



Pilot Phase Report and Proposal

HPDT
Health Professions
Discipline Tribunals



TDPS
Tribunaux de discipline
des professions de la santé



Table of contents

GLOSSARY	4
INTRODUCTION	5
The OPSDT	5
The HPDT Pilot	6
This Report	6
PART I – THE MODEL AND THE PILOT	7
Background	8
The New Model: Core Components	12
Implementing the Pilot	22
PART II – FEEDBACK AND DATA	25
Qualitative Feedback	26
Quantitative Measures	29
PART III -- NEW MODEL	34
Principles	34
Proposal for the HPDT	35



Glossary

The terminology used at different Health Colleges and at different times varies. For readability, we have used consistent terminology as follows.

Board	“Council” under the Code
CASLPO	College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario
HPDT or OPSDT Chair	Chair of the Ontario Physicians and Surgeons Discipline Tribunal and Chair or Co-Chair of the Pilot Tribunals, currently David Wright
CMC	Case Management Conference
CMTO	College of Massage Therapists of Ontario
Code	Health Professions Procedural Code, Schedule 2 to the RHPA
CPSO	College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario
CRPO	College of Registered Psychotherapists of Ontario
Discipline Tribunal	A discipline committee or tribunal under the Code
Experienced Adjudicator	Individuals with at least five years of experience as an adjudicator, recruited through a competitive process and appointed to the OPSDT and Pilot Tribunals
HPDT	Health Professions Discipline Tribunals, currently the OPSDT, ORPDT, and the Discipline Committees of CMTO and CASLPO
OPSDT	Ontario Physicians and Surgeons Discipline Tribunal, which is the Discipline Committee of the CPSO
ORPDT	Ontario Registered Psychotherapists Discipline Tribunal, which is the Discipline Committee of the CRPO
Parties	The parties to a discipline proceedings are the College (the prosecutor) and the registrant (the defence)
Pilot Colleges	CASLPO, CMTO and CRPO
Pilot Tribunals	The Discipline Committees of CMTO and CASLPO and the ORPDT
Registrant	A “member” under the Code
RHPA	<i>Regulated Health Professions Act</i>
Tribunal Office	The department within CPSO that supports the OPSDT and HPDT
Tribunal Office Staff	Staff employed by CPSO who work on administration and case processing of HPDT matters, including the HPDT Chair and Tribunal Counsel.



Introduction

The OPSDT



Between 2021 and 2023, the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (CPSO) revamped its process for hearing and deciding allegations of professional misconduct and incompetence

referred for discipline hearings. The changes, reflecting best practices in administrative justice, have led to increased independence, higher participant and public confidence, dramatically shorter timelines and significant cost savings. Physician and public members hearing discipline cases have provided extremely positive feedback.

The significant components of the changes include:

- renaming the CPSO Discipline Committee the Ontario Physicians and Surgeons Discipline Tribunal (OPSDT) to signal independence and promote understanding of its work;
- appointing an independent full-time Chair to lead the OPSDT and the Tribunal Office, along with a part-time physician Vice-Chair;
- recruiting individuals with significant experience as adjudicators in other contexts to chair hearing panels, eliminating the need for independent legal counsel;
- instituting intensive case management in the pre-hearing phase, with case management conferences (CMCs) chaired by an experienced adjudicator;
- implementing a more streamlined scheduling process;
- modernizing the OPSDT's Rules of Procedure and Practice Directions to make them more plain language, flexible and values based;
- developing a separate website for the OPSDT, including detailed, plain-language guides to various OPSDT processes and other easily accessible and user-friendly resources;
- adopting a more contemporary, accessible reason-writing style and implementing a comprehensive reasons preparation and review policy with tightened timelines for completion;
- establishing a practice advisory group to gather feedback from lawyers who represent both the College and registrants;
- designing and implementing new, more robust training when new members are appointed and continuing education for all OPSDT members;
- emphasizing equity, diversity and inclusion in all we do.



These changes produced notable successes, including:

Shortened timelines across all stages of the process, including:



- releasing all reasons within our 84-day standard, with most completed sooner
- developing a 2024 key performance indicator of one year from referral to final decision, 80 percent of the time




Feedback from professional and public OPSDT members that hearing management by experienced adjudicator chairs allows them to better focus on the issues the panel must decide



Significant cost savings

A more diverse discipline tribunal membership



Positive feedback from all participants in the process and favorable comments from the courts



Ability to schedule uncontested hearings within weeks of parties' agreement

Greater transparency





The HPDT Pilot



In 2023, the OPSDT embarked on a pilot project together with the Colleges of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists (CASLPO), Massage Therapists (CMTO) and Registered Psychotherapists (CRPO) – the Health Professions Discipline Tribunals Pilot (HPDTP). The Pilot Colleges adopted core aspects of the model as implemented at the OPSDT. The Pilot Colleges appointed the experienced adjudicators that were initially recruited by the OPSDT to their Discipline Committees, and the HPDT Chair as the Chair or Co-Chair of their Discipline Committees. CPSO billed the Pilot Colleges for the work done on a non-profit basis.

