

Council

Minutes

SCPT Council Meeting Minutes via Teleconference on March 13, 2021 via Redbooth 9:00 am-2:00 pm

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

Absent: J. Grant

Call to Order: 9:00 am by D. Shuya, President.

President acknowledges the events of the last year relating to Covid. The impacts on Council, the physiotherapy profession, and all its branches. A moment of silence for Council to reflect on the lives lost this past year and the personal impacts of Covid is taken.

Agenda

* 1. Approval of Agenda and Consent Agenda

 EDR requests adding an Item for Decision 3.1.7 Appeal of Remittance for Late Fees into agenda.

 **Motion: to approve amended agenda and consent agenda**

 Mover: C. Cuddington

 Seconder: A. Crow

 **CARRIED: MOTION 21.001**

 J. Hunchak joined at 9:09 am.

* 1. Declaration of Conflict of Interest- none declared
	2. Minutes of Previous Council Meeting
		1. December 5, 2020

 **Motion: to approve December 5, 2020 Council meeting minutes**

 Mover: D. Poncsak

 Seconder: D. Pitura

 **CARRIED: MOTION 21.002**

1. Items for Information

2.1 Governance

2.1.1 Consent Agenda

2.1.2 EDR Report

 2.1.2.1 EDR Report

Discussion:

- EDR provided briefing on Covid 19 and a change to the vaccination roll out since the package was sent out. Physical therapists are approved as potential immunizers by Ministry of Health. Physical therapists will be insured as an ‘immunizer’ through the SHA and not under their private licence. If this was not the case, physical therapists would have no insurance to provide Covid 19 immunizations through CPA insurance. There was a question about whether academic licensed physical therapists may apply as an immunizer; EDR advised them to ensure to declare their licence is a non-practicing license when applying to SHA.

- Reviewed concerns brought to EDR about redeployment of physical therapists and lack of training. This concern is being handled by SHA.

-EDR described concerns brought forward by SPA and its concerns about the jurisprudence question involving yoga. EDR met with CCC and EDR will do an article about billing and role of alternate therapies. The question was changed to be about reflexology instead of yoga.

- External meetings. CAPR exam going ahead next weekend. They did a full risk assessment before and are doing a review after the March exam to see effectiveness for candidates and stations. This will happen after each exam in 2021 and CAPR will do a psychometric analysis of each exam.

- MOU Telerehab is still in process, with each jurisdiction putting appropriate regulations in place. Discussion around this led to discussions relating to the impact of changes on interjurisdictional practice. The previous MOU covered both virtual and in person, but the new bylaw will only be for virtual practice. EDR has referred this to the Legislation Committee.

- Updated version of the approved regulatory bylaws with amendment has been posted on the website.

- NIRO Legislative reform is hopefully siting in April.

- The practice advisor interviews have been completed. Two strong candidates were interviewed. The hiring committee will be checking references on March 15th. Will make their final decision next week. The hiring panel is EDR, Judy Grant, Amanda Crow and Heather Burridge.

- The transition of all SCPT banking from TD to RBC is completed.

- 2021 licence renewals went well. The office had some hiccups at the very end due to a new In1Touch employee making changes. Tammy will provide a report on this for the May meeting. There were $960 of late fees paid.

- EDR, Tammy, and Merrilee met to discuss Prof Corps. A procedural document for renewal of Prof Corps will be created.

- As of Thursday, the office has received 6 complaints. PCC doing a great job. Two complaints from January are still being worked on and now the addition of the new one received this week.

- DC had its first virtual hearing this week. Went very well. DC panel sent compliments about how smoothly it was run to the office.

- Complaints 2020.5 and 2020.6 are completed. No further action is being recommended by the PCC. 2020.4 will be a lengthy investigation. 2021.1 and 2021.2 are just getting started.

 - President asking EDR to update Council after the virtual March PCE exam on feedback.

