



CITIZEN ADVISORY GROUP MEETING REPORT

Saturday, May 4, 2019

9:30 am – 3:30 pm

Facilitated by: Misha Glouberman

College of Physiotherapists of Ontario
Suite 800 – 375 University Ave
Toronto, ON M5G 2J5

A G E N D A

Item	Topic	Page
1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	<p>PUBLIC REGISTER</p> <p><i>Finding Information on CASLPO's Public Register of Audiologists (AUDs) and Speech-Language Pathologists (SLPs): What's Easy, What's Hard and What Could Help?</i></p> <p>Sponsoring Partnership Member: College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists</p>	6
3	<p>NEW PROCESS FOR APPOINTING DIRECTORS TO COLLEGES' BOARD OF DIRECTORS</p> <p><i>Feedback on Adopting a New Process for Appointing Directors to Colleges' Boards of Directors</i></p> <p>Sponsoring Partnership Members: College of Dental Hygienists of Ontario College of Massage Therapists of Ontario College of Nurses of Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario</p>	8
4	WRAP UP	13

IN ATTENDANCE

Citizen Advisory Group Members	12 participants	
Facilitator	Misha Glouberman	
Partnership Chair	Lisa Pretty	College of Physiotherapists of Ontario (CPO)
Partnership Coordinator	Olivia Kisil	College of Physiotherapists of Ontario (CPO)
Sponsoring Partnership Representatives	Lisa Gibson	College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario (CASLPO)
	Sarah Chapman-Jay	
	Tracey Sobers	College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (CPSO)
	Courtney Brown	
	Rosanne Jabbour Suzanne Amiel	College of Nurses of Ontario (CNO)
	Angie Brennand	College of Massage Therapists of Ontario
	Lisa Taylor	College of Dental Hygienists of Ontario
Note Taker	Carol Ann Burrell	

1. INTRODUCTION

Meeting facilitator Misha Glouberman opened the meeting by welcoming the participants and introducing himself to the group. He described his role in the meeting and outlined the agenda for the day.

a. GENERAL UPDATE AND FOLLOW-UP FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Lisa Pretty, CAG Partnership Chair and Communications Director at CPO explained that previous group feedback had indicated that the group would benefit from hearing how their meeting input was being used and/or implemented. She shared the following information:

- College of Naturopaths of Ontario – Patients’ Rights poster – it was noted that the College representatives took away a lot of helpful feedback and have since successfully launched the poster
- College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario – a formal strategy around more meaningful patient engagement has been included as one of the priorities in the College’s proposed strategic plan
- College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario – two public consultations are underway including one that examines alternative medicine policy – the survey closes May 6; however, feedback may also be submitted by email
- The Colleges expressed their thanks to the participants for continuing to provide very valuable feedback

b. PARTICIPANT INTRODUCTIONS

Introductions – Part I

By a show of hands, it was determined that participants in today’s meeting are a combination of first-time and returning group members.

CAG members were organized into smaller break-out groups to:

- Introduce themselves and discuss what they are hoping will come out of today’s meeting and how they hope to contribute
- Discuss what has been most rewarding and/or challenging about participating in the group

Following discussion in the break-out groups, participants were asked what thoughts and observations came up in the group, if there were any questions that didn’t come up in the small groups, or what feedback was shared about participating in the CAG.

Introductions – Part II

Each of the group participants then introduced themselves to the whole group and provided context to their reasons for participating, including:

- Personal learning, understanding and enrichment
- Voicing their opinion and providing feedback as a patient and/or caregiver to make a difference
- Professional development and interest

c. INTRODUCTION OF SPONSORING PARTNERSHIP REPRESENTATIVES IN ATTENDANCE

The sponsoring partnership representatives introduced themselves and explained that they were in attendance in order to hear feedback from the group first-hand, as well as provide clarity and answer questions if necessary:

d. REVIEW OF GOALS AND OUTCOMES

Goals for the CAG:

- Get (re)introduced
- Provide feedback to the Colleges on the questions in the pre-reading
- Continue to become more effective as a group
- Be heard and valued by the Colleges

Confidentiality Policy:

- “We are adults”
- Participants should share with the group what they are comfortable sharing
- Outside of the group, participants can share information learned during the meetings in a broad sense, but should not share specifics (i.e. names of individuals)

Hopes for the future of the CAG:

