

Council Minutes



SCPT Council Meeting Minutes via Teleconference on May 29, 2021 via Redbooth 9:00-1:06 pm

Present through Zoom: B. Green (EDR); C. Cuddington; D. Pitura; L. McLellan; J. Hunchak; A. Crow; K. Horvey; J. Grant; K. Mueller; D. Poncsak; K. Harrison; K. Large; D. Shuya

Call to Order: 9:02 am by D. Pitura.

1. Agenda

1.1. Approval of Agenda and Consent Agenda

Motion: to approve agenda and consent agenda

Mover: J. Grant

Seconder: K. Mueller

CARRIED: MOTION

1.2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest- . D. Pitura identified he may be in conflict relating to the PCE report discussion (as an author of the report). During this portion of the meeting he will only present the information and answer any questions. Council is in agreement with same.

1.3. Minutes of Previous Council Meeting

1.3.1. March 13, 2021

Motion: to approve March 13, 2021 Council meeting minutes

Mover: D. Poncsak

Seconder: C. Cuddington

CARRIED: MOTION

1.3.2. March 22, 2021

Motion: to approve March 22, 2021 Council meeting minutes

Mover: L. McLellan

Seconded: J. Grant

CARRIED: MOTION

1.3.3. March 31, 2021

Motion: to approve March 31, 2021 Council meeting minutes

Mover: L. McLellan

Seconded: C. Cuddington

CARRIED: MOTION

1.3.4. April 22, 2021

Motion: to approve April 22, 2021 Council meeting minutes

Mover: J. Grant

Seconded: D. Poncsak

CARRIED: MOTION

2. Items for Information

2.1 Governance

2.1.1 Consent Agenda

2.1.2. EDR report

Open for questions about the report

- Public rep asks about EDR recruitment. What is the process after the short list? EDR states the Leadership Source will make short list, Hiring Committee will review and decide who to interview. The plan initially is to be up to six candidates on the short list and narrowing down for interviews. Public rep asking if when the field is narrowed down to the last two to three candidates would there be some consideration as far as Council be involved in interviewing or observing responses to interview questions with opportunity to ask questions? Public rep stated she feels since the EDR is an employee of Council that Council should be involved. Hiring Committee member states the package on short list candidates will be provided to the Hiring Committee this week and they are meeting on June 7th to review package. Leadership Source wanted to know if the committee has the authority to hire the new EDR or if the Executive/Council should be involved. This may depend on difficulty of hiring or what options. Discussion on if candidates should be brought back to Council before hiring. If virtual, can Council observe? Committee will discuss with Leadership Source to see options/best practice.

- Highlights from Renewal Report- helpful to see issues regarding payment from SHA. EDR stated that getting payment from some of the SHA regions in a timely matter is an ongoing problem. SHA pays based on region so we are getting multiple cheques from different regions at different times. This year, SCPT asked SHA members to register early to allow for appropriate time for payment processing by SHA and continued to have an issue. Discussion of discontinuing SHA ability to pay, and have employees pay and be reimbursed by SHA. This problem is present with

all NIRO groups that have the option of SHA paying directly. It is much less complicated and less risky from SHA manager perspective on Council to have employees pay and be reimbursed. Also, late payments are an issue with SHA paid renewals.

ACTION 2.1.2: EDR/Registration Committee will bring a recommendation on SHA payment for options for employee registrations to the Sept Council meeting.

2.1.3. Strategic Plan Update

- EDR summarized strategic plan update. Most items are proceeding as scheduled. Governance Procedure Manual was delayed but is in package today.
- At September meeting we will be doing Board schedule, likely 4 meetings will be scheduled for the upcoming Council year, as per the strategic objectives set by Council.
- Council competencies on agenda today and then will go back to GNC.
- In June, Communication Committee will be looking at social media plan.
- Risk management was significantly delayed but in package today. Next risk review will be completed next spring. The previous one was completed in 2018/2019.
- Practice advisor is doing a lot of work, has updated Prof Corp stuff and will be focusing on continuing competency plan. Continuing to work on developing role.
- Communication plan has been delayed and will come back in September, 2021.
- Continuing competency is on track and just waiting for bylaw to be approved at next AGM. Practice advisor will do environment scan for rural outreach.

2.1.4. Risk Framework/Dashboard

Discussion:

- Reviewed Risk Dashboard. Risks analysis was done in 2018/2019. They were defined with specific actions and some were general/ongoing with focus on proper policy/procedure list.
- Right now, our reputational risk and member engagement risk was high due to the PCE issues and cancellations.
- Months of Council meetings will specifically identify current risk at this time. Public rep asking if the assessment will be done at each meeting and meant to fuel discussion or to discuss mitigation strategies. Feels some discussion would be beneficial. Council needs to be reviewing risks as it is Councils' responsibility to be regularly reviewing.
- At this time there is not any definitions for what 'low, medium, or high' risk are, is Council comfortable with it subjectively reported by EDR? Agreed it should be as per EDR and that Council still has responsibility to review and discuss/provide feedback especially with a new EDR taking over.