The Pilot began in March 2023 at CMTO, April 2023 at CRPO and May 2023 at CASLPO. Initial agreements were for a one-year period. After the first year, the Pilot was extended until the end of December 2024 at all three Colleges.

There have been several differences between Pilot Colleges in implementation:


- At CMTO, only cases with allegations of sexual abuse were part of the Pilot stream; other cases continued under the existing system.
- At CASLPO, the Tribunal Office has handled case processing from the beginning of the Pilot. At CRPO, the Tribunal Office took over case processing in the spring of 2024. CMTO continues to do all its own case processing.
- CRPO, CASLPO and OPSDT harmonized their rules, forms, practice directions, guides, administrative processes and templates in the spring of 2024. CMTO continues to be distinct in these ways.



This Report

This report on the Pilot Phase is divided into three parts. The first provides the background to the Pilot and reports on what we did. The second presents participant feedback and some quantitative measures of our work. The third outlines the form of the proposed permanent organization, which is open to both existing participants and other Ontario Health Colleges to join in 2025.

We sought feedback from multiple individuals, including members of the Pilot Tribunals and OPSDT, Pilot College leadership, prosecution and defence counsel and staff supporting the Pilot Tribunals. We have also consulted with senior leadership of other Health Colleges not currently part of the Pilot. Unless attributed to others, the analysis in this report reflects the views and proposals of the Tribunal Office. Proposals on human resources, information technology and finances are on behalf of both the Tribunal Office and CPSO as the organization responsible for resources and contractual arrangements.



PART 1

The model and the pilot

The model and the pilot



BACKGROUND

Changing Expectations and New Challenges

Ontario's Health Professions Procedural Code¹ sets out regulatory processes that apply to all 26 of Ontario's Health Colleges, including establishing various committees. The Discipline and Fitness to Practise Committees are unique within the College structure, in that they are required to hold formal, quasi-judicial hearings to decide allegations referred to them by the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee.

Despite their name, Discipline Committees are administrative tribunals, a part of the justice system that decides far more disputes than the courts. They are required to hold quasi-judicial hearings in accordance with the principles of procedural fairness, write decisions and process cases effectively and efficiently. These are just some of the types of claims that tribunals address: rental housing disputes (Landlord and Tenant Board); entitlement to automobile insurance benefits (Licence Appeal Tribunal); allegations of discrimination in employment or services (Human Rights Tribunal); refugee claims (Immigration and Refugee Board), involuntary detention in psychiatric facilities (Consent and Capacity Board); and entitlement to Employment Insurance Benefits (Social Security Tribunal).

Like other parts of the administrative justice system, professional discipline tribunals are facing several challenges that have become more pronounced in recent years. One is scrutiny from the courts. Discipline decisions can be appealed by either party to the Divisional Court. Since the Supreme Court of Canada's 2019 decision in *Vavilov*,² discipline decisions no longer receive deference from the courts on questions of law; they must be correct. There is also greater scrutiny of tribunals' written reasons.

The court said in *Vavilov* that tribunals must adopt a "culture of justification" and demonstrate through reasons that their exercise of public power can be justified.³

The legal issues in discipline cases are becoming increasingly complex. Supreme Court decisions have clarified that parties may raise issues under the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*⁴ and the *Ontario Human Rights Code*⁵ before tribunals. Recent discipline cases have involved decisions on *Charter* claims of freedom of expression, unreasonable search and seizure and patient privacy.

There is also a marked increase, in both tribunals and courts, in the number of self-represented litigants. Tribunals have a duty to provide appropriate support and information to self-represented litigants in published materials, communications with tribunal staff and case management/pre-hearing conferences. Some litigants' and counsel's approach to litigation can lead to hearing management challenges.

Discipline Committees are administrative tribunals, a part of the justice system that decides far more disputes than the courts.

The legal issues in discipline cases are becoming increasingly complex.

¹ Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, S.O. 1991, c. 18.

² *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65.

³ Para. 14.

⁴ *Nova Scotia (Workers' Compensation Board) v. Martin; Nova Scotia (Workers' Compensation Board) v. Laseur*, 2003 SCC 54.

⁵ *Tranchemontagne v. Ontario (Director, Disability Support Program)*, 2006 SCC 14.



Finally, there are increased legal and societal expectations of transparency and accessibility. Best practice is now to write decisions using a more plain-language, non-formulaic, less legalistic approach so they are more understandable to the parties and the public. Recent court decisions have also found that the “open courts principle” requires that documents filed in tribunal proceedings be available to the public in a timely way, with limited exceptions. The use of on-line hearings that began with the pandemic and has continued since then has allowed the public, complainants, other registrants and the media to view hearings without travelling to downtown Toronto and sitting in a hearing room all day.

