

**IN THE MATTER OF THE LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSES ACT, 2000
AND BYLAWS AND IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT AGAINST
MELISSA LEUNG OF SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN**

DECISION OF:

**SASKATCHEWAN ASSOCIATION OF LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSES
DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE**

INTRODUCTION:

The hearing by the Discipline Committee into the complaint against Melissa Leung was convened at the Quality Inn in Regina, Saskatchewan, on October 18, 2011 at 9:00 a.m., being the location and date set out in the Notice of Hearing sent to Ms. Leung. The Discipline Committee waited approximately 15 minutes before commencing the hearing but the Member did not attend the hearing, nor did she do so at any time during the course of the hearing.

Present at the hearing were Merrilee Rasmussen, Q.C., legal counsel for the Counselling and Investigation Committee (the "Investigation Committee") of the Saskatchewan Association of Licensed Practical Nurses ("SALPN"), Zena Charowsky, assisting legal counsel for the Investigation Committee, and Della Bartzan, investigator for SALPN.

The complaint against Ms. Leung that is the subject of this hearing involves an allegation of professional misconduct on the basis that Ms. Leung violated the terms of an Alternate Dispute Resolution ("ADR") agreement she entered into with the Investigation Committee in 2010.

PRELIMINARY ISSUE:

Given the Member's failure to attend the hearing at the designated time, date and place set out in the Notice of Hearing, it became necessary for us to determine that the Member was properly served with the Notice of Hearing.

In an affidavit sworn on September 21, 2011, by [REDACTED] Ms. [REDACTED] states that she served Ms. Leung with the Notice of Hearing and Formal Complaint dated September 13, 2011, by sending it on September 17, 2011 by registered mail to Ms. Leung's last address known to the Registrar of SALPN, as shown in the SALPN Register. Attached to Ms. [REDACTED] affidavit are copies of the Canada Post customer receipts for this item as well as a copy of a document obtained from Canada Post's website that shows tracking information concerning the item sent by registered mail. The Canada Post document shows that the item (being the Notice of Hearing) was successfully delivered on September 20, 2011. The Canada Post document also verifies that the item was signed for by "R Leung" at Ms. Leung's address and includes an image of the signature.

Section 29(11) of *The Licensed Practical Nurses Act, 2000* (the “Act”) allows the Discipline Committee to proceed with a hearing in the absence of the member charged. It states:

29(11) Where the member whose conduct is the subject of the hearing fails to attend the hearing, the discipline committee, on proof of service of the notice mentioned in subsection (1), may proceed with the hearing in his or her absence.

Section 29(11) refers to a notice mentioned in s. 29(1). This subsection reads as follows:

29(1) Where a report of the counselling and investigation committee recommends that the discipline committee hear and determine a formal complaint, the executive director shall, at least 14 days before the date the discipline committee is to sit:

(a) send a copy of the formal complaint to the member whose conduct is the subject of the hearing; and

(b) serve notice on the member whose conduct is the subject of the hearing of the date, time and place of the hearing.

Therefore, on the basis of s. 29(1) and (11) of the *Act*, the Discipline Committee may proceed with this hearing without Ms. Leung in attendance provided there is adequate proof that the Notice of Hearing dated September 13, 2010, setting out the date, time and place of the hearing, was served on Ms. Leung at least 14 days before the date of the hearing.

Section 50 of the *Act* sets out the rules governing the service of notices under the *Act*, including a Notice of Hearing provided for in s. 29(1). Section 50 states:

50(1) Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or the bylaws, any notice or other document that is required to be served pursuant to this Act may be served by:

(a) personal service made:

(i) in the case of an individual, on that individual;

(ii) in the case of a partnership, on any partner; or

(iii) in the case of a corporation, on any officer or director; or

(b) registered mail addressed to the last business or residential address of the person to be served known to the registrar.

(2) A notice or document sent by registered mail is deemed to have been served on the seventh day following the date of its mailing, unless the person to whom it was mailed

establishes that, through no fault of that person, the person did not receive the notice or document or received it at a later date.

(3) If it is for any reason impractical to effect service of any documents in the manner provided for in subsection (1), the court may, on application that may be made ex parte, make an order for substituted service.

(4) A document served in accordance with the terms of an order mentioned in subsection (3) is deemed to have been properly served.

