

INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE  
of the  
SASKATCHEWAN REGISTERED NURSES' ASSOCIATION

- and -

Laura A Watson  
Saskatchewan RN # 0033981  
PRINCE ALBERT, SASKATCHEWAN

---

DECISION  
of the  
DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE  
of the  
SASKATCHEWAN REGISTERED NURSES' ASSOCIATION

---

Appearance for the Investigation Committee:	Mr. Roger Lepage
Appearance for Laura A. Watson:	Mr. Jay Watson
Appearance for the Discipline Committee:	Ms. Darcia Schirr, Q.C.
Chairperson for the Discipline Committee:	Mr. Christopher Etcheverry, R.N.

Date of Hearing: August 11, 2014  
Ramada Plaza Regina  
1818 Victoria Avenue  
Regina, Saskatchewan

Date of Decision: September 22, 2014

## INTRODUCTION

The Discipline Committee of the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association (SRNA) convened to hear and determine complaints of professional misconduct against Registered Nurse # 0033981, Laura A. Watson on August 11, 2014.

The charges against Ms. Watson arise from a report received by the SRNA on June 26, 2013 from Pine Grove Correctional Centre, Ms. Watson's employer at that time.

A subsequent investigation by the Investigation Committee resulted in a referral to the Discipline Committee. The Discipline Committee is constituted under section 30 of *The Registered Nurses Act, 1988* (the "Act").

The allegations against Ms. Watson are outlined in a Notice of Hearing dated January 22, 2014, which sets out five charges of professional misconduct contrary to section 26(1) and 26(2)(c) and (l) of the *Act*, along with breaches of numerous provisions of the *Standards and Foundation Competencies for the Practice of Registered Nurses, 2007* and the Canadian Nurses Association (CNA), *Code of Ethics for Registered Nurses, 2008*.

The five charges as outlined in the Notice of Hearing are as follows:

### Charge Number 1

**You, Laura A Watson, are alleged to be guilty of professional misconduct regarding fraudulent access of your laboratory results in 2011 while working in your position at the Pine Grove Correctional Centre, using another RN colleague's name and without authorization. The telephone call to the Provincial Laboratory was witnessed by another colleague.**

### Charge Number 2

**You, Laura A Watson, are alleged to be guilty of professional misconduct and failed in your ethical responsibilities to conduct yourself in a professional and respectful manner with other members of the health care team and in particular with former manager**

**Cathy Suchorab, RPN regarding comments made on Facebook to another RN colleague stating that you were going to charge Ms. Suchorab with harassment. Further, in the incident on February 14, 2013 whilst you were orienting a new RN employee, you informed the new employee that Pine Grove Correctional Centre was not a safe place to work, that management was not good and that Cathy Suchorab, RPN was the worst boss and would give the present employee no consideration because she does not have a child. This constitutes a breach of your ethical responsibilities to recognize formal leadership positions, to work with members of the health care team in a positive and constructive manner, and to resolve differences in a constructive manner.**

### **Charge Number 3**

**You, Laura A Watson, are alleged to be guilty of professional misconduct for breaching your employer's policies, procedures and protocols regarding cell phone and internet usage for personal reasons. These behaviours have been witnessed by multiple co-workers during the course of employment hours and have had a negative impact upon your capacity to perform the duties of a registered nurse, and work collaboratively within the health care team.**

### **Charge Number 4**

**You, Laura A Watson, are alleged to be guilty of professional misconduct for a lack of collaboration and functioning as a team member within the health care team, failing to accept responsibility for professional accountabilities as a registered nurse in the work environment, not meeting the request for patient care needs including shredding medical request slips, and not supporting a positive work environment that resulted in co-workers not wanting to work with you because of bullying and threatening to lay harassment charges when conduct issues were raised by the employer.**

### **Charge Number 5**

**You, Laura A Watson, are alleged to be guilty of professional misconduct for breaching the December 12, 2011 Penalty Order of the Discipline Committee of the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association, as follows:**

a) Violation of section 3 which states: “The performance reviews may be submitted in the format regularly used by the employer. Unfavourable performance reviews or any further complaints received regarding the member shall be reported to the Investigation Committee for further investigation and action.”