Tribunal Best Practices

The following are among the best practices in contemporary tribunal design⁶:

- merit-based appointment and reappointment processes, based on recommendations from the tribunal leadership;⁷
- expert leadership that sets direction through policy, process and decision writing, promoting consistency while respecting panels’ independence;
- tribunal independence, including fixed terms for adjudicators, removal of adjudicators during terms only for cause and separation from the prosecution in discipline tribunals;⁸
- a robust education program for adjudicators, both at the time of appointment and on an ongoing basis;
- plain language, values-based, flexible rules of procedure that allow procedures to adapt to the needs of a particular case;
- plain-language guides and practice directions to assist parties, witnesses and the public;
- issues-based, plain language reasons;⁹
- “decision review and release” policies to ensure high quality and timeliness;
- supports for self-represented litigants;¹⁰
- establishment of committees or roundtables for feedback from those who appear before the Tribunal;
- the use of case management, alternative dispute resolution and active adjudication to promote settlement and streamline hearings;¹¹
- attention to trauma-informed approaches to adjudication.

⁶ For examples of tribunal policies in these and other areas see the Council of Canadian Administrative Tribunals Tribunal Policies Repository: <https://www.ccat-ctac.org/tribunal-policies-repository/>

⁷ See the *Adjudicative Tribunals Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act*, S.O. 2009, c. 33, Sched. 5 (ATAGAA), which does not apply to professional discipline tribunals but is based on best practice.

⁸ See 2747-3174 *Québec Inc. v. Québec (Régie des permis d'alcool)*, [1996] 3 SCR 919.

⁹ See Ed Berry, *Writing Reasons: A Handbook for Judges*, 5th Edition, 2020.

¹⁰ See Canadian Judicial Council, *Statement of Principles on Self-represented Litigants and Accused Persons*, September 2006: <https://cjc-ccm.ca/sites/default/files/documents/2020/Final-Statement-of-Principles-SRL.pdf>; *Pintea v. Johns*, 2017 SCC 23; Michelle Flaherty and Morgan Teeple Hopkins, “Active Adjudication and Self-Represented Litigants: the Duties of Adjudicators” (2022) 35 *Canadian Journal of Administrative Law & Practice* 177.

¹¹ See Michelle Flaherty, “Best Practices in Active Adjudication” (2015) 28 *Canadian Journal of Administrative Law and Practice* 291.



Expertise in Adjudication and Tribunal Administration

Greater professionalization of administrative tribunals has led more people to build careers in administrative justice, resulting in a significant cadre of professionals with extensive experience in the area. Adjudicators often serve on more than one tribunal at the same time or in succession, working part-time in multiple roles and/or applying their experience in different contexts.

With regards to tribunal administration, over the last 15 years, governments have developed umbrella organizations for tribunals, in which they share resources, leadership and policies. Tribunals Ontario is made up of 14 different adjudicative tribunals with a common Executive Chair and Executive Director. Several tribunals have now been combined into the Ontario Land Tribunal. Federally, the Adjudicative Tribunals Support Service of Canada provides support services to 11 tribunals.

Combining Legal and Health Expertise

The OPSDT and Pilot Tribunals hear discipline cases in five-member panels that include an experienced adjudicator chair, two public members of the College's Board (as required under the Code), one professional member of the College's Board (also required under the Code) and one professional non-Board member. Panels of decision-makers such as this, consisting of experts in adjudication, health care professionals and members of the public are common in Canadian administrative justice.

For example, the Consent and Capacity Board decides a variety of applications, including those related to involuntary status in a psychiatric facility, findings of incapacity to consent to treatment, reviews of community treatment orders, admission to long term care, end-of-life care, capacity to make financial decisions, access to health and youth records, and certain communicable diseases. Its members include lawyers, psychiatrists, other physicians, nurses in the extended class and members of the public. It sits in panels of one, three or five members and multi-member panels must include a mixture of lawyers, health care professionals and public members. The legal member presides and prepares the written decision and the reasons for decision.

The Ontario Review Board and its counterparts in other provinces and territories make decisions about the detention or restrictions on individuals who have been found by a court to be either unfit to stand trial or not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder. Its members include lawyers, judges, retired judges, psychiatrists, psychologists and members of the public. Panels of five are made up of two legally trained members, two health professionals and a member of the public.

The Health Services Appeal and Review Board, which holds appeals, hearings and reviews concerning publicly insured health services under the Health Insurance Act and other hearings, is required to have both lawyers and medical professionals as members, and they may sit together on panels. The lawyer generally presides.

None of these tribunals regularly use independent legal counsel.