Based on the evidence presented to us, the Discipline Committee made a finding at the hearing that proper service of the Notice of Hearing on Ms. Leung was made such that it was proper to proceed with the discipline hearing in her absence. In accordance with s. 29(1) of the *Act*, the executive director of SALPN served the Notice of Hearing (setting out the date, time and place of the hearing and the formal complaint) on Ms. Leung at least 14 days prior to the hearing date of October 18, 2011. Service was properly carried out in accordance with s. 50(1)(b) of the *Act*, by sending the document by registered mail to the last address of Ms. Leung known to the Registrar of SALPN and as shown in SALPN's Register. Although a notice or document is deemed to have been served on the seventh day following its mailing (which in this case would have been September 24, 2011), the evidence before us indicates that the item (the Notice of Hearing) was successfully delivered on September 20, 2011 to "R Leung" at Ms. Leung's address.¹ Therefore, we find that proper service was made on either September 20, 2011 (the date the item was signed for) or September 24, 2011, either of which is more than 14 days prior to the hearing date of October 18, 2011.

Based on all the circumstances, the Discipline Committee found it appropriate to proceed with the hearing in Ms. Leung's absence given that she was properly served with the Notice of Hearing.

EVIDENCE:

SALPN Investigator, Della Bartzen, testified on behalf of the Investigation Committee. As an investigator, Ms. Bartzen is responsible for the investigation of complaints that are made against LPN's who are members of SALPN. Taking instructions from the Investigation Committee, she also assists with the processing and monitoring of ADR agreements that are entered into between the Investigation Committee and a member as a method of resolving complaints.

On April 7, 2010, Ms. Leung's employer filed a written complaint with SALPN regarding Ms. Leung's nursing practice. Following Ms. Bartzen's investigation of the complaint, the Investigation Committee decided to offer Ms. Leung an ADR agreement as a means of resolving the complaint without a discipline hearing. Ms. Leung was agreeable to doing so. Although the Affidavit of Execution attached to the ADR

¹ The fact that the person who signed for the registered mail is identified as "R Leung" and thus may not have been the Member, Melissa Leung, does not affect our conclusion that the Member was properly served on September 20, 2011. Section 50 of the *Act* requires only that a document be served by registered mail to the Member's last known address. It does not require that the Member herself sign for and acknowledge delivery.

agreement suggests that Ms. Leung signed the agreement on March 25, 2010, Ms. Bartzen testified that this date is incorrect and should read March 25, 2011.

Ms. Bartzen explained that on October 9, 2010, the Investigation Committee sent the ADR agreement to Ms. Leung to be signed, requesting that she return it by the end of October. In December 2010, the Investigation Committee received a copy of the ADR agreement back from Ms. Leung which indicated that she had signed it on November 15, 2010, however, the Affidavit of Execution attached to the ADR agreement was not sworn. The agreement and affidavit were returned to Ms. Leung in March 2011 for proper completion. Ultimately, the agreement and the properly completed affidavit were returned to the Investigation Committee at the end of March 2011. Though the date of signing is noted in the affidavit as "March 15, 2010," Ms. Bartzen testified that the year 2010 was a typographic error and should read "March 15, 2011." It appears that those who completed the affidavit simply failed to change the year on the preprinted form from 2010 (when the form was originally sent for completion) to 2011. Ms. Bartzen stated that the Investigation Committee and the Member treated the ADR agreement as having been in place by at least November 15, 2010, when the Member initially signed and returned the document to SALPN.

Under the ADR agreement, Ms. Leung agreed to a number of conditions. Those that are at issue in this case include paragraphs 4, 5 and 6, which read as follows:

4. The Member shall, at her own cost, arrange for and successfully complete the course titled "Roles, Responsibilities and Ethics for LPN's" from the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology (SIAST) by April 30, 2011 and provide proof of having done so to the Counselling & Investigation Committee on or before that date.

5. The Member shall at her own cost, arrange to enroll by the January 2011 intake deadline for the Physical Assessment course from the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology (SIAST) and then successfully complete the course and provide proof of having done so to the Counselling & Investigation Committee upon completion.

6. The Member agrees to arrange for her current employer(s) and any future employer(s) by whom she is employed during the term of this agreement to conduct performance appraisals and to provide a report of her performance to the Counseling & Investigation Committee on November 15, 2010 and every three months thereafter up to and including November 15, 2011.