- Council member would like to know if the College receives technical results from PCE. EDR states they only receive information for candidates for Saskatchewan. (pass/fail if a candidate comments they are registered or planning to register in Sask on their application). The tech reports for November still are not available for the written exam, likely due to all the Covid changes going on. Usually, this information is in the CAPR rep report and then shared at AGM. This information comes up to 3 times a year. The data SCPT gets is pass/fail, Canadian/international educated. President asks if it is relevant for Council to have more information or if waiting two to three times per year for information is reasonable. Immediate information probably doesn’t impact satisfaction of SCPT with this service. EDR clarifies registrars can check the CAPR website for official pass/fail results for a candidate. EDR states the registrar gets the information the same time as the board but when there has been an issue (ie. the high fail rate that occurred in the past) that information came to the registrar and to the Council sooner. The assumption is if there is a concern the information would be provided more quickly to registrar/Council since CAPR would be doing more psychometrics to investigate the issue quickly. Council member commented the September exam pass/fail rate has not been provided to the school. EDR has not seen it either but had not been watching/looking for it. Council agrees that information three times per year is sufficient at this time.

**ACTION 2.1.2.1 B Green to send Council an update on how March sitting of the virtual PCE goes after feedback from students, examiners, and/or CAPR is provided.**

 2.1.2.2 Final 2020 Strategic Plan Update

 Discussion:

- Risk management was not addressed this year. Governance procedures manual was delayed. The first draft will be ready for May Council meeting. Presently working on Council competency documents. Considering Covid year, we did meet a lot of our plan goals.

-President commented EDR and office staff did an excellent job considering what a challenging year it was with Covid.

 2.1.2.3 2021 Strategic Implementation Plan

Discussion:

- June to June. We will not review in detail today since this may change once we have a new EDR in place. Council member comments it may be too ambitious. The EDR may need to scale back plan based on their experience and what the new EDR feels they will be able to accomplish in their first year. If the plan is scaled back, Council would need to decide what can be moved and what needs to be prioritized. This plan impacts the annual budget, so we need to view those items together. When the final budget approval occurs, in May, we will know what the strategic plan is.

- Council member comments the actual implementation plan is an operational issue. The plan the EDR provides should be monitored by Council. Council should set priorities and allow the EDR to set the implementation plan. EDR says it should be part of the budget discussion. Once the budget plan is in place, EDR will adjust the implementation plan.

- Council competencies are ready to go. GNC has developed a competency inventory. A survey on self-perceived competencies of Council Members will be sent out. The list will go to the May Council meeting and to GNC. This will then be used to develop a recruitment and nominations strategy to better meet the needs of Council.

-Social media- holding off a bit until practice advisor is hired. They will be involved in working with Communications committee to determine appropriate use of social media for the organization.

- Risk management – will review in May since this meeting was so full. Overall, a lot of the implementation plan has been accomplished. Most tasks are on track. EDR may finish more items before the plan starts in June.

 2.1.2.3.1 Membership and Employer survey results

 Discussion:

* Two surveys completed since last meeting. Reviewed purpose in IFD.
* Employer survey
* Appears employers didn’t know what the College’s role is. It is not relevant for College to do job postings. It would be helpful to have an educational booklet for new Prof Corp. What information is on the Employer section of the website, and could this help? Information that needs to be available would include the difference between SPA and SCPT, why you need/should register for a Prof Corp, the purpose of a Prof Corp etc. It would be helpful to make it clear that this is optional. President thinks the results of the surveys should be available to registrants. Sharing of the information ensuring information isn’t identifiable would be beneficial. A summary would be best and plan for what we will do with the information. Council needs to be clear when asking for any information what we plan to do with it. The raw data may not provide a clear picture. EDR recommends sharing information in an educational article including stats. The article could include the stats and summary information around it.
* Membership survey
* More engagement with this survey. Concern from Council member regarding questions on tele rehab and 3rd party assessments. We need to focus on global recommendations and in the future consider what questions are we asking to make it appropriate. President reports this is an issue that is being brought to the College from members, clinic owners etc. When membership brings forward concerns, we need to demonstrate that the issues/concerns are being looked into and clarify what the College’s role is. EDR comments these questions help to get an idea around competencies with certain skills and what the role of the College is. We need to use this information when reviewing risk for the public and where the competency is lacking. Tele rehab is a national level issue. More information likely coming regarding if this is an entry level skill or will be something more specialized (this is being discussed from curriculum/entry level competencies and moving forward). More information will be helpful, and data will keep coming from other national groups. EDR says it is important to remember this is a self regulated profession. The members are involved in determining best practice. The consideration of ‘is this an entry level skill?’ helps inform the regulatory decisions around this practice. With these questions it is important to provide proper explanation of the data. It would be beneficial to create a provincial telerehab working group to consider the information coming from research and national working group. SPTAG may be an appropriate place for this to be developed.

