panel's discretion, a caution sanction may be imposed for any period between one and five years. In order to ensure that a fair and consistent approach is adopted, Panels should regard a period of three years as the 'benchmark' for a caution sanction. However, as Panels must consider sanctions in ascending order, the starting point for a caution is one year and a Panel should only impose a caution for a longer period if the facts of the case make it appropriate to do so.

Cautions appear on the register but do not restrict a registrant's ability to practice. However, a caution may be taken into account if a further allegation is made against the registrant concerned. Records will be marked as monitored.

5.8. Conditions of Practice Sanction

A conditions of practice sanction must be for a specified period not exceeding three years. Conditions appear on the register and, most often, will restrict a registrant's practice, require the registrant to take remedial action or impose a combination of both.

Conditions of practice will be most appropriate where a failure or deficiency is capable of being remedied and where the Panel is satisfied that allowing the registrant to remain in practice, albeit subject to conditions, poses no risk of harm or future harm. Panels need to recognise that, beyond the specific restrictions imposed by a Conditions of Practice Sanction, the registrant concerned is being permitted to remain in practice. Consequently, the Panel's decision will be regarded as confirmation that the registrant is capable of practising safely and effectively.

Conditions of Practice Sanctions should be remedial or rehabilitative in nature. Before imposing conditions, a Panel should be satisfied that there is no general failure and that the matter is capable of correction, is appropriate, realistic and that verifiable conditions can be formulated. Whatever the conditions imposed, another Panel must be able to consider and determine whether the conditions have or are being met.

Conditions of practice provide a very flexible means of managing cases. A combination of conditions may be imposed, including formal education and training requirements. Equally, in some cases it will be appropriate to impose a single condition for a relatively short period of time to address a specific concern (e.g. to undertake specific remedial training). In imposing conditions of practice, Panels must recognise that, to a large extent, the registrant will be trusted to comply with them. Consequently, before doing so, Panels need to be confident that the registrant will adhere to those conditions of practice.

The imposition of conditions requires a commitment on the part of the registrant to resolve matters and therefore conditions of practice are unlikely to be suitable in situations where problems cannot be overcome, such as serious overall failings, lack of insight, denial or matters involving dishonesty or the abuse of service users.

Above all, conditions must be realistic and there is a limit to how far they may extend. For example, a combination of conditions which require a registrant not to provide in certain ways e.g. out of hours working, never present on premises on their own or provision in only one setting may, in reality, amount to a suspension and thus be far too wide. Equally, care must be taken to ensure that the combined effect of the conditions imposed does not amount to a requirement only to perform the role of an unregistered counsellor.

Careful consideration needs to be given to whether conditions of practice are an appropriate remedy if they are being used as a means of controlling the setting in which a registrant operates.

As noted above, before deciding to impose conditions of practice, Panels need to reflect on the fact that, whilst conditions can be drafted so that they are verifiable, including providing mechanisms for verifying compliance, to a large extent the registrant will be trusted to adhere to those conditions. Where the allegation before the Panel is based upon actions which constitute dishonesty, abuse or a breach of trust, conditions of practice are unlikely to be appropriate. However, if a Panel is considering imposing conditions in such a case, the Panel will need to consider carefully whether it is likely that the registrant can be trusted not to breach any conditions of practice which may be imposed.

Panels may specify a minimum period (of up to two years) for which a conditions of practice sanction is to have effect before the registrant may apply to vary, replace or revoke it. In general, Panels should only exercise that power in cases where either it is clear from the evidence that earlier review is unlikely to be of value or where the nature of the conditions imposed make early review inappropriate.

5.9. Suspension Sanction

A suspension sanction must be for a specified period not exceeding one year. Suspension completely prohibits a registrant from practicing their profession.

Suspension should be considered where the Panel considers that a caution or conditions of practice are insufficient or inappropriate to protect the public or where the allegation is of a serious nature but there is a realistic prospect that repetition will not occur and, thus, that striking off is not merited.

A registrant who is suspended cannot practice (and the register is marked accordingly). However, the registrant may be subject to further fitness to practice proceedings for events which occur whilst he or she is suspended.

If the evidence suggests that the registrant will be unable to resolve or remedy his or her failings, then removal from the register and membership may be the more appropriate option. However, where the registrant has no psychological or other difficulties preventing him, or her, from understanding and seeking to remedy the failing(s) then suspension may be appropriate.

Panels need to be aware that suspension is punitive in effect and that a short-term suspension may have long term consequences for the registrant, including being dismissed from his or her current employment. However, short term suspension may be appropriate where any lesser sanction would be unlikely to provide adequate public protection, undermine public confidence or be unlikely to have a suitable deterrent effect upon the registrant in question and the profession at large.

Short term suspension may also be appropriate where a registrant's current status means that he or she would be unable to respond to and comply with conditions of practice but where there is a realistic prospect that, if the registrant can resolve those difficulties whilst suspended, conditions of practice could then be imposed. In appropriate cases, this enables Panels to facilitate a staged return to practice for the registrant concerned.

This approach is likely to be most appropriate in cases involving, for example, substance dependency where, at the time of the case, the registrant is seeking or undergoing treatment but has not reached the stage where he or she could safely return to practice even subject to conditions. If a short-term suspension is imposed for this sort of purpose, the Panel should give clear reasons for their decision, so that the registrant clearly understands what is expected of them.

Suspension sanctions cannot be made subject to conditions. However, where the Panel expects the registrant to address specific issues or take specific action before the suspension sanction is reviewed –for example, to undergo substance abuse treatment, clear guidance should be given to the registrant so that, when the sanction comes to be reviewed, he or she understands what is expected of them and the evidence that may need to be submitted to the reviewing Panel. However, in imposing suspension sanctions, Panels should avoid being unduly prescriptive and must not seek to bind, or fetter the discretion of, a future reviewing Panel.