As of the April 30, 2011 deadline for completion of the Roles, Responsibilities and Ethics course, Ms. Bartzen had not received any information from the Member concerning her completion of that course or that she had registered for the Physical Assessment course by the January 30, 2011 deadline. Nor had any performance appraisals been submitted. Ms. Bartzen contacted SIAST in May 2011 and was advised that Ms. Leung had not completed either of the courses she was required to take.

Ms. Bartzen testified about her various attempts to communicate with the Member. Messages were left but not returned by the Member, until June 9, 2011 when the Member contacted Ms. Bartzen and provided an update. The Member advised that a family member had passed away and that she had had to

go to China, for a lengthy period of time. She also said that she was working on the courses, that SIAST had granted her extensions of the deadlines for the completion of the courses, that she would complete the courses soon, and that she had made requests of management to provide performance appraisals to the Investigation Committee. Ms. Bartzen advised Ms. Leung to provide her information in writing, along with confirmation from SIAST concerning the extensions, so that it could be taken to the Investigation Committee for their consideration. On June 14, 2011, the Member faxed a document to Ms. Bartzen confirming the information she spoke about on the phone, but without the confirmation from SIAST.

Ms. Bartzen had, at some point, contacted SIAST to determine the status of his Leung's registration and completion of the two required courses. Based on information in the Investigation Committee's Report to the Discipline Committee, the Investigation Committee received information that the Member had enrolled in the Roles, Responsibilities and Ethics course on February 12, 2011 but had not completed it by SIAST's May 4, 2011 deadline (SIAST allows LPN's 12 weeks to complete this course). The Investigation Committee also received information that the Member had registered for the Physical Assessment course (actually titled "Nurs 227 Health Assessment") on April 4, 2011 but had not completed it by the June 24, 2011 deadline.

Ms. Bartzen sent another letter to the Member indicating that she needed to provide, by June 30, 2011, something that confirmed that SIAST was permitting her to continue with the courses she had registered for and was required to take pursuant to the ADR agreement. The Member did not respond to this request.

At the end of June 2011, Ms. Bartzen filed a complaint with the Investigation Committee concerning Ms. Leung's failure to complete the terms of her ADR agreement. The Investigation Committee met and considered whether to grant the Member an extension of the time limits in the ADR agreement. The Investigation Committee declined to do so and determined that the complaint should be investigated. In its Report to the Discipline Committee (pursuant to section 26 of the *Act*) dated September 12, 2011, the Investigation Committee recommended to the Discipline Committee that it hear and determine a formal complaint, as set out in Schedule A to the report. The allegations in Schedule A are those that appear in the Notice of Hearing, and include an allegation of professional misconduct within the meaning of section 24 of the *Act*, based on:

1. failing to provide proof to the SALPN Counselling and Investigation Committee that she successfully completed the Roles, Responsibilities and Ethics for LPNs through SIAST, contrary clause 4 of her Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) agreement, dated November 15, 2010;
2. failing to provide proof to the SALPN Counselling and Investigation Committee that she successfully completed the Physical Assessment course through SIAST, contrary clause 5 of her ADR agreement;
3. failing to provide any performance appraisals to the SALPN Counselling and Investigation Committee, contrary clause 6 of her ADR agreement.

Ms. Bartzen testified that in August 2011, she unexpectedly received a performance appraisal from Ms. Leung's manager. This was the first and only performance appraisal that had been submitted. Ms. Bartzen

further testified that Ms. Leung has not contacted her at all since sending her the faxed document on June 14, 2011, including between the dates of delivery of the Notice of Hearing and this hearing.

SUBMISSIONS:

Legal counsel for the Investigation Committee pointed out that in clause 8 of the ADR agreement, Ms. Leung agreed that a breach of any of the terms of the agreement constitutes professional misconduct and will be referred to the Investigation Committee for investigation as a new complaint. Counsel also submitted that Ms. Leung's conduct in violating the terms of her ADR agreement, amounts to "professional misconduct" within the meaning of s. 24 of the *Act* because it is harmful to the best interests of the public or its members and it tends to harm the standing of the profession. Ms. Leung's conduct shows that she is not taking her obligations seriously and her conduct undermines the disciplinary process and the ability of the Investigation Committee and members to resolve complaints through an ADR process. The disciplinary process focuses not on punishment but on professional and safe practice by an LPN. When the member breaks promises she's made about how she'll improve her practice, the ADR mechanism becomes worthless, there's a potential for public cynicism about the disciplinary process, and it causes an increase in the cost of the disciplinary process, which is a cost borne by all members.