**ACTION 2.1.2.3.1 B. Green to send survey results and summary request to Communication committee. Communication committee will write sensitive and detailed articles balancing transparency and information of Membership and Professional Corp. Surveys. The articles will be brought back to Council to review with the intention of the information to be shared with the membership**

**ACTION 2.1.2.3.1 B. Green to approach various stakeholders to have a working group discussion on the data from the telerehabilitation questionnaire.**

 2.1.3. PCE Working Group Update

 Discussion:

* President wants the minutes to reflect that a written draft update from the PCE working group was requested for this meeting. Presenter utilized a PowerPoint presentation to disseminate the information to Council.
* PCE working group chair said the committee is working as quickly as possible. COVID has really impacted the ability to meet with necessary stakeholders. Committee has been busy and working as quickly and effectively as they can. The written update will be the final report to Council; this cannot be provided until it is complete. Chair is extremely impressed by the work of the committee, the effort provided and their availability to work on this project.
* PowerPoint summary presentation. Discussion included original motion, committee member list, the full process, the plan, literature review, reference list, review other health professional’s exam process, credentialling process of other professionals ie. psychology, nursing and appeal processes, environmental review, stakeholder discussions, status of project, Council contemplations. The final report will be complete for Council review at the May Board meeting.
* EDR wants to know if we should share PowerPoint presentation with the membership. A lot of work/consideration/consultation has gone into it and the whole process. Committee chair says it is clear Council has had this as a priority, as it has been on minutes for every meeting. Council will need to decide how to pass/share the information off to the membership to be transparent, but we also need to remember that the committee’s role was to gather information for Council, to help inform decisions on licensure requirements. President states that she has received several questions about where this is at. Council agrees sharing this presentation will help with transparency to members and presentation was very well done. Many members agree with the value for sharing for accountability and transparency. Student Council member states it is helpful to see that this is still being reviewed and the work going into it. Council member wonders if change to number of questions of PCE will change results of the review. Committee chair said there are many ways to increase reliability (more stations or less that are more comprehensive etc). All the factors about the stations have been involved in the discussion at the group. Council member asks if there is information about written/practical vs just a written. The mandate from Council did not involve looking at written exam information. Discussion on entry level competencies and new graduates (Canadian graduates vs international grads). EDR said Ontario’s formal report outcome looks at ‘what do we do now’ while still living in the present legislation. The hardest work will be to come considering we have a lot of governing legislation that we need to work in.

**ACTION 2.1.3 D. Pitura to send PCE review committee’s PowerPoint to EDR to share with membership as an eblast.**

 2.1.4. Financial Report

 2.1.4.1 Q3 Financial Comparative Report

 Discussion:

* Decreased expenses due to no in-person meetings and noting an increase in registration income.
* Treasurer acknowledging the benefit of EDR/office taking a role in developing budget.
* Projected deficit of $100 000 is actually $50 000. Reminder, this money is coming from a reserve we have saved/planned to use (not an operational deficit).
* Treasurer highlighting at Exec meeting the discussion of reducing reserves that were prepaid/saved. We are being cautious with our budget and this was all planned expenses.