- Continue to get feedback from the College (are the group's suggestions useful, workable?)
- Know the approximate timing of the next meeting
- Making a difference by contributing to good care, including the patient voice, seeing improvements/suggestions put into place (or knowing why if they weren't)
- Develop a concrete mandate and mission
- Representatives from the group will attend Council meetings

What went well at the last meeting:

- Sharing of diverse ideas
- Good group
- Respectful interaction
- Camaraderie
- Input from the College representatives
- Combination of large group and small group discussions
- Misha was effective
- Smaller room made the experience more intimate
- Fast pace

What could be done differently/the CAG's aspirations:

- More meetings
- More supportive to the Colleges
- Understand pressures better
- Have the group become a more formal entity with organizational capacity
- Less Toronto-centric
- Clearer information

2. PUBLIC REGISTER

Finding Information on CASLPO's Public Register of Audiologists (AUDs) and Speech-Language Pathologists (SLPs): What's Easy, What's Hard and What Could Help?

Sponsoring Partnership Member: College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario (CASLPO)

a. WHEN WOULD YOU USE THE CASLPO REGISTER AND WHAT IS THE USEFULNESS OF THIS TOOL?

- To find an AUD or SLP, but only if a patient knew the register existed
- If a friend recommends an AUD or SLP, you might use the register to look them up
- If you had a bad feeling about the referred audiologist
- To compare and decide which AUD or SLP you prefer, especially if you are a long-term patient
- To search for audiologists or/and speech-language pathologists that have a certain specialty
- Some people might use the register automatically because they are familiar with registers on other Colleges' sites
- If a family doctor refers you to an AUD or SLP for an assessment, you might not think to use the register unless you are already familiar with College registers (i.e. not a "typical" patient) or you are going to receive treatment
 - A CASLPO representative clarified that anyone can go to an audiologist without a doctor's referral

The group was asked if they would use the register to look up an AUD or/and SLP:

7 out of 11 said they would use the register

b. HOW EASY WAS IT TO FIND AN AUDIOLOGIST OR SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST?

- Could have been easier – advanced search had sub-categories that made it appear as if they needed to be completed to do a search
- Difficulty finding the register – website was busy
- Couldn't find the name at first – went back to find it – took 10 minutes of searching
- If you search by name, it was easy
- If you search by postal code, the tool didn't work

c. WHAT DO YOU THINK COULD BE CHANGED TO MAKE THIS TOOL MORE USEFUL?

- Position this link to "find an audiologist or speech-language pathologist" more prominently at the top of the website home page - the website was busy-looking
- Change practitioner to "audiologist or speech-language pathologist"
- The search form felt messy, didn't like the font; make it more pleasing to the eye and more user-friendly – "make it less awful"
- Complaints about a practitioner need to be more prominent – not in a sub-tab
- Need to have less tabs and links – keep information all on one page/tab

- Create a neater browsing experience – don’t allow so many tabs to open
- If searching someone – want to know about conduct problem right away – don’t want to search for it
- Search needs to be flexible: one search option if you know the name of the practitioner and another search option if you don’t have a name of the practitioner
- Black, white and grey colours are not pleasing to look at – the register should have the look and feel of the main website
- Make it easy to find a practitioner near me (not necessarily just practitioners in my region or postal code) – don’t use geographical borders but if you do, make sure these borders are updated – better to allow searches by a certain distance from me (based on address or postal code)
- Visually separate the list of professionals from each other in the search result
- Discipline info is on a grey background – usually grey backgrounds indicate the info is disabled or not accessible – but this info was active – this was confusing
- Would be ideal to have a one-stop shop to search for a practitioner from any of the Colleges or make the search engines of each College very similar and more standardized

d. TOP THREE MOST IMPORTANT IDEAS TO IMPROVE THE REGISTER?

The group was asked to choose their top three choices from among the following ideas for CASLPO to improve the register:

Ideas	Votes
More prominent link on main page of website	6
Able to find a practitioner by distance from me (not just in my region)	6
Complaints need to be more apparent	6
Search experience more user-friendly and pleasing to the eye	4
All info in one tab/view	2
Clearer search tasks – 1) if you have a name 2) if you don’t have a name	2
Don’t allow new browser tabs to open	2
Change the grey colour scheme	1
One site to search for practitioners from all Colleges	1
Standardized search engines across College sites	1
Lists need to be numbered	0

3. NEW PROCESS FOR APPOINTING DIRECTORS TO COLLEGES' BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

Feedback on Adopting a New Process for Appointing Directors to Colleges' Boards of Directors

Sponsoring Partnership Members: College of Dental Hygienists of Ontario
 College of Massage Therapists of Ontario
 College of Nurses of Ontario
 College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario

a. WHY DOES HOW DIRECTORS ARE APPOINTED TO COLLEGES' BOARDS OF DIRECTORS MATTER? WHY DOES IT MATTER WHO IS ON THE BOARD AND HOW THEY ARE CHOSEN?