With respect to appropriate penalties for Ms. Leung's professional misconduct, legal counsel for the Investigation Committee submitted that not only should Ms. Leung be required to complete the courses she failed to complete, but that Ms. Leung's license to practice should be suspended until she does so. Ms. Leung agreed to take those courses and did not avail herself of the opportunity to do so when there were no consequences to her license and her ability to continue to practice. Counsel also submitted that there should be monetary consequences to make the point that Ms. Leung's failure to carry through with the promises she voluntarily made in the ADR agreement are a serious matter. If the Discipline Committee orders only that she complete the courses she promised to complete, the ADR process is undermined, leading an LPN to believe that delaying compliance or failing to comply is not critical because he or she would get a second chance if it goes to a disciplinary hearing. Legal counsel suggested that a fine of \$1000 would be appropriate in this situation. Furthermore, the failure to comply with the ADR agreements has caused SALPN to incur the substantial costs associated with a discipline hearing, costs that were unnecessary had Ms. Leung complied with the terms of the ADR agreement. Therefore, in addition to a fine, legal counsel submitted that the Member be ordered to pay costs in the amount of \$1000, an amount that is substantially less than the actual costs of this hearing. Such costs include those associated with the hearing room and the court reporter; the attendance at the hearing of a representative of the Investigation Committee, the Investigation Committee's witness, and the members of the Discipline Committee; and the costs of legal assistance provided to the Investigation Committee and the Discipline Committee. Lastly, legal counsel submitted that the Member's license to practice should be suspended until the fines and costs are paid.

DECISION:

The issue before the Discipline Committee is whether the Member's conduct — having violated the terms of the alternative dispute resolution (ADR) agreement she entered into with the Investigation Committee, dated November 15, 2010 — is professional misconduct as defined by section 24 of the *Act*. If so, then the Discipline Committee must determine the appropriate penalty for the misconduct under section 30 of the *Act*.

Sections 24 and 30 of the *Act* read as follows:

24. *Professional misconduct is a question of fact, but any matter, conduct or thing, whether or not disgraceful or dishonourable, is professional misconduct within the meaning of this Act if:*

- (a) it is harmful to the best interests of the public or the members;*
- (b) it tends to harm the standing of the profession;*
- (c) it is a breach of this Act or the bylaws; or*
- (d) it is a failure to comply with an order of the counselling and investigation committee, the discipline committee or the council.*

30(1) *Where the discipline committee finds a member guilty of professional misconduct or professional incompetence, it may make one or more of the following orders:*

- (a) an order that the member be expelled from the association and that the member's name be struck from the register;*
- (b) an order that the member's licence be suspended for a specified period;*
- (c) an order that the member's licence be suspended pending the satisfaction and completion of any conditions specified in the order;*
- (d) an order that the member may continue to practise, but only under conditions specified in the order, which may include, but are not restricted to, an order that the member:*
 - (i) not do specified types of work;*
 - (ii) successfully complete specified classes or courses of instruction;*
 - (iii) obtain medical or other treatment or counseling or both;*
- (e) an order reprimanding the member;*
- (f) any other order that the discipline committee considers just.*

(2) *In addition to any order made pursuant to subsection (1), the discipline committee may order;*

(a) that the member pay to the association, within a fixed period:

(i) a fine in a specified amount not exceeding \$5,000; and

(ii) the costs of the investigation and hearing into the member's conduct and related costs, including the expenses of the counseling and investigation committee and the discipline committee and costs of legal services and witnesses; and

(b) where a member fails to make payment in accordance with an order pursuant to clause (a), that the member's licence be suspended.