 2.1.5 IFD 2021-2022 Draft Budget

 2.1.5.1 2021-2022 Draft Budget

 2.1.5.2 Potential Fee Increase info

 Discussion:

* EDR has made changes to format of budget document to show where spending is coming from i.e. the Unrestricted Reserve (money saved for projects), operational expenses from the operational account, maintenance of Restricted Reserves for emergency expenses related to operations, legal, discipline and disaster. EDR will make a further adjustment to include ‘incomes line for budget’ to better demonstrate that the money is moving from unrestricted reserves to used income. With our current fee structure, by 2024/2025 we will be starting to draw down our operational funds, which is not ideal (we will still have all our restricted reserve in place). Council agrees it is good to be using the unreserved funds as we saved this with a plan to spend it and there have been concerns about our maximum amount of savings allowed as a non-profit. EDR clarifies we are a legislative entity, not a non-profit and as such do not have a limit of unrestricted reserve amounts.
* Regarding 2021/2022 we want four face to face meetings as usual or move two to virtual and two face to face? Council agrees two face to face and two virtual is best.
* Continuing with virtual AGMs? Or do we move to a hybrid? EDRs explains virtual saves money on rental space, food, speaker costs etc. If we do only virtual, will we do an education session or town hall in person instead? Is the purpose of an AGM strictly for voting? Feedback for the virtual AGMs last year was split. Virtual provided convenience but some wanted hybrid model for networking and felt it was more open for discussion. Due to Covid, likely October will need to be virtual. Treasurer stating if it’s a straight financial meeting virtual is good but then we could possibly combine with SPA for their townhall/education options. There is a sense there may be a lot of membership engagement for the October AGM. President states it would be best to budget face to face in case we need to do this. Council member comments with a new practice advisor and new EDR for October it may be good to have a face-to-face option.
* Currently the budget shows the new EDR position as a full-time position at 50th percentile pay range, is this appropriate? Right now would be challenging since we might have budget approved before hiring is completed. Being a fulltime position removes any OT/banking of hours concerns. EDR feels this position is possible to do at a 0.8 FTE, but recommends that optimal performance in the role would be accomplished with 1.0 FTE. Presently she is working at a 0.6 and feels for her it would be possible to perform best at 0.8 FTE. Discussion around on the challenge of cutting back hours if we start it at a fulltime position. The strategic plan may impact how many hours are needed. Council can change those goals based on the hours. Feels a 0.8 FTE is a good option, as there should not be as much workload on the EDR now that many of the foundational document work has been completed and we have hired a practice advisor to manage the communication with membership around practice related questions.
* President wants to acknowledge how much work has been done this past year. We are in a good position to transition to the new EDR.
* Discussion of Council agrees with the position being a 0.75 or 0.8. Feels that the salary range might depend on the person hired. Previously when Council did its wage review for the EDR role it was not determined what range we would want our EDR to stay in (i.e. 45 – 60%). Might be best to start below the 50% and then we have flexibility to move them dependent on their experience. Council member states we should set a range of the salary depending on academic background and work experience. Once we are at the hiring point, then decide. Discussion on starting below 50% and then bumping them up to 50% after six months. Council agrees it seems reasonable to budget for the 50% range at this time.
* Due to the projections for a deficit budget over the next several years Council needs to consider whether to proceed with all the planned strategic objectives. If we plan to proceed with all strategic objectives, then we will require fee increases to cover these costs. We will likely require a fee increases by 2023 regardless due to increased staffing of Practice Advisor and CCP however, the amount of these fee increases will be dependant upon the projects we wish to undertake each year. EDR stated that since our deficit for 2020/2021 is half of what was projected, Finance Committee can review and bring new recommendations back to Council in May.
* Do we want to maintain the operational reserve fund policy at the amount of the previously years expenses? If so, we will need to increase the amount we currently have saved. (was $300,000 and would be bumped to $500,000) Does Council agree that this policy is still effective for our organization or does it need to be reviewed? Council member recommended 3 months. President wants to know if we need to decide right now or go status quo or possibly an average of three years? EDR states that we currently aren’t meeting our policy requirements, so either need to review policy or increase amount in reserve fund to meet policy requirements. If we continue with this policy, we will need to increase our fees in order to maintain operations and reserve amounts. Finance committee to review the policy, with feedback from our accountant, and bring recommendation to May council meeting.
* The recommendation from Finance committee is to maintain the current honorarium and stipend amounts for the 2021/22 budget year. The projections included in this budge sheet include an increase in both of these for 2023/24 budget year as per the finance committee. To possibly review after we know our EDR and strategic plan.
* Treasurer requesting Council thoroughly review budget before May meeting. Treasurer thanked EDR and the office for their work on this.