The member was the subject of an SRNA investigation following receipt by the SRNA of an unfavourable performance review from the employer at the conclusion of 1500 hours of registered nursing practice. The investigation supported continued professional misconduct.

b) Violation of section 12.1 which states: “For the duration of this order, Laura Watson shall forthwith report in writing to the Registrar any change in nursing employment including any leave of absence longer than one month.”

The member failed to notify the Registrar of the SRNA that she had been placed on an administrative leave of absence for investigation by the employer for greater than one month;

c) Section 10 provides as follows: “Any breach of the terms of this order, may be referred back to the Investigation Committee for investigation and referral to the Discipline Committee for a hearing regarding professional conduct.”

Sections 26(1) and 26(2)(c) and (l) of the *Act* are as follows:

**26(1) For the purpose of this Act, professional misconduct is a question of fact but any matter, conduct or thing, whether or not disgraceful or dishonourable, that is contrary to the best interests of the public or nurses or tends to harm the standing of the profession of nursing is professional misconduct within the meaning of this Act.**

**(2) Without restricting the generality of subsection (1), the discipline committee may find a nurse guilty of professional misconduct if the nurse has:**

**(c) inappropriately used the nurse’s professional status for personal gain**

**(l) failed to comply with the code of ethics of the association**

The relevant provisions of the *Code of Ethics* (Canadian Nurses Association, 2008) are as follows:

**Ethical responsibilities:**

**A.1** Nurses have a responsibility to conduct themselves according to the ethical responsibilities outlined in this document and in practice standards in what they do and how they interact with persons receiving care as well as with families, communities, groups, populations and other members of the health-care team.

**A.2** Nurses engage in compassionate care through their speech and body language and through their efforts to understand and care about others' health-care needs.

**A.3** Nurses build trustworthy relationships as the foundation of meaningful communication, recognizing that building these relationships involves a conscious effort. Such relationships are critical to understanding people's needs and concerns.

**B.1** Nurses provide care directed first and foremost toward the health and well-being of the person, family or community in their care.

**B.3** Nurses collaborate with other health-care providers and other interested parties to maximize health benefits to persons receiving care and those with health-care needs, recognizing and respecting the knowledge, skills and perspectives of all.

**D.1** Nurses, in their professional capacity, relate to all persons with respect.

**D.10** Nurses treat each other, colleagues, students and other health-care workers in a respectful manner, recognizing the power differentials among those in formal leadership positions, staff and students. They work with others to resolve differences in a constructive way.

**E.8** Nurses do not abuse their access to information by accessing health-care records, including their own, a family member's or any other person's, for purposes inconsistent with their professional obligations.

**F.2** Nurses refrain from judging, labelling, demeaning, stigmatizing and humiliating behaviours toward persons receiving care, other health-care professionals and each other.

**F.3** Nurses do not engage in any form of lying, punishment or torture or any form of unusual treatment or action that is inhumane

or degrading. They refuse to be complicit in such behaviours. They intervene, and they report such behaviours.

**G.1 Nurses, as members of a self-regulating profession, practise according to the values and responsibilities in the *Code of Ethics for Registered Nurses* and in keeping with the professional standards, laws and regulations supporting ethical practice.**

**G.2 Nurses are honest and practise with integrity in all of their professional interactions.**

**G.9 Nurses share their knowledge and provide feedback, mentorship and guidance for the professional development of nursing students, novice nurses and other health-care team members.**

The relevant provisions of the *Standards and Foundation Competencies for the Practice of Registered Nurses, 2007* are as follows:

#### **STANDARD 1 – PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

**The registered nurse:**

- 1. Is accountable and accepts responsibility for his/her own actions and decisions.**
- 2. Articulates and enacts the role and responsibilities of a registered nurse as a member of the health care team.**
- 5. Demonstrates professional presence.**
- 7. Displays initiative, confidence, self-awareness, and encourages collaborative interactions within the nursing and health care team, with the client as the centre of the health team.**
- 9. Demonstrates effective collaborative problem solving strategies, including conflict resolution.**
- 15. Consistently intervenes in the client's best interest.**
- 23. Exercises professional judgment when using agency policies and procedures, or when practising in the absence of agency policies and procedures.**
- 27. Demonstrates professional leadership by:**
  - a. building relationships and trust**
  - b. creating an empowering environment**