2.1.5. Standards of Practice/Practice Guidelines Amalgamation Update

Discussion:

- PSOP and hired project manager have been working hard on Standards of Practice and practice guidelines. First draft in meeting package. Standards of Practice are a national document. The committee went through and matched each practice guideline with the aligned national Standards of Practice. In general, our practice guidelines lined up well. This new document has also incorporated the national Code of Ethical Conduct. Each standard of practice has its own

page including aligned items from the national document, any related standards, any related legislation and possibly clinical resources to help with applying the bylaws and standards.

- Committee would like Council to review and give feedback. Next steps could be a graphic designer making it look professional/functional and take some steps to get some membership feedback.

- Member states it is easy to use and links helpful information. Feels it will be really helpful for membership questions/clarification.

- Member stating in public practice there have been admin professionals managing wait lists and don't understand professional standards and responsibilities of PTs. Our practice guidelines did not speak to wait lists and would like it flagged for Committee to consider. EDR saying we cannot define specific standards for each work environment because there are a lot of specific issues with each work situation. This example would fall under 'client centered care' in the current standards document.

- This document has an intentional broad scope. Would there be a place to change the document? Yes, this could be a living document and national standards have to be maintained but other features can be changed/added as needed. It may be helpful to have more resource documents around specific questions.

- It was clarified that this will replace our practice guidelines documents, so there will now be only one fulsome document instead of multiple documents.

- What is the plan for membership consultation? Committee was considering communicating to membership that this exists and considering a case study to see if this is helpful and if its user friendly.

2.1.6. Financial Report

2.1.6.1 Q4 Financials

Discussion:

- We have a surplus, not the anticipated deficit.
- Higher budget for increased restricted licences and more late fees, one discipline cost that was not expected. Initially budget was for new EDR starting in Oct 2020 but now is June 2021, so that expense amount has be used for the Interim EDR instead.
- Discipline Committee had one hearing, that was virtual, and all costs were combined into one item to make it clear what one hearing costs (\$20 000). Everything else is on budget.
- Council expenses were under due to having all virtual meetings. NIRO and education being virtual with decreased travel and reducing costs.

3. Items for Decision

3.1 Governance

3.1.1 IFD Budget for 2021-2022

3.1.1.1. IFD Operational Reserve Policy

Discussion:

- We are risk adverse. Previously it was one year of expenses which was high compared to other organizations. Briefing note from EDR was reviewed by Finance Committee. Committee feels this is very generous and risk adverse.

Motion: to approve the following wording for operational reserve ‘operational reserve to be a set amount, equal to 6 months of operational expenses, determined by calculating the average expenses of the preceding 5 years. This is to be reviewed yearly and updated in the Governance Procedures manual. ‘

Mover: C. Cuddington

Seconder: J. Grant

CARRIED: MOTION

3.1.1.2. 2021-2022 Draft Budget

Discussion:

- Treasurer and EDR discussed presented budget. Presently we are looking at transferring approx. \$90,000 from Unrestricted Reserve. The template was restructured to more easily demonstrate where the funds come from and to reflect that although it will be an annual deficit, SCPT has planned reserve funds to cover the additional expenses expected. Even with this useage of Unrestricted Reserve funds, SCPT will continue to have a reasonable unrestricted reserve fund amount until 2025, which means we do not need to increase fees for members at this time. In this updated version of the 2021/22 budget, the EDR updated specific numbers for strategic objectives, as available. It is still a best estimate for programs like the mentorship network development. For NIRO, the citizen advisory group is a guestimate depending on what NIRO decides and how our Council will proceed. Public education campaign budget is an estimate. Member education is based on if bringing in someone for education. IT support increased with the new practice advisor role. EDR budget for next year is a .8 and a 50th percentile pay range. In the future, it leaves room for the EDR wage to be budgeted for increased wage or increased hours. Also there is room in the budget for a possible increased staff including audits. This template demonstrates the unrestricted reserves and the plan is to be spending this money in coming years.

Motion: to approve the 2021/25 budget as presented.

Mover: C. Cuddington

Seconder: A. Crow

CARRIED: MOTION

3.1.2 PCE Working Group Report

3.1.2.1 PCE Review Report Document

Motion: to go In Camera for the PCE Review Report discussion

Mover: L McLellan

Seconder: A. Crow

CARRIED: MOTION

In camera started at 10:35 a.m.