- It matters, but it doesn't necessarily matter to the general public
- Practitioners are accountable to patients – it's about public accountability and trust
- Affects priorities and what the Boards do
- Affects the professions and impacts how people are treated
- There is a trickle-down; it reflects the integrity of the College
- Shapes the way the College behaves

The group was asked if they had enough information to provide informed feedback on this subject matter:

7 of 11 said yes

b. WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF A PROCESS FOR APPOINTING DIRECTORS TO A COLLEGE'S BOARD?

- A cross-section of professional diversity
- Directors must be impartial – no conflicts of interest, no axe to grind – in the interest of transparency/fairness
- Consider the balance of having directors who have agendas and the bodies they represent
- If directors are elected, they likely have an agenda and it's political – the Colleges need to decide if a director having an agenda is OK; sometimes it is
- Appointed directors are less likely to have a constituency to which they are accountable
- Directors don't have to be from the profession – could be people with other types of expertise (finance, strategic planning, safety, etc.)
- Diversity of experience (i.e. those with lived experience, caregivers, people with chronic illnesses) – should be recognized and valued as a competency or expertise of sorts
- Stagger and limit number of directors' terms
- Transparency – “don't appoint directors behind closed doors” – openness about the recruitment and selection process (including promotion, sending out notices, knowing how to apply) is needed and builds trust – “if you don't know what is going on, you assume the worst”
- Continuously revisit governance structure because circumstances change

- It’s good to have a few ex-officio directors (those who can’t vote) who have expertise, knowledge and experience to share

c. TOP TWO MOST IMPORTANT ASPECTS FOR APPOINTING DIRECTORS TO A COLLEGE’S BOARD?

From among the following, the group was asked to choose their TOP TWO most important aspects for appointing directors to a College’s board:

Ideas	Votes
A cross-section of professional diversity in terms of having a balance of elected and appointed directors, and directors with outside expertise (i.e. finance)	6
Lived experience as a patient, caregiver, people with chronic illnesses	8
Best practices with respect to term limits, staggering terms, ex-officio directors, continuously revisiting governance structure, etc.	4
Accessible & transparent process through promotion, notice of recruitment and selection process, information on how to apply, etc.	5
Merit (i.e. knowledge and expertise to do the job)	0

d. CONTEXT AND CLARITY REGARDING THE PROPOSED CHANGES

- To put the proposed changes in context, College representatives reviewed the pre-reading on pages 6 – 8
- The current board composition and appointment/election process was briefly explained, and the proposed new process was summarized
- It was expressed that there is currently a focus on professional interest instead of public interest when it comes to board slates – most often, directors from the profession are elected rather than elected – candidates are usually members who have free time and are available to serve, but are not necessarily the best candidates to meet the College’s leadership needs
- It was noted that in the proposed model, it would be the Board’s responsibility to replace directors when they conclude their term and/or retire from the board
- With the new process, a needs assessment and a gap analysis would guide the standing committee to recruit and recommend candidates who meet the identified needs and criteria for appointment by the board
- This proposed change was initiated by the Colleges themselves and the need to have specific and appropriate knowledge and skills from among board members (i.e. strategic planning expertise) in order to more effectively fulfill their mandate
- Colleges have little input into who the government appoints to their boards and public appointees often change upon the election of new governments
- In College language, “diversity” refers to having a variety of professional skills and competencies, so it important to clarify if the group understands diversity to mean something different – group members generally indicated that they concurred with this definition
- One group member commented that having “diversity of perspectives” is another way to understand how the public might perceive what diversity of professional skills and competency means

e. IN TERMS OF SOME OF THE CHANGES PROPOSED ON HOW BOARDS ARE SELECTED, WHAT ARE THE THINGS THAT MOST CONCERN YOU AND ARE IMPORTANT TO YOU?