### **STANDARD III – ETHICAL PRACTICE**

**The registered nurse:**

- 66. Practices in accordance with the values of the current CNA code of ethics for registered nurses and the accompanying responsibility statements, as amended from time to time.**
- 68. Establishes and maintains professional relationships and boundaries with clients and other team members.**
- 71. Promotes a safe environment that addresses the unique needs of clients within the context of care and uses a culturally safe approach to nursing care.**
- 78. Uses a principled ethically reasoned decision-making process to address situations of ethical distress and dilemmas.**

### **STANDARD IV – SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC**

- 84. Collaborates with all members of the health care team to facilitate:**
  - c. maintenance of professional boundaries and accountabilities**
- 85. Participates and contributes to nursing and health care team development by:**
  - a. building partnerships with health team members, recognizing and respecting the unique and shared competencies of each member**
  - b. recognizing that values, assumptions and positional power affects team interactions**

### **STANDARD V – SELF-REGULATION**

- 97. Develops support networks and mentor roles with registered nurse colleagues, other care team members and community based resources.**

## HEARING

This hearing proceeded on the basis of an Agreed Statement of Facts. A binder was filed with the Discipline Committee and marked as Exhibit P-1. It consisted of 32 tabs with the key tabs being the following:

- Tab 1 Notice of Hearing with proof of service;
- Tab 3 Decision of the Discipline Committee dated February 13, 2012 involving Laura Watson;
- Tab 31 Joint Submission Regarding Penalty Order;
- Tab 32 Agreed Statement of Facts.

Laura Watson and her counsel appeared at the hearing by telephone.

The Agreed Statement of Facts consisted of three paragraphs and the first paragraph was Ms. Watson's entry of guilty pleas to all five charges in the Notice of Hearing. Given the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Discipline Committee did not hear from any witnesses. Counsel for the Investigation Committee and Ms. Watson made a joint submission regarding penalty. The joint submission will be dealt with later in this decision.

This is the second time Ms. Watson has appeared before the Discipline Committee of the SRNA. There is a connection between the earlier Discipline Committee Order and these proceedings and it is necessary to set out that background.

On December 12, 2011, Ms. Watson appeared before the Discipline Committee and entered guilty pleas to two charges of professional misconduct contrary to sections 26(1) and 26(2)(q) of the *Act*. That hearing also proceeded on the basis of an Agreed Statement of Facts and Ms. Watson entered guilty pleas to both charges. At the time of those proceedings, the charges related to Ms. Watson's employment through the period of April 1, 2009 to May, 2010 at the Prince Albert Penitentiary. In its decision dated February 13, 2012, the Discipline Committee concisely summarized the charges, the particulars to the charges and the evidence. At page 10 of the decision:



**The particulars supplemented by the evidence shows a consistent pattern of insubordination on Ms. Watson's part and a lack of respect for the skills and judgment of her colleagues.**

In that case, like this case, the Discipline Committee was presented with a joint submission, which was accepted by the Discipline Committee. One aspect of the Penalty Order was that Ms. Watson provide performance reviews at intervals of actual worked hours of registered nursing practice. The intervals were 500 hours, 1,000 hours, 1,500 hours and 2,000 hours.

At page 13 of the previous Discipline Committee decision, it deals with performance reviews and this provision is relevant:

**Unfavorable performance reviews or any further complaints received regarding the member shall be reported to the Investigation Committee for further investigation and action.**

In accordance with that provision, the Registrar received performance reviews from Pine Grove Correctional Centre. The 1,500 hour performance review was received by the Registrar by e-mail on June 26, 2013. The performance review is at Tab 8 of P-1 and it is based on hours worked of 1,722.08. The performance review is not positive. It refers to Ms. Watson bullying junior staff, threatening harassment complaints about her supervisor and an ongoing problem with personal phone calls and internet usage despite a previous coaching session.

Given paragraph 13 of the previous Discipline Committee decision, this negative performance review led to an investigation by the Investigation Committee. The Investigation Committee interviewed numerous witnesses and the end result was the five charges set out in the Notice of Hearing.

In the course of its investigation, the Investigation Committee learned that Pine Grove Correctional Centre placed Ms. Watson on administrative leave with pay as of May 3, 2013, pending the outcome of an investigation regarding an allegation that she had used another nurse's name to obtain her personal lab results from the Provincial Lab. Ms. Watson remained

on administrative leave with pay until October 17, 2013, when she was suspended without pay for ten days. This incident is the subject of Charge 2 of the Notice of Hearing.