**ACTION 2.1.5.2 Finance to review the operational reserve fund policy (based on previous one year of expenses presently).**

* + 1. Updated Pre-Approved Vendor List- for approval

 Discussion:

* Reviewed provided preapproved vendor list.
* Treasurer reminded Council there is a check and balance in place in that RBC we have a dual authority approval and the Treasurer reviews the financials quarterly for any inconsistencies. This list allows for a dual staff signature/approval for these vendors compared to a Council member needing to sign/approve.

 **Motion: Council to approve the pre-approved vendor list as presented**

 Mover: K. Horvey

 Seconder: D. Poncsak

 **CARRIED: MOTION 21.003**

1. Items for Decision

3.1 Governance

3.1.1 EDR Recruitment plan

3.1.1.1 Briefing note EDR Recruitment Plan

 a) Executive Director and Registrar Proposal

 b) People First- Executive Search Proposal

 c) SCPT RFP Executive Director and Registrar Recruitment

Discussion:

* EDR presents initial discussion of hiring executive search firm. Quotes provided in package. Two individuals have reached out to EDR with interest in the role. Council needs to discuss recruitment plan and then create a hiring committee to assist with the recruitment process.
* New Council member asks if we have previously used a company. Council previously hired a HR firm to go through the hiring process and develop an interview process. We still have all of the resources that were developed by the HR firm for the process. Council member feels with transparency it would be smart to go with a firm. Council members agree. It is a lot of money; however, its more costly to have an unsuccessful hire.
* To assemble the hiring committee Council member recommends we should reach out to the membership to find members with the skill sets to perform a hiring process. Possibly getting a committee established first before deciding on a recruitment firm. EDR commented that the proposals will provide a larger range of applicants and likely more specific skill set. If the hire is unsuccessful the firms will redo the search (within a certain amount of time). The greatest risk is the cost. Council member comments that replacing personnel is 20 to 30% of the salary. Council discusses with the warranty and the ability to be transparent; this would be most beneficial.
* The hiring firmshould be helpful in setting up hiring committee. EDR says we likely won’t need a hiring committee until early May. Council should consider doing some shoulder tapping. EDR to email membership asking for interest.

**Motion: That EDR to get updated quotes from search firms for EDR recruitment, and hire a firm, with a budget of no more than $25,000 to assist with EDR recruitment and hiring.**

 Mover: D. Pitura

 Seconder: C. Cuddington

 **CARRIED: MOTION 21.004**

**ACTION 3.1.1.1 B. Green to reach out to search firms to get 2021 quotes and confirm an executive search firm for recruitment for the EDR position.**

**ACTION 3.1.1.1 B. Green to send email asking for membership interest in joining the EDR hiring committee.**

3.1.2 Bylaw Amendments

 3.1.2.1 IFD Reg Bylaw 4.1

 3.1.2.1.1 Extended Access Draft Bylaws

Discussion:

* Council member asks for clarification if members can be registered but not licensed? EDR confirm yes. The MOU is to reduce barriers. Council member states we will need to educate public that they need to go to the licensing province for any complaints. Council needs to be aware there might be increased costs associated with out of province complaints.

**Motion: That Council approve the Regulatory Bylaw #4.1 amendment to proceed to membership consultation, as attached**

 Mover: D. Pitura

 Seconder: K. Mueller

 **CARRIED: MOTION 21.005**

 3.1.2.2 IFD Reg Bylaw 13 and 15

 3.1.2.2.1 Continuing Comp Program Draft Bylaws

**Motion: That Council approve the Regulatory Bylaw #13.1 in its entirety to proceed to membership consultation, as attached**