(3) *The executive director shall send a copy of an order made pursuant to this section to the member whose conduct is the subject of the order and to the person, if any, who made the complaint.*

(4) *Where a member is expelled from the association or a member's licence is suspended, the registrar shall strike the name of the member from the register or indicate the suspension on the register, as the case may be.*

(5) *The discipline committee may inform a member's employer of the order made against that member where that member has been found guilty of professional misconduct or professional incompetence.*

On the basis of the evidence and the submissions of legal counsel for the Investigation Committee presented at the hearing held on October 18, 2011, the Discipline Committee finds that the Member committed an act of "professional misconduct" within the meaning of clauses 24(a) and (b) of the Act, for having breached the ADR agreement she entered into with the Investigation Committee. She breached the terms of that agreement by failing to provide proof of having successfully completed the SIAST Roles, Responsibilities and Ethics course by the deadline of April 30, 2011, failing to provide proof of having successfully completed the SIAST Physical Assessment course (she did not comply with the requirement to enrol by the January 2011 intake deadline, and while she did enrol on April 4, 2011, she did not complete the course by SIAST'S June 24, 2011 deadline, nor did she provide proof of completion at any time prior to this hearing), and failing to provide any performance assessments.

Beyond the fact that paragraph 8 of the ADR agreement provides that any breach of the agreement constitutes "professional misconduct," the Discipline Committee is of the view that a breach of that agreement would constitute "professional misconduct" even if the agreement had not so provided, a conclusion reached by the Discipline Committee in other complaints it has heard and determined in the

past.² The Discipline Committee has previously held that breach of an ADR agreement amounts to conduct that “harms the best interests of the public or the members” because the public should be able to rely on the disciplinary process of a self-regulating profession such as SALPN to ensure that the profession’s members are practising in a safe and competent manner, according to the rules and regulations that apply to them.

The Discipline Committee has also held that such conduct is harmful to the best interests of the other members of SALPN because if SALPN cannot rely on a member’s compliance with the terms of an ADR agreement that she voluntarily entered into, the Investigation Committee may become reluctant to enter into such agreements in the future, thereby affecting the ability of other members to enter into such agreements for their own benefit, while potentially driving up membership costs in order to pay for discipline hearings for every complaint that appears to have merit. Finally, the Discipline Committee has previously held that a breach of an ADR agreement amounts to professional misconduct because it “tends to harm the standing of the profession” by calling into question the profession’s ability to govern itself as it is required to do under the Act, which includes the use of investigative and disciplinary powers that ensure that LPNs are practising competently and without misconduct. When a member fails to meet her obligations under an ADR agreement that failure has the effect of undermining the discipline process, resulting in harm to the standing of the profession.

In reaching these conclusions, we are mindful of the fact that it appears that Ms. Leung encountered some personal difficulties (a relative passing away and the need for an extended trip out of the country) that might have affected her ability to comply with the terms of the ADR agreement. We do note that she had enrolled in the required courses (although she did not comply with the deadline for enrollment in the Physical Assessment course) and therefore took some steps towards compliance with the agreement. We also appreciate that Ms. Leung would not have had complete control over the requirement that her employer conduct the performance appraisals every three months, and we note that one such appraisal was submitted, but it was not until August 2011 when the first one was required on November 15, 2010. However, it is difficult for us to attach much weight or significant to these factors given the limited information we have and Ms. Leung’s failure to attend the hearing and provide further information/explanation. Even if we take those factors into account, they do not provide a complete answer or defense to her having failed to provide confirmation of completion of the courses as required, and to have performance appraisals submitted by her employer every three months. At no time did Ms. Leung request that the Investigation Committee grant her an extension of time to comply with the terms of the agreement, nor did she provide information/verification about her failed efforts to have her employer submit performance appraisals. We also note that she did not ask the Investigation Committee for assistance in meeting this condition. Lastly, we note that in addition to Ms. Leung’s lack of communication with the Investigation Committee, she failed to provide confirmation that SIAST had granted her extensions to complete the courses she had enrolled in, when asked to do so by Ms. Barten.

² See the Discipline Committee’s decision in *"In the Matter of a Complaint Against Gladys Shewchuk of MacNutt, Saskatchewan"* where the Discipline Committee dealt with an LPN’s breach of the terms of an ADR agreement and explained, at length, why such conduct is "professional misconduct" under the Act (at pages 7 to 8).

PENALTY:

Having found the Member guilty of professional misconduct, the Discipline Committee must consider which penalty or penalties provided in section 30 of the Act may be appropriate in relation to that misconduct.