Based on the Book of Exhibits, these are the relevant facts regarding the five charges:

**Charge Number 1:**

Ms. Watson contacted the Provincial Lab to obtain her personal lab results regarding her Pap test. She used the name of her co-worker, Peggy Bohmann, to do that. It appears Ms. Watson took those steps because she was concerned about the lab results and she could not wait to hear from her doctor as the doctor was out of town. Ms. Bohmann most certainly did not agree to Ms. Watson's actions. Ms. Watson made the call to the Provincial Lab from the workplace and she did that in the presence of another worker, Carin Van Walsem. Upon hearing the call, Ms. Van Walsem asked Ms. Watson about this and Ms. Watson apparently just shrugged her shoulders and provided no explanation (Tab 15).

The documentation did not reveal when this occurred other than in 2011. It appears Ms. Watson was not disciplined by her employer for these actions until 2013 and that delay is reflected in the sanction imposed by the employer which was the ten day suspension without pay (Tab 10).

**Charge Number 2:**

Based on the wording of the charge, there are a number of aspects to this. The evidence shows that Ms. Watson made critical comments about her supervisor, Kathy Suchorab. She made critical comments about Ms. Suchorab to her nursing colleagues either in direct conversation and/or on her Facebook page (Tab 7). Further, it appears Ms. Watson often spoke about pursuing harassment complaints against Ms. Suchorab. It was not clear from the evidence whether she actually pursued those threats.

On February 14, 2013, Ms. Watson was orienting a new employee named Marivic Ramos. Ms. Ramos advised Ms. Watson that she was three months pregnant and that her pregnancy was high

risk because she was diabetic. Ms. Ramos also shared that she had not yet provided that information to her manager Ms. Suchorab. According to Ms. Ramos, Ms. Watson stated that Pine Grove Correctional Centre was not a safe place for her to be, given her pregnancy. Ms. Watson went on to describe a past incident where she was assaulted and another nurse had been assaulted while that nurse was pregnant. Ms. Watson also advised Ms. Ramos that she should not expect any accommodation from the supervisor Ms. Suchorab as Ms. Suchorab did not have a child. Ms. Watson encouraged Ms. Ramos not to return to the workplace. Ms. Watson's comments apparently frightened Ms. Ramos such that she did not return to work the next day and she only returned after an encouraging phone call from Ms. Suchorab (Tab 19 and Tab 25).

### **Charge Number 3:**

Exhibit P-1 includes a number of can-say statements and communication records setting out interviews with Ms. Watson's co-workers at Pine Grove Correctional Centre. A constant theme through most if not all of those records and statements is the concern about Ms. Watson's excessive use of the internet and her cell phone for personal, non-work related business. One co-worker Pat Marshall a registered psychiatric nurse, suggested that Ms. Watson was involved in internet use on personal matters at least 50% of the time she was at work (Tab 16). Similar statements are made by Norma Sheldon (Tab 17).

The evidence included policies from the Saskatchewan Public Service Commission and Pine Grove Correctional Centre on internet use (Tab 29). Pine Grove Correctional Centre has a specific provision on cell phone use and the policy statement provided that personal cell phones were not allowed within the centre and must be stored in a locked box. It was not explained how Ms. Watson managed to circumvent these policies.

### **Charge Number 4:**

The core allegation is that Ms. Watson shredded medical request slips submitted by inmates.

At Pine Grove Correctional Centre, inmates complete a medical request slip describing their medical concern. This is submitted to the nursing unit office and the nurses are expected to assess the request slips and act on them. A sample request slip is provided at Tab 30 of Exhibit P-1. Based on the documentation, it appears Ms. Watson frequently shredded the request slips before they were ever acted on by nursing staff. She did this a number of times in the presence of co-workers including a nursing student, Tara Lynn Furber. According to Ms. Furber, she saw Ms. Watson do this at least two to three times per week (Tab 20 and Tab 28). When asked about this, it appears Ms. Watson's explanation to other staff varied as she would indicate that the particular inmate was difficult, the request was not important or the staff should not "baby" the inmates. A number of inmates complained to staff, questioning why their requests had not been acted on. The explanation for that was that Ms. Watson had destroyed the request slips.

