

**SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BOARD**  
**Notes of the 71<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Committee on Professional Conduct**

Date: 13 March 2019  
Time: 7:00 p.m.  
Venue: Conference Room, 26/F Eastern Commercial Centre, 83 Nam On Street, Shau Kei Wan, Hong Kong.  
Present: Mr. LUN Chi-wai (Convenor)  
Ms. CHAN Tsz-wai  
Ms. MAN Yuen-ling, Connie  
Dr. TING Wai-fong  
Mr. TSANG Kin-chiu  
Apology: Dr. NG Yut-ming  
Secretary: Mr. LEE Wing-po, Eric, Registrar and  
Ms. FAN Lai-ye, Veronica, Assistant Registrar

Mr. LUN, Convenor of the Committee, presided the meeting.

**Matters arising from the last meeting**

1. Members took note of the last meeting notes.
2. The last term of the Committee had discussed and proposed amendments to the complaint form and the related disciplinary proceedings. One of the major changes was to request the complainant to make statutory declaration when he/she lodged the complaint to the Board, (business information deleted). The revised documents were still under preparation by our legal advisor for submission to the Committee for discussion.

**Progress report on the Review of Code of Practice**

3. The Convenor highlighted the major changes as below:
  - (a) The current two documents i.e. Code of Practice and the Guidelines of Code of Practice were to be combined and the legal status of the Guidelines would then be uplifted.
  - (b) Section 2, 4 and 6 were newly added.
  - (c) Section 5 elaborated the standards and rules and distinguished what should not do and what should do.
  - (d) Some standards and rules were revised, deleted or moved under different sections.
4. The Convenor, being one of the Taskforce members, briefed that the Taskforce had studied a few complaint cases concluded in recent years before revisions were made. Unlike the current version, some sections were first prepared in English whilst some in Chinese. The translation was done by the third party recommended and appointed by the Taskforce.
5. The Committee was invited to comment on the Chinese version and the following points were highlighted:

- (a) The translation was not up to standard and required further editing. The translator had adopted the approach of literal translation but the document could not be accurately translated. When reading the Chinese version, members had difficulties in understanding the literal meaning and sometimes arrived at other interpretations.
  - (b) By also referring to the English version, the Committee examined the document sentence by sentence, and tried to propose amendments as far as possible. Members' comments and proposed amendments were marked in Annex 1.
  - (c) In Section 3, the beliefs and values were elaborated with details in the new version whilst the original version was comparatively clear and easy to be understood.
  - (d) It was suggested to distinguish social worker and social work profession or move section 6 to upfront.
  - (e) The Committee noted that paragraphs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 in the original version were moved to paragraph 23 and 25 in the new version and these paragraphs should be subject to further discussion.
  - (f) The Committee's proposed amendments would be passed onto the Taskforce for discussion and consideration, but these proposed amendments might not be in line with the Taskforce's original purpose.
  - (g) With the purpose of screening out trivial complaints, the Taskforce made the revisions from the RSWs' perspectives. A member reminded that other stakeholders such as service users would have opposite views.
6. Due to time being run off, the Committee had not finished the full document and the rest would be discussed at subsequent meeting.
  7. The Committee discussed the next action to be taken. A member suggested submitting part of the documents to the Board at its meeting to be held in March 2019. Other members held opposite view that the Committee had the responsibility to examine the documents in details before putting forward to the Board. Upon endorsement by the Board, the document would go through legal vetting and public consultation. After discussion, it was agreed that the document would not be submitted to the Board at this juncture and comments would be reverted to the Taskforce in one go for further revision.

### **Nomination of co-opted members of the Committee on Professional Conduct**

8. The Committee was invited to discuss the nomination of co-opted members and members were briefed of the approach adopted in last term. After discussion, members concluded as below:
  - (a) Only non-RSWs lay-person would be recruited as co-opted members for CPC;

- (b) Up to two co-opted members would be recruited;
- (c) The recruitment would be by invitation to professionals in human services sectors who were under similar regulatory regime of RSWs;
- (d) First to former co-opted member having served in last term, namely Ms. LIT Ming-wai, Physiotherapist, to leverage on her past experience and exposure in CPC;
- (e) Then to professional bodies for their nomination in turn (with one-month's response time) for the second lay-member, proposed in the following sequence:
  - (i) of legal (the Law Society),
  - (ii) of nursing (the Nursing Council),
  - (iii) of doctor (the Medical Association or the Medical Council),
  - (iv) of psychologists (the Psychological Society).

**Progress report on the complaint cases**

9. The Committee took note of the report.

**Date of next meeting**

10. Members agreed that the next meeting would be held on 11 April 2019 at 7:00 pm.

11. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 pm.

28 March 2019