 Mover: A. Crow

 Seconder: K. Horvey

 **CARRIED: MOTION 21.006**

**Motion: That Council approve the Regulatory Bylaw #15 amendments to proceed to membership consultation as attached**

 Mover: C. Cuddington

 Seconder: K. Horvey

 **CARRIED: MOTION 21.007**

 3.1.2.3 IFD Reg Bylaw 18 Specialized Procedures

 3.1.2.3.1 Specialized Procedures Bylaw Separate

 3.1.2.3.2 Specialized Procedures Bylaws integrated

**Motion: That Council approve the Regulatory Bylaw #18 amendment as attached to proceed to membership consultation**

 Mover: K. Mueller

 Seconder: A. Crow

 **CARRIED: MOTION 21.008**

 3.1.2.4 IFD Reg Bylaw 12- Prof Liability Insurance

 3.1.2.4.1 Prof Liability Insurance Draft Bylaws

Discussion

* One amendment was done last year. More research was done and recommendation now to add amendment. We have discussed counselling for sexual abuse victims. It needs to be included in legislation in order for insurance to cover it, as such, we have not included this in the bylaw amendments at this time. CPA coverage is up to 10 years after employment (if having been covered with them for 2 years). Council asks if this will limit options for physical therapists to go with different insurance providers? EDR says no, most insurers offer tail end insurance. In Saskatchewan, only three different insurers are currently being used by membership.

**Motion: That Council approve the Regulatory Bylaw #12 amendment as attached with 12 a) iii) included.**

 Mover: K. Horvey

 Seconder: K. Mueller

 **CARRIED: MOTION 21.009**

3.1.3 Membership Consultation Process for Bylaw Amendments

Discussion:

* Should we be sending out to membership with significant time to review before AGM? If the legislative review goes through, the membership will no longer vote on bylaws. It will benefit membership engagement to send out a survey on the amendment stating the reasons and whether members agree/disagree, for example. Council discusses thoughts on this plan. SMA process is similar. There is no risk in sharing and a potential benefit for membership.

**ACTION 3.1.3 B. Green to develop new membership bylaw amendment engagement procedure and documents.**

3.1.7. Member asking to appeal to remit their late fees.

Discussion:

* A member has submitted an appeal to remit their late fees. SHA is the employer, and the employee thought their employer had paid the dues on time. Registration committee reviewed and their recommendation is for Council to accept the appeal. The member did their due diligence in getting registered on time and had received an email from the employer confirming receipt of the invoice submission. Discussion on who is responsible for getting the fees paid and concerns if employers figure out that we don’t charge late fees they may not pay on time. Committee discussed, and it’s the members responsibility, however, this person had taken all the necessary steps (they received an email from employer saying ’Thanks’ and as such assumed it was completed). EDR confirmed you can see on our website if your fees have been paid but this member was somehow missed on the warning email list at the end of February from In1touch. At the May meeting we may want to consider whether we should be accepting fees directly from employers (SHA).

**Motion: To approve the Registration committee recommendation to accept the appeal to remit member’s late fees.**

 Mover: K. Mueller

 Seconder: K. Horvey

 **CARRIED: MOTION 21.010**

**ACTION 3.1.7 Registration committee to review the acceptance of registration fees from employers.**

3.1.4 CAPR Board Nominee for 2021/2022

**Motion: Nominate Dale Pitura to be the SCTP CAPR Board nominees.**

 Mover: C. Cuddington

 Seconder: J. Hunchak

 Abstained: D. Pitura

 **CARRIED: MOTION 21.011**

 3.1.5 Disciplinary Website Posting Policy

 3.1.5.1 Current Discipline Positing Policy

 Discussion:

* EDR discovered procedure for posting disciplinary action for members has been inconsistent. With respect to what other Colleges do, Merrilee’s response was there is a wide range (i.e., all information, a summery etc.). The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Sask post the full report but redact anything identifying the complainant. DC chair’s opinion was to post the full report as it is more transparent and have it indefinitely posted. DC committee feels if the whole report was posted it should be redacted (regardless of who the complainant is) but feels the summary report should give enough information to the public. Of note, an out of province regulator reviewing these may not be able to see sufficient details if only the summary is posted. If not posting full report, the full report will still be on *members only* portion of the file, just not publicly searchable. Council member states full transparency is best, similar to College of Physicians and Surgeons. Public rep’s both stated the note at the bottom of the Discipline posting policy should be removed. EDR reminds Council that the report is shared to Council before posting (after PCC and DC have completed and reviewed the report). EDR follows through with procedure afterwards.
* Council member states the quick read through at the meetings isn’t sufficient time for editing. EDR states DC and PCC will identify if there is a controversial issue. Posting full text with redaction required but sees certain situations that in which full report posting may not be appropriate. May be an incidence where a legal recommendation would be to not post in order to protect the complainant (ie: if the situation occurred in a small rural area where the complainant could be easily identified from the circumstances surrounding the complaint).