#### **Charge Number Five 5:**

This relates to the previous Discipline Committee Order of February 13, 2012 and the unfavorable performance review at Tab 8.

The Discipline Committee draws attention to the incorrect date as referred to in Charge #5 of the Notice of Hearing. The date of the hearing was December 12, 2011, however, the date of the Discipline Committee Order was February 13, 2012, and therefore, the charge should have reflected the correct date.

#### **ANALYSIS**

As indicated, Laura Watson has offered guilty pleas to the five charges. The Discipline Committee accepts the guilty pleas to the charges of professional misconduct. The can-say statements and communication records in Exhibit P-1 bear out each charge and the Discipline Committee is well satisfied that that evidence proves each charge on the required standard of proof.

Based on the previous decision of the Discipline Committee, the Discipline Committee understands that Laura Watson began working at Pine Grove Correctional Centre on a part time basis in 2004. In January 2011 she took a full time position at Pine Grove Correctional Centre. The Discipline Committee was advised by counsel for the Investigation Committee that on May 30, 2014, Ms. Watson was allowed to resign from her employment at Pine Grove Correctional Centre.

Ms. Watson is not currently employed as a nurse. Her counsel suggested that given her age of fifty one (51) years and her SRNA discipline record, it will likely be difficult for Ms. Watson to secure a nursing position.

The previous discipline proceedings related to Ms. Watson's employment at the Prince Albert Penitentiary. The Discipline Committee is deeply troubled by the fact that it appears that the same conduct Ms. Watson presented through her employment at the Prince Albert Penitentiary continued at Pine Grove Correctional Centre. Personal conflicts and criticism of management is a persistent theme in this case as it was in the first proceeding.

As no evidence was heard, it is difficult for the Discipline Committee to understand what underlies Ms. Watson's conduct and her apparent attitude of superiority. She made unilateral decisions to decide which inmates were worthy of medical attention. Despite clear employer policies to the contrary, Ms. Watson excessively used her cell phone and internet for personal non-work related business. Not only did Ms. Watson violate employer policies, her excessive use of her cell phone and the internet understandably frustrated her colleagues, who were left to shoulder Ms. Watson's work responsibilities while she looked at vacation websites or dealt with her family. Counsel for the Investigation Committee advised that there were only two telephone lines into the nursing unit. Ms. Watson's personal phone usage frequently tied up one telephone line.

In and of itself, Ms. Watson's conduct in obtaining her personal lab results by using another registered nurse's name demonstrates professional misconduct and it is conduct worthy of

sanction. Her apparent lack of insight as to the impropriety of her actions when she simply shrugged her shoulders is even more troubling to the Discipline Committee.

Laura Watson is a senior registered nurse. Based on Tab 2 of Exhibit P-1, it appears Ms. Watson first registered with the SRNA in 1994. Many of the actions that she demonstrated that were the subject of these charges were witnessed by a nursing student at Pine Grove Correctional Centre. The nursing student's can-say statement is at Tab 28. A registered nurse of Ms. Watson's seniority should be providing mentorship, guidance and setting a positive example for a nursing student. Ms. Watson's actions are the complete opposite of mentorship and positive role modeling.

### **PENALTY ORDER**

Counsel for the Investigation Committee and Ms. Watson presented a draft Order which is at Tab 31 of P-1. Broadly, it provides for a six month suspension and upon expiry of the six month suspension, Ms. Watson's continued practice would be subject to conditions including a period of indirect supervision, the obligation to file at least four performance reviews, a requirement to review the *CNA Code of Ethics for Registered Nurses* and the *SRNA Standards and Foundation Competencies for the Practice of Registered Nurses*, the completion of the CNA on-line Code of Ethics course and the completion of a customized course from SIAST focusing on the topics that are of concern in this case, including professionalism and interpersonal skills. Finally, the draft penalty order provides for payment of costs in the amount of \$12,000.00 and publication provisions. Counsel for the Investigation Committee characterized the joint submission as progressive discipline given Ms. Watson's previous discipline record.

The penalty order was presented as a joint submission. The Discipline Committee is aware of the principles of joint submissions established by case law including the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal decision of *Rault v Law Society of Saskatchewan* (2009 SKCA 81). The Discipline Committee finds the joint submission reasonable, consistent with the principles of sentencing orders in discipline cases and particularly consistent with the SRNA's public interest mandate.