Given the Member's complete lack of response following her June 14, 2011 communication, her failure to respond to the Notice of Hearing or attend this discipline hearing, we view Ms. Leung's failure to comply with the ADR agreement as evidence demonstrating a complete disregard for her professional obligations, whether that behaviour is a simple lack of concern or defiant in nature. Either way, the Member has demonstrated disregard for the consequences of her actions and the penalties we order must therefore be sufficiently significant to ensure that Ms. Leung understands the seriousness of her obligations; obligations that come with the privilege of holding a license to practice as an LPN.

The types of penalties that legal counsel for the Investigation Committee requested are generally appropriate for us to consider.³ In our view, issuing a formal reprimand is appropriate because it represents a formal acknowledgment of professional misconduct by the Member and the Discipline Committee's disapproval of the Member's conduct. We also find it appropriate to require the Member to complete the terms of the ADR agreement that she failed to comply with. Given that the Member failed to comply with the terms of the ADR agreement while she was permitted to continue to practice, we find it is appropriate and necessary to suspend Ms. Leung's license to practice until such time as she complies with these requirements.

With respect to the request for payment of a fine, we find that even though Ms. Leung's misconduct is sufficiently serious to warrant the imposition of a fine with the objective of deterrence and punishment, we are not ordering Ms. Leung's payment of a fine. It is our view that the suspension of Ms. Leung's license pending completion of the requirements we have set out in our orders is a significant penalty and one with a substantial financial impact on Ms. Leung, considering that she will also have to bear the cost of registering a second time for the courses she is required to take, a cost which we understand to be in excess of \$1300.

The issue of an order concerning costs raises different considerations. Clearly, Ms. Leung's professional misconduct has put the Association to significant costs in investigating her failure to comply with the ADR agreement and in holding this discipline hearing. In similar cases, we have estimated these costs to be in excess of \$5000. The Investigation Committee requested that Ms. Leung be required to pay a portion of those costs in the amount of \$1000. We agree that an order of costs in this amount is appropriate. As with our orders requiring Ms. Leung to take the courses she had agreed to, Ms. Leung's license will be suspended until she complies with the order to pay costs.

³ Most of the penalties sought in this case were discussed at length in the Discipline Committee's decision in "*In the Matter of a Complaint against Nola Bastian of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan*," dated March 14, 2011. In that decision, the Discipline Committee made orders of a formal reprimand, a requirement to complete a course, a fine, costs, and the notification of her employer, in circumstances where the member was found guilty of professional misconduct for failing to renew her license on time and working without a license.

Lastly, given our order concerning the suspension of Ms. Leung's license to practice, we find that this is an appropriate case in which to include an order that SALPN notify Ms. Leung's employer of this finding of professional misconduct and the associated orders, by sending a copy of this decision to Ms. Leung's employer.

The Investigation Committee did not request an order related to the requirements in the ADR agreement that performance appraisals be provided by Ms. Leung's employer. Aside from the fact that it is not possible for the Discipline Committee to make an order requiring the employer to complete this task, an order simply requiring Ms. Leung to make her best efforts to have the employer undertake this task is not practical given the suspension of her license.

The Discipline Committee therefore makes the following orders pursuant to section 30 of *The Licensed Practical Nurses Act, 2000*:

1. Ms. Leung is hereby formally reprimanded.
2. Ms. Leung's licence to practise is suspended until:
 - (a) she provides proof to the Registrar of SALPN that she has successfully completed the course entitled "Roles, Responsibility and Ethics for LPNs" through the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology (SIAST);
 - (b) she provides proof to the Registrar of SALPN that she has successfully completed the Physical Assessment course through SIAST; and
 - (c) she pays costs to SALPN in the amount of \$1,000.
3. If Ms. Leung does not currently hold a licence to practise, she cannot be licensed until she satisfies the conditions in paragraph 2.
4. SALPN shall advise Ms. Leung's employer of this finding of professional misconduct and associated orders by sending a copy of the decision to her employer.

DATED at Regina, Saskatchewan, this 31st day of October, 2011.

**SASKATCHEWAN ASSOCIATION OF
LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSES,
DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE**

Angela Zborosky, Chairperson
Brenda Ballagh, LPN, Member
Marjorie Molsbery, LPN, Member
Terry Chretien, LPN, Member
Tony Linner, Public Representative, Member