**ACTION 3.1.5.1 B. Green to update posted DC information in public profile of Members to align with new motion (full text of cases with redacted information).**

**Motion: EDR to post full text report of discipline cases with redated complainant information.**

Mover: J. Hunchak

Seconder: C. Cuddington

**MOTION 21.012**

 3.1.6 Letter from Coalition

 3.1.6.1 Letter from Coalition of Physical Rehabilitation Centres of Saskatchewan

 Discussion:

* The letter, as provided, did not reflect intent. Out of the discussion of EDR and Coalition representatives came the plan for the Coalition to update their own practice standards to include the informed consent information but wanted to know if the College would develop a secondary/tertiary specific standard. It was clarified that if a thorough informed consent at the beginning of secondary/tertiary program is completed that their continued attendance was implied consent and the patient could continue or discontinue at any time. Coalition had concerns about risk of complaints or the PCC finding additional documentation issues during a complaint from a secondary/tertiary patient situation. Currently, a quarter of the complaints to the College have been secondary/tertiary but none were relating to consent. Council member is concerned that this group has standards that she was unaware of. EDR states their standards are more like practice guidelines and not regulatory standards. EDR is unsure of how the Coalition shares this information. EDR said the understanding is they do the secondary tertiary negotiations and the standards are based on this agreement between these groups. Discussion around specific standards for subgroups. Council feels it is a slippery slope; we are mandated to protect the public and that should be our focus.
* A second issue from this letter was brought forward. Coalition is concerned that there is not always a member with a specialized skillset on the PCC or DC relating to the complaint. Right now, we don’t have a peer review step in our investigations process. President is asking if the PCC would be researching areas they aren’t sure about. Currently, there is no formal process for this. The PCC documents do indicate that they can access whatever resources are needed to ensure appropriate investigation of the case. Member disagrees and feels that someone with sufficient experience in a specialized area (i.e. pelvic health) should be mandated to participate in a specialized area complaint. PCC is peer review and if they aren’t knowledgeable, they should be for assistance from whatever sources are necessary. EDR stating we need to clarify the process and the ability to access help. Concerns about ‘not knowing what you don’t know’. EDR states it is challenging to recruit volunteers for the PCC, so having multiple specialists on the committee is not a reasonable expectation. Concerns discussed about some specialty areas being small to access someone for committee and possible delays and if the complaint is about a general practice concern (i.e. charting) but is a specialized PT. Do we trust the committees will search for information when they need it? EDR states our role is to ensure the committee knows the option for consultation is available and ensuring membership knows this option is available.

**ACTION 3.1.6.1 B. Green to provide educational article for the Momentum regarding Consent Standard of Practice requirements.**

1. Items for Vision

4.1 Governance

4.1.1. Cultural Humility

 4.1.1.1 Inclusion and Diversity Policy

Discussion:

* Reviewed updated guiding principle wording options. Discussion around the benefit of the short and concise provided description of ‘We are committed to diversity within all aspects of our organization.’

**Motion: to add to the Guiding Principles and approve ‘the inclusion and diversity’ component as circulated.**

Mover: J. Hunchak

Seconder: D. Pitura

**MOTION 21.013**

**ACTION 4.1.1.1 B. Green to include updated Inclusion and Diversity Policy in the Guiding Principles.**

4.1.2 Board Diversity Recruitment Process

 4.1.2.1 Privileged Perspective PowerPoint

Discussion:

* Presented IFD discussed. EDR stated she was in a CIHI (Canadian Institute of Health Information) meeting last week and this group is considering the addition of a question around diversity to their annual data collection requirements. Any self identification would have to be voluntary. Concerns about collection of data and often there is a feeling of safety relating to professional impact. Council needs to proceed with caution regarding the information and what the purpose of collection is. Need to be transparent with membership about why we are asking for information. Council needs to be diligent with the value of the information and that we are asking for only pertinent information. Council needs to be thoughtful about collecting information without having a plan for how we want to specifically utilize it.
* President states this information would be voluntary and then go to GNC to help with recruitment/nominations. We need to ensure appropriate protection of the data. University programs are collecting this information. EDR states CIHI is looking into the legality of this information collection. Is this information for statistical understanding or for shoulder tapping for recruitment purposes? More work will be done on this at a national level. No regulators are collecting right now but if we all start to collect this data, we would want to ensure it’s the same as other jurisdictions. We need to project to the public we are safe and welcoming. Once CIHI decides on their required information it will be easier for Council to develop a plan. GNC will keep working on this. BC and Alberta have made public statements that their Councils value diversity and are seeking diversity in Council and committees.

**ACTION 4.1.2.1 B. Green to look into how other colleges recruit diversity for their Councils and committees.**

4.1.3 Board Evaluation

Discussion:

- November 2019, we first implemented the Sarc Elevate and Council completed the self evaluation questionnaire. For Zoom, what is the best format? Email it out to fill out and send back? Make a survey monkey questionnaire?

**ACTION 4.1.3 B. Green to circulate board evaluation questions using survey monkey and circulate to Council.**

4.1.4 Risk Round Table

Discussion:

* Council previously had been doing a Risk Round table at the end of Council meetings. Important to continue with this in some form. Discussed options including adding a question to survey monkey.
* Question in survey monkey (whatever it is) seems best and to let it morph from there.

**ACTION 4.1.4 B. Green to add a risk question in the survey monkey and circulate to Council.**

1. Meeting Summary

5.1 Action Plan Review; Momentum/Website

Discussion:

* Next Momentum will be sent out after this Council meeting. Articles will include yoga billing, article of practice hours, article about supervisory agreements consent article, renewal update, PCE exam, into new practice advisor and posting of EDR recruitment plan.

ACTION list

**ACTION 2.1.2.1- B Green to send Council an update on how March sitting of the virtual PCE goes after feedback from students, examiners, and/or CAPR is provided.**

**ACTION 2.1.2.3.1- B. Green to send survey results and summary request to Communication committee. Communication committee will write sensitive and detailed articles balancing transparency and information of Membership and Professional Corp. Surveys. The articles will be brought back to Council to review with the intention of the information to be shared with the membership.**

**ACTION 2.1.2.3.1- B. Green to approach various stakeholders to have a working group discussion on the data from the tele rehabilitation questionnaire.**

**ACTION 2.1.3 Dale to send PCE review committee’s PowerPoint to EDR to share with membership as an eblast.**

**ACTION 2.1.5.2 Finance to review the operational reserve fund policy (based on previous one year of expenses presently).**

**ACTION 3.1.1.1 B. Green to reach out to search firms to get 2021 quotes and confirm an executive search firm for recruitment for the EDR position.**

**ACTION 3.1.1.1 B. Green to send email asking for membership interest in joining the EDR hiring committee.**

**ACTION 3.1.3 B. Green to develop new membership bylaw amendment engagement procedure and documents.**

**ACTION 3.1.7 Registration committee to review the acceptance of registration fees from employers.**

**ACTION 3.1.5.1 B. Green to update posted DC information in public profile of Members to align with new motion (full text of cases with redacted information).**

**ACTION 3.1.6.1 B. Green to provide educational article for the Momentum regarding Consent Standard of Practice requirements.**

**ACTION 4.1.1.1 B. Green to include updated Inclusion and Diversity Policy in the Guiding Principles.**

**ACTION 4.1.2.1 B. Green to look into how other colleges recruit diversity for their Councils and committees.**

**ACTION 4.1.3 B. Green to circulate board evaluation questions using survey monkey and circulate to Council.**

**ACTION 4.1.4 B. Green to add a risk question in the survey monkey and circulate to Council.**

* 1. Closing Comments; Plan for April Education Session; Next Meeting: May 29, 2021

Education session will be in the evening, approximately for an hour. EDR will send doodle to figure out date.

5.3 Adjournment at 1:54pm

President \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_June 6, 2021\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_



Secretary \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date \_\_\_\_\_June 3, 2021\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_