In a written Brief, counsel for the Investigation Committee set out a list of factors the Discipline Committee should consider in crafting a penalty order. Those factors come from a case called *Jaswal v. Medical Board* (Nfld.) (1992) 42 Admin. L.R. (2d) 233.

From those factors, the Discipline Committee sees these to be particularly relevant in this case:

1. The previous character of the member and in particular, the presence or absence of any prior complaints or convictions.
2. Presence or absence of any mitigating circumstances.
3. The need to promote specific and general deterrence and thereby, to protect the public and ensure the safe and proper practice of nursing.
4. The need to maintain the public's confidence and the integrity of the nursing profession.

Less than three years ago, Ms. Watson appeared before the Discipline Committee for similar professional misconduct. At that time, the Discipline Committee accepted a penalty order that included attendance at certain workshops and education. The basis of those kinds of provisions would primarily be specific deterrence. Whether Ms. Watson learned anything from the courses the Discipline Committee ordered her to attend is questionable given the fact that she now appears before the Discipline Committee again with similar issues. Further, when given the opportunity to outline the nature of the courses she took and what she learned from them, Ms. Watson unfortunately provided a non-responsive answer to the Discipline Committee.

It would appear the only mitigating factor in this case is the fact that Ms. Watson entered guilty pleas and matters proceeded without the need of a contested hearing.

The Discipline Committee appreciates that a six month suspension is a significant consequence. It is expected that the time provided by a suspension, along with the reading requirements and

courses proposed in the joint submission will be used by Ms. Watson in a positive way to alter her conduct such that this is the last time she appears before the Discipline Committee of the SRNA.

The Discipline Committee therefore makes the following orders pursuant to Section 31 of the *Act*:

1. Pursuant to section 31(1)(b) of the *Act*, Laura Watson shall be suspended for six (6) months from the SRNA commencing the date of this order.
2. Upon expiry of the six (6) month suspension and pursuant to section 31(c) of the *Act*, Laura Watson shall be allowed to practise only under the following conditions:
  - (a) Upon return to the practise of registered nursing and for the next 2,000 hours of registered nursing practice, Laura Watson shall not practise registered nursing except under the indirect supervision of another registered nurse (“RN”) or a registered psychiatric nurse (“RPN”). The supervising RN or RPN shall be selected by the employer. The supervising RN or RPN may be in the singular or plural as the Registrar approves.
  - (b) “Indirect supervision” means the supervising RN or RPN need not be physically present but must monitor Laura Watson’s nursing activities by having her report regularly or by periodically observing her registered nursing activities. The supervising RN or RPN shall be selected by the employer and shall be approved by the Registrar of the SRNA. The indirect supervising RN or RPN may be in the singular or plural as the Registrar of the SRNA approves.
  - (c) Laura Watson shall be responsible to file with the Registrar of the SRNA a letter signed by herself, the supervising RN or RPN, and the employer, confirming compliance with and satisfactory completion of the 2,000 hours of indirect supervision.



3. Laura Watson shall provide at least four written performance reviews completed by the supervising RN or RPN and her employer, with a particular focus on her ability to demonstrate the following:
  - (a) The ethical obligation to conduct herself in a professional and respectful manner with other members of the health care team.
  - (b) The ethical obligation to collaborate with other health care providers and to recognize and respect the knowledge and skills of other members of the health care team.
  - (c) The ethical obligation to recognize the formal leadership positions and to work with members of the health care team to resolve differences in a constructive way.
  - (d) The ethical obligation to refrain from judging, labelling, demeaning and humiliating behaviors toward other health care professionals.
  - (e) The ethical obligation to provide orientation, to share knowledge and to provide guidance for the professional development of other health care team members.
  - (f) The ethical obligation to not use her nurse's professional status for personal gains.
  - (g) The ethical obligation to respect the employer's policies with respect to the use of communication devices, i.e., telephone, internet, for personal reasons while at work.
  - (h) The ethical obligation to collaborate and function as a team member within the health care team and to carry out her fair share of the workload.
  
4. The performance reviews may be submitted in the format regularly used by the nursing employer or in a format directed by the SRNA. Unfavorable performance reviews or any further complaints received regarding Laura Watson shall be reported to the Investigation Committee for further investigation and action. The performance reviews may be submitted at any time but must at least be provided as follows:
  - (a) After having completed 500 actual worked hours of registered nursing practice.