Panels may specify a minimum period (of up to 10 months) for which a suspension sanction is to have effect before the registrant may apply to vary, replace or revoke it. In general, Panels should only exercise that power in cases where it is clear from the evidence that earlier review is unlikely to be of value.

5.10 Removal from Register

Removal from Register removes a registrant's name from the Register and, on a permanent basis, prohibits the registrant from practicing their profession. It will be accompanied by removal from membership.

Such removal as a sanction may not be made in respect of an allegation relating to competence or health unless the registrant has been continuously suspended, or subject to a conditions of practice sanction, for a period of two years at the date of the decision to remove.

Removal is a sanction of last resort for serious, deliberate or reckless acts involving abuse of trust such as sexual abuse, dishonesty or persistent failure.

Removal should be used where there is no other way to protect the public, for example, where there is a lack of insight, continuing problems or denial. An inability or unwillingness to resolve matters will suggest that a lower sanction may not be appropriate.

Removal may also be appropriate where the nature and gravity of the allegation are such that any lesser sanction would lack deterrent effect or undermine confidence in the profession concerned or the regulatory process. Where removal is used to address these wider public protection issues, Panels should provide clear reasons for doing so. Those reasons must explain why removal is appropriate and not merely repeat that it is being done to deter others or maintain public confidence.

Unless new evidence comes to light, a person may not apply for restoration to the register within five years of the date of removal being made and Panels do not have the power to vary that restriction. Any future application would have to be accompanied by evidence that the original reasons for removal are dealt with and no longer an issue regarding public safety.

5.11 Interim Sanctions to give effect to decisions

If a Panel disposes of a case by removal from the Register, suspension or conditions of practice sanction, the Panel has the discretionary power to

impose an interim suspension or conditions of practice sanction which will apply during the time allowed for appealing against the final outcome or, if such an appeal is made, whilst that appeal is in progress.

It is important to recognise that the power is discretionary and, consequently, Panels should not regard the imposition of an interim sanction as an automatic outcome of fitness to practice proceedings.

If the Panel is considering imposing an interim sanction, before doing so it must give the parties a specific opportunity to address it on the issue of whether or not such a sanction should be made.

Whether an interim sanction is necessary will depend upon the circumstances in each case, but Panels should consider imposing such a sanction in cases where

- there is a serious and ongoing risk to service users or the public from the registrant's lack of professional knowledge or skills; conduct or health problems
or
- the allegation is so serious that public confidence in the profession or the regulatory process would be seriously harmed if the registrant was allowed to remain in practice on an unrestricted basis.

5.12. Multiple sanctions

There is an escalating range of sanctions and Panels may impose only one sanction at any one time. Similarly, when reviewing sanctions, a Panel may vary, extend, replace or revoke an existing sanction but cannot impose a second additional sanction. Consequently, it will be rare for a registrant to be subject to more than one sanction at the same time. However, if that situation does arise, Panels need to ensure that there is no doubt as to the duration and effect of each sanction.

A registrant is only likely to be subject to multiple sanctions where a sanction has been imposed in respect of one allegation and the registrant is then the subject of separate proceedings in respect of another allegation. Even then the circumstances in which multiple sanctions would be appropriate are limited.

If the second allegation involves a repetition of prior conduct, is broadly similar in nature to the previous allegation or involves breach of the existing sanction, then escalation to a higher sanction is likely to be the more

appropriate course of action. In addition, some sanctions will simply 'trump' others.

For example, the imposition of a suspension sanction will have the effect of ending a conditions of practice sanction.

In practice, multiple sanctions are only likely to arise where a sanction has been imposed in respect of one allegation and a second needs to be imposed in respect of an entirely separate and unconnected allegation.

For example, if an allegation based upon misconduct is made against a registrant who is already subject to a competence related conditions of practice sanction, then provided that the misconduct is unconnected, does not amount to breach of the existing sanction or raises wider concerns about overall fitness to practice, it might be appropriate to impose a separate caution sanction in respect of that misconduct. In that event, the Panel should be very clear as to the effect (if any) of this sanction on the existing sanction.

In the example given, the Panel would be expected to make clear that the sanction it had made had no effect on the terms and duration of the conditions of practice sanction to which the registrant is already subject.

6. Timescales of publication of sanctions

- 6.1 Mediation - no publication if accepted and resolved. Practice may be continued if appropriate while this process is carried out.
- 6.2 Caution - From 1 to 5 years depending on the circumstances but decided by the Panel. Benchmark is 3 years as a guide. Practice may be continued if appropriate.
- 6.3 Conditions of Practice - 1 to 3 years (maximum) but a guide of 2 years can be made before a counsellor may request variance, replacement or revocation. Practice may be continued under the conditions placed upon the counsellor.
- 6.4 Suspension Sanction - not exceeding one year. While in place the counsellor cannot practice. A registrant who is suspended cannot practice (and the register is marked accordingly).
- 6.5 Removal from Register - When used it will mean withdrawal of membership. The counsellor can no longer practice. Only if new evidence comes to light

can the counsellor apply for restoration within 5 years. The register will publish this fact of Removal for the whole period unless this happens.

- 6.6 Interim Sanctions - This is a discretionary power of Disciplinary Panels and publication will clearly state terms of length and whether a counsellor can continue to practice. This will happen after consultation with the parties concerned before it is finalised e.g. if an appeal is being lodged.
- 6.7 Multiple Sanctions - as only one sanction can be normally used at the same time and is likely only to be used in rare circumstances. Publication timescale to be determined by the panel.

Document History

1.0	First Published	May 2017
1.1	Amendments to bring guidelines up to date	October 2022