- Remuneration for service is important because directors may be taken away from their practice or jobs – there was concern that they may not be paid enough to make the commitment
 - *It was explained that doctors get paid to be on the board - doctors and members of the public are paid a half day or a daily rate, plus out-of-pocket expenses - the public rate is set by the government and is a different rate than for professional members*
- Who oversees changing the rules? – rules or laws need to exist to make board structural changes
 - *It was explained that the Colleges are not concerned about how the changes are made; they asked that the group assume that the regulations can be changed*
- The government needs to be willing to make these changes
- The Colleges must have the ability to recruit people they need but it's hard to find people with the right skills
- Is the board structural change and process sustainable over the longer-term?
- If the size of the board is reduced size, there could be too much work for directors
- Will there be adequate public representation? Need to consider the lived experience perspective, people living in urban and rural areas, those with chronic illnesses, the indigenous perspective, the caregiver point of view, etc. – there was concern that all the different perspectives will not be adequately represented and heard
- Will fewer professional board members (who have the knowledge and expertise to do the job) be able to adequately serve and sit on committees
- The process needs to be open and clear about what kinds of skills and competencies are needed on the board from year to year
- There could be public directors who bring multiple perspectives and competencies – for example, an accountant with a lived experience as a patient
- The process needs to be transparent so that both College members and the public know it is happening
- More thought needs to be given to creating awareness about the policies, process, public director positions and advertising vacancies on the board – this info may be posted on websites, but something is missing because it is not well-known
- Transparency is important to the process – but what is being proposed is a change to the process, not the transparency of the process – that is already happening and wouldn't change
- For the future, transparency must continue to be important in the new process – for example, Colleges should post Board vacancies on their website – people don't know these possible vacancies exist

f. WHAT IF THE COLLEGES SET UP THEIR OWN SYSTEM FOR RECRUITING PUBLIC MEMBERS OF THE BOARD (INSTEAD OF WHAT HAPPENS NOW, WHICH IS THE GOVERNMENT RECRUITS AND SELECTS THESE DIRECTORS)?

- Colleges know better than government what kind of directors they need
- A focus on diversity is important
- As long as the board is 50% professionals / 50% public
- Do all Colleges, small and large, have the capacity to take on this responsibility successfully?

- Moving away from government appointments is a good idea (the group was unanimous on this) because the government changes frequently; giving the Colleges the responsibility of recruiting public members of their boards would improve continuity, as well as reduce partisanship and instability
- Without government involvement in board appointments, it is even more important that public representation is given adequate consideration and importance
- With the new system, be careful to avoid tunnel vision within the organization (“organizational bias”)
- Need to work out who will remunerate board members – Colleges and/or government
- Consider a hybrid model where the government creates a public pool of candidates and then Colleges choose from that pool to meet their needs

g. DO YOU HAVE CONFIDENCE THAT THE PROPOSED PROCESS (AS OUTLINED IN THE PRE-READING ON PAGES 5 – 6) WILL RESULT IN THE APPOINTMENT OF DIVERSELY QUALIFIED BOARD MEMBERS? WHY OR WHY NOT?

The group was asked if the proposed changes to the board selection process would
1) make things better OR 2) not make things better:

6 said the changes would makes things better

4 said the changes would not make things better

What the group likes about the proposed changes:

- Smaller feels better/streamlined
- Removes potential bias or possible agendas – real or perceived
- Feels more transparent
- Better represents the public
- Important how it is implemented – there are assumptions – need to take a leap of faith that it will work
- Could be more effective if Colleges have the people they need on their boards

Concerns the group has about the changes:

- Independence of Colleges – watch out for becoming a “closed shop” and limiting change for the future – new process needs to safeguard against this
- Removing government involvement doesn’t necessarily solve problems related to transparency and improving public representation
- Smaller colleges might not have capacity to cope with the new model (i.e. financial remuneration for directors or ability to recruit directors with suitable skills and competencies) Colleges know better, but they may not have the capacity to implement the changes successfully
- Overall, the changes are probably for the better – just might need to adapt the process; acknowledge and address the concerns to have full confidence in the process
- Having more details about the proposed process would give group members more confidence that the new process will be better
- Suggestion to mitigate a “closed shop” scenario: one committee that does the needs assessment and gap analysis and another committee that recruits and assesses the candidates

- Concern was raised that not all Colleges will be successful at recruiting directors with the external competencies needed (i.e. strategic planning, leadership, policy)
- Some professionals may feel that they have less of a voice and be unhappy about their lack of representation – it may cause problems
 - *A College representative noted that there are senior staff with certain professional expertise who are often available to advise boards on various issues*

h. WHO SHOULD BE ON THE COMMITTEE THAT RECOMMENDS NEW BOARD MEMBERS?