Motion: to go Out of Camera

Mover: K. Horvey

Seconder: J. Grant

CARRIED: MOTION

In camera ended at 11:35 a.m.

ACTION 3.1.2.1: EDR/Registration Committee to create a risk profile and implementation plan (short term and long term) options from the PCE report.

Discussion:

- Treasurer stating that the amount of work that the PCE Ad Hoc Committee was significant and the quality of the report was impressive. The budget for the Ad Hoc Committee including money for hiring additional help, if needed, and this was not accessed.
- D. Pitura states he will not engage or participate in this discussion as a member of the committee.
- Discussion of Council member saying it feels an additional stipend would be a good way to show the Council's appreciation and acknowledgement of the hard work of the committee members.

Motion: to pay the PCE Ad Hoc Committee members each an additional stipend of \$500. (funds already in committee budget)

Mover: C. Cuddington

Seconder: K. Horvey

CARRIED: MOTION

D. Pitura stating he will not accept an additional stipend as the Chair of the PCE Ad Hoc Committee.

ACTION 3.1.2.1: Finance Committee to develop a procedure for additional honorarium funding for committee members for excessive and additional demands of the committee.

3.1.3. Governance Procedure Manual

3.1.3.1. Procedures Manual Document

Discussion:

- Presented in draft form in meeting package. Brought forward for Council approval.
- Comments that were submitted before meeting were updated.
- Clarification regarding in camera minutes access. EDR clarified that admin does also have access to this area but have agreed not to access unless needed. The way Redbooth is set up, the ED must have access to all the SCPT workspaces.

- Discussed provided amendments in report. For PCC, need to include discussion for use of the PCC Reserve Members as alternates should there be significant COI that limits member participation, or too many cases for the current committee members to manage.
- Discussed adding in a procedures relating to PCC and history of discipline actions and investigations. Maybe we need to look in to records of dismissed complaints? From interest of public safety it may be beneficial to have a record of repeat complaints directed at one member. For public safety we need to have a record of any complaints. EDR clarified the office keeps a record of if there was a complaint, who it was, the dates, and the outcome. At this time the office does not keep content information.
- Discussing having GNC look into above discussion and update into Governance Procedure Manual.

ACTION 3.1.3.1: EDR to take back Governance Procedure Manual to GNC to look into PCC and Discipline complaints sections in the Governance Procedure Manual.

3.1.4 Competency Profile for Council.

Discussion:

- Circulated survey and results to Council. Does Council agree with competencies selected? Are there any we don't want to include or are any of competencies need to have a higher priority on recruitment? Should be use this same tool for committee recruitment?
- No concerns on provided information from Council.

ACTION 3.1.4: EDR to provide to GNC to use the reviewed tool to guide competencies for Council and committee recruitments.

3.1.5 IFD Osteopathy Program

Discussion:

- Reviewed decision item and letter from chiropractors regarding their concerns and letter from the Ministry of Advanced Education.
- Are there any actions that Council would like to take to address these concerns?
- Member asking who is responsible, is it the Ministry of Health or Ministry of Advanced Ed? Ministry of Advanced Ed is who deals with it since Osteopathy is not a regulated profession. Public rep says we should push concerns forward if we still feel this is a concern.
- Osteopaths are not regulated in Saskatchewan. Public rep comments that a letter sent to the Ministry of Health about our concerns about lack of regulation may be beneficial.

Motion: send a letter to Ministry of Health and Ministry of Advanced Education regarding osteopaths and their lack of regulation and the possible impact on public safety.

Mover: J. Hunchak

Seconder: D. Poncsak

ACTION 3.1.5: EDR to send letters to the Ministry of Health and Ministry of Advanced Education regarding osteopaths and their lack of regulation and the possible impact on public safety.

3.1.6. Extenuating Circumstances Alternative Assessment

Discussion:

- EDR summarized IFD. Alberta and BC has set eligibility criteria to people who haven't previously failed the CAPR PCE CC, no conduct history and must have been registered since March 2020 to be able to take the alternate exams. They are not looking at allowing any other individuals to take exams. Quebec has 16 candidates and offered them to take the Sherbrooke University OSCE and 14/16 chose to do this.
- Registration Committee reviewed. Sask has a more diverse cohort. About 19 candidates have been waiting about one year, some have failed the CAPR PCE CC previously. Six have never taken the exam at all. If we follow the same criteria as BC and AB, only 6 of our candidates would be eligible. If this was the case, Sask could not create its own exam since the group would be too small to get a valid cut score. Should we choose to use the same eligibility criteria, the only option available to our candidates would be to join the BC exam – if they had room for our candidates and if our bylaw amendment was approved in time. The Registration Committee recommended that in Sask the eligibility criteria be expanded to all candidates (regardless of previous failures on the PCE) and all new grads licenced for 6 months or more. Labor and mobility would be impacted regardless since it is not the PCE. If we allow all candidates, then the cohort would be large enough to have CERS develop a Saskatchewan alternative exam. Registration is unsure if BC is going to be open to doing it again for Sask members at a later date since it seems like our bylaw doesn't leave enough time to prepare. We could ask if they would do a later in July exam.
- Council needs to decide what eligibility is and are we ok for looking in to either of those options?
- Concerns around people who have failed before. If any BC/Alberta/Sask can offer an additional exam would be good. BC is only virtual.
- Cost? BC isn't going to be high, their College is considering covering the costs. Alberta is charging \$700-1000 cost to do cost recovery and additional legal cost. We would also need to decide who pays for it.
- Will the exam be good enough to weed out any candidate that is not competent?
- Registration Committee discussed people who have previously failed, they have been the most impacted/what their future looks like, and are also the most vocal group.
- Rates of passing are high for Canadian graduates on repeated attempts of the PCE regardless.

Motion: to allow the Registration Committee recommendation for eligibility (candidate held a restricted practice license with SCPT on May 1/21 and no history of misconduct with SCPT) to participate in an alternative assessment process.

Mover: C. Cuddington

Seconder: K. Horvey

ACTION 3.1.6: EDR to speak with the U of S/CERS about alternate exam option

ACTION 3.1.6: EDR to speak with UBC about alternate exam option

- Will Council object to anyone who takes this exam from BC or Alberta and are requesting licensure in Sask? Registration and legal looked in to it. We have legislation to support both. Registration Committee saying it would be hypocritical to not accept the Alberta or BC license if we are allowing our restricted licences to use this exam.
- Our rules state if someone holds a license in another province, they only require a letter of good standing, proof of insurance and proof of current licensure to meet the labour mobility clause in our Regulations.
- Do we accept Quebec's usual licensure process under labour mobility? Right now there was a national decision to accept Quebec's standard after a national review.
- EDR stated that if we license these individuals, they will be fully licensed to practice – as that is how the labour mobility clause is worded.

ACTION 3.1.6: EDR to develop a policy around out of province extenuating circumstances licensure requests.

4. Items for Vision

4.1 Governance

4.1.1. Board Evaluation- SARC

4.1.1.1. Board Evaluation Survey Report

4.1.1.2. Board Meeting Evaluation Survey Report

Discussion:

- In June we will work on keeping meeting short and will also include these two items on June agenda. How do we increase from good to very/good and excellent.

SETTING AGM DATE and plan

- Does October 2 still work? How will we do face to face, virtual, or both?
- Discussion if October 2, 2021 works for AGM. Council all agrees
- Discussion regarding if we want a face to face meeting, virtual, or both? Discussion around COVID 19 and possible impacts. Multiple Council members comment they would like hybrid as long as there is not a financial risk to committing to a deposit on a meeting space at this time.
- EDR clarifies that Council has previously decided all in person AGMs will have a virtual option. Council agrees on planning for face to face, with virtual option, as best plan. To hold in Saskatoon due to proximity to students and pre COVID it was already scheduled to be in Saskatoon.

ACTION 5.1: EDR to organize face to face AGM in Saskatoon for October 2, 2021.

5. Meeting Summary

ACTION: EDR to send out survey to other regulators to get feedback on (labour mobility and reviewing national standards).

ACTION: D. Pitura will ask PCE Committee if they consent to the PCE report being sent out to other jurisdictions prior to it being shared with our Sask membership.

ACTION: PCE Committee and EDR to arrange to release report and present at a webinar to our membership.

Council member thanks EDR for the extensive briefing note regarding the PCE report.

Action Items:

ACTION: Send request to Governance committee to develop a communication policy and procedure plan for SCPT.

ACTION: To line up a facilitator to assist with Inclusion and Diversity discussion with Council.

ACTION: Hiring committee to set up presentations of two candidates for EDR role for Council.

ACTION: Exec to meet and complete performance review of EDR.

ACTION: EDR to send out survey to other regulators to get feedback on (labour mobility and reviewing national standards).

ACTION: D. Pitura will ask PCE Committee if they consent to the PCE report being sent out to other jurisdictions prior to it being shared with our Sask membership.

ACTION: PCE Committee and EDR to arrange to release report and present at a webinar to our membership.

Adjournment at 8:50 pm.

President  Date September 9, 2021

Secretary  Date Sept 3, 2021