- (b) After having completed 1,000 actual worked hours of registered nursing practice.
  - (c) After having completed 1,500 actual worked hours of registered nursing practice.
  - (d) After having completed 2,000 actual worked hours of registered nursing practice.
5. Laura Watson shall review the *Code of Ethics for Registered Nurses* (2008 or current CNA publication) and upon completion, provide a self-reflective essay to the Registrar of the SRNA with an emphasis on the standards, competencies and ethical responsibilities outlined in the Notice of Hearing, explaining how this document will guide the member's future nursing practice.
- (a) This self-reflective essay shall be submitted within three (3) months of the date Laura Watson begins employment as an RN.
6. Laura Watson shall review the *SRNA Standards and Foundation Competencies for the Practice of Registered Nurses*, (2013 or current SRNA publication) and upon completion, provide a self-reflective essay to the Registrar of the SRNA with an emphasis on the standards, competencies and ethical responsibilities outlined in the Notice of Hearing, explaining how this document will guide the member's future practice of nursing.
- (a) This self-reflective essay shall be submitted within three (3) months of the date Laura Watson begins employment as an RN.
7. Laura Watson shall satisfactorily complete the Canadian Nurses Association, *Code of Ethics* online learning modules and provide, as proof of completion, the Certificates of Completion to the Registrar of the SRNA.
- (a) Proof of completion shall be submitted within four (4) months of the date Laura Watson begins employment as a RN.

8. Laura Watson shall attend and satisfactorily complete a customized theory course from SIAST (distance learning is acceptable) focusing on the following topics: professionalism, code of ethics, communication, interpersonal skills and collaboration.
  - (a) The customized theory course from SIAST must be completed within five (5) months of the date Laura Watson begins employment as an RN.
  - (b) Laura Watson shall be solely responsible for the costs of the course.
9. In the event Laura Watson fails to complete the terms of this order within the timelines provided, she shall be suspended from the SRNA until such time as she has completed the terms.
10. Any breach of the terms of this Order may be referred back to the Investigation Committee for investigation and referral to the Discipline Committee for a hearing regarding professional misconduct.
11. All communication and required filing of documents shall be directed to: Registrar, SRNA, 2066 Retallack Street, Regina, Saskatchewan, S4T 7X5.
12. For so long as a term of this order remains outstanding, Laura Watson shall report in writing to the Registrar on a monthly basis advising of her progress in meeting each term of the Order.
13. For the duration of this Order, the member shall forthwith report in writing to the Registrar any change in nursing employment including any leave of absence longer than one month.
14. Pursuant to section 31(2)(a)(ii), Laura Watson shall pay the costs of the investigation and hearing which costs shall be fixed in the amount of \$12,000.00. Those costs shall be paid in monthly installments of \$250.00 for the first six (6) months, with the first payment to

be made on December 1, 2014. As of June 1, 2015, Laura Watson shall pay \$500.00 per month until the costs are fully paid.

15. In the event Laura Watson fails to make payment of the costs, she shall be suspended from the SRNA until the outstanding costs are paid.
16. Pursuant to section 31(3) of the *Act*, a copy of this Order shall be sent to Pine Grove Correctional Centre. In addition and consistent with SRNA Council policy and bylaws, notification of this Order shall be given to the following;
  - (a) All registrars of registered nurses in Canada;
  - (b) The editor of Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association News Bulletin;
  - (c) Other jurisdictions where she may have practiced;
  - (d) Any other jurisdiction in which the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association considers appropriate to be notified of this decision;
  - (e) The Webmaster of the SRNA so that this decision shall be posted on the SRNA website.
17. For as long on this Order remains in effect, Laura Watson shall forthwith disclose the Order to prospective and existing health care employers.
18. Laura Watson shall forthwith submit her existing RN license to the SRNA, who shall enter upon the license the existence of this Order.
19. Once all terms of this Order have been complied with, the Registrar shall so advise Laura Watson in writing.

Date: September 22, 2014.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Chris Etcheverry". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

---

Christopher Etcheverry, RN, Chairperson  
*and on behalf of the Members of the  
Discipline Committee*

Brenda Bumphrey, RN

Janna Willis, RN

Ruth Black, RN

Frances Passmore, Public Representative