- Needs to have diverse sector representation (i.e. public, private, government)
- Competent people
- Do an external review of the committee and the board to evaluate their efficiency
- Ensure there is qualified governance support for the committee (not just a notetaker)
- Need people with a mix of skills (i.e. interviewing, organizational skills)
- 50/50 mix of professional and public members is good
- There needs to be turn-over among the committee members
 - *It was noted by one of the College representatives that this would be a standing committee of the board*
- Have two committees: one committee that does the needs assessment and gap analysis and another committee that recruits and assesses the candidates

The College of Physicians and Surgeons then proposed the following question to the group:

i. WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT A HYBRID MODEL, WHERE SOME DIRECTORS ARE APPOINTED AND SOME ARE ELECTED (INSTEAD OF APPOINTING THROUGH A NOMINATIONS PROCESS)?

- *A College representative explained that elections are a way to engage members in their own College and how their profession is regulated*

The group was asked if the hybrid model is a good idea:

3 said this was a good idea
7 or 8 said they didn't know

- Confused about it – why try to maintain duality? – it creates layers of confusion – what is the advantage? The motivation? What problems does it solve?
- “Not sure the pain is worth the gain”
- It depends on how many professionals are involved
- Might create tiers of representation; the elected directors may feel they are entitled to more of a say
- It would encourage people to get involved
- This model should still allow professional members to express interest in being nominated
 - *The College representatives asked if there a perception that doctors who are elected are representing a geographic constituency*
 - *The group said this is what they understood*
 - *It was clarified that this is not the case – duty to represent a constituency does not apply; the director’s duty is to the general public*

The group was asked if
1) all directors should be appointed OR 2) there is a need to have some directors elected:

7 said to appoint all directors
4 said there is a need to have some directors elected

Why is there a need to have them elected?

- Seems fairer, more democratic
- There would be a bigger pool of potential candidates
- Suggested ideas: 1) have professionals vote on the candidates who are submitted to the nominations committee and the committee/board appoint 2) professionals express interest in being appointed and the committee/board vote on who is selected
 - *College representatives shared that that only 10 – 15% of members vote in board elections*
- After hearing this information, one of the group members – who initially said that some directors should be elected – changed their mind and said that all directors should be appointed
- Whether to have all directors appointed, or some appointed and some elected, depends on what the desired outcome is (i.e. more diversity or engaging members)

4. WRAP-UP

Group participants were asked to provide feedback on the following questions:

What went well at today's meeting:

- Lots of valuable interaction with the College representatives
- Good cross-section of ideas
- Everyone spoke up
- Discussion didn't stray off topic
- Overall process worked well, captured spectrum of opinions and helped group come to consensus
- Respectful
- Smaller groups worked well, not as intimidating
- Friendly and open-minded participants
- Started slowly but thanks to interaction, it picked up
- Misha did a great job of keeping on topic and on time
- Helpful to get clarity from the College representatives when necessary
- College representatives were patient with participants
- Process was flexible enough to allow discussion that brings maximum benefit
- Lots of honesty
- Lots of depth on topics
- Colleges got information they needed
- Misha asked helpful, probing questions

What could have been done differently at today's meeting, or could be done differently next time?

- Knowing about the 10% election turn-out changed the context of the discussion – this info was needed upfront – “why ask about this?” – this was a source of frustration for the group
- More information upfront – group felt a little under-informed – answers would have been different if they had more information in the pre-reading
- Survey results in the pre-reading exercise were not shared – would have liked to see the results
- Reading should be appropriate for the subject matter
- Can't assume group knows the governance models of College boards – an appendix with additional optional reading would have been helpful
- Colleges could do a brief introduction at the beginning of the meeting to provide context and background on why they are seeking feedback on the specific agenda topics
- Misha commented that he could have done some of the synthesis beforehand with the Colleges to drill down to the core goals of the feedback
 - *Lisa Pretty commented that initially feedback from the CAG was that there was too much pre-reading, and having an in-house expert during the meeting to consult with, was a good tactic for providing supplementary information – however, today's topic was more complex than usual and there was an appreciation that more information was needed – it's a challenge to know how much information to provide since the Colleges don't know how many of the 60 group members will attend*

The participants were thanked for their valued time and feedback. The meeting concluded at 3:57 pm.