Other Professional Regulators

There are also various professional regulators that have panels combining legal experts and others without using independent legal counsel.

The Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia and Quebec have legally trained members sit on all panels and chair their discipline hearings, as do the College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants and the Electrical Safety Authority.

Beginning in 2013, the Law Society of Ontario implemented significant enhancements to its hearing process. This included establishing the Law Society Tribunal (LST) as a body with a separate identity from the Society. The LST has its own premises, website and logo along with an independent, full-time chair. Beginning in 2013, it recruited experienced adjudicators to serve on panels along with elected or appointed board members. Appointee lawyer members chair many but not all hearing panels and conduct most pre-hearing conferences. The panels include paralegal and public members sitting together with lawyers, without independent legal counsel.



The Goudge Report

In 2015, the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care asked Stephen Goudge, a former justice of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, to make recommendations about the complaint and hearing processes at the CPSO. His report recommended, among other things:

- that non-physician members with advanced dispute resolution skills be appointed to the Discipline Committee to deal with cases where a physician pre-hearing conference chair is not required, or where a non-physician pre-hearing conference chair might be more effective; and
- that legally trained persons, experienced in running hearings, be appointed to the Discipline Committee to chair hearing panels in non-clinical standards cases. He noted that would eliminate the need for independent legal counsel at those hearings.

THE NEW MODEL: CORE COMPONENTS

Leadership

OPSDT

The CPSO Board appointed David Wright as the Chair of the then Discipline Committee for a three-year term beginning in November 2020. He was renewed for a further five-year term beginning in November 2023.

A physician serves as Vice-Chair of the OPSDT: James Watters from 2020-2023 and Joanne Nicholson since 2023. The Vice-Chair's primary role has been to provide the Chair advice and feedback and to sit as a panel member on significant or difficult cases.



David Wright has been a full-time adjudicator for over 15 years, serving in senior leadership positions at adjudicative tribunals since 2009. Prior to his appointment at CPSO, he was the Chair of the Law Society Tribunal for over seven years, during which time he led the implementation of the reforms discussed above. Before that he was a Vice-Chair, Interim Chair

and Associate Chair at the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario as that tribunal implemented the reform of the human rights system and a new adjudicative model. David is bilingual, has been the Chair of the Council of Canadian Administrative Tribunals and is frequently asked to speak at conferences and to other tribunals. He has published several articles on administrative law and practice in peer-reviewed journals.

The OPSDT Chair is responsible for both adjudicative and administrative leadership. His appointment agreement protects his independence, under a structure that has been found by the Divisional Court to be appropriate:¹²

- He is appointed for a fixed term of three years and cannot be removed except for just cause. He must be provided with written reasons and an opportunity to make submissions to the Board if it is proposed that he be removed for cause. Similar provisions are included in the CPSO's agreements with the Pilot Colleges.
- He reports to the Registrar and Chief Executive Officer on operational or managerial issues and with respect to the Tribunal's goals, policies and processes.
- The agreement specifies that nothing in it is intended to prevent the OPSDT Chair from "making any decisions and expressing any opinions in the course of conducting proceedings and writing reasons as an adjudicator."

The OPSDT Chair assigns panels and sits as an adjudicator on CMCs and hearings. Since 2020, he has been case management chair for most files, and has sat regularly as a panel chair or as a single adjudicator deciding preliminary issues. He coordinates the educational programming for adjudicators and often delivers training himself. He and his team have proposed and implemented all aspects of the new model, including recruitment, preparation of policies, guides and practice directions, and the project to update the Rules of Procedure.

The OPSDT Chair has the administrative responsibilities of a director on operational matters like finance, information technology and human resources. The Tribunal Office staff report to him, and he is the final decision maker on matters of case processing. He attends CPSO Senior Leadership Team meetings occasionally, but only when there are operational matters that affect the Tribunal Office.

¹² *College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario v. Khan*, 2022 ONPSDT 23; *Kopyto v. The Law Society of Upper Canada*, 2016 ONSC 7545.



Pilot

The leadership model differed at each of the Pilot Colleges. As CMTO had a Pilot and a non-Pilot stream, two co-chairs were appointed. The HPDT Chair fulfills the Chair responsibilities for Pilot cases and a massage therapist – first Kim Westfall-Connor and then Bobbie Flint – exercised the responsibilities for the non-Pilot cases.

At CRPO, the HPDT Chair was appointed as Chair of the Discipline Committee when the Pilot started. In 2024, Shelley Briscoe-Dimock was appointed as Vice-Chair, reflecting the model at OPSDT.

At CASLPO, the HPDT Chair was appointed as Co-Chair of the Discipline Committee. The CASLPO Co-Chair, elected by the members of the Committee, appoints the two professional and two public members to each panel. This position has been held since the Pilot started by Kim Eskritt.

Recruitment of Adjudicators

We engaged in a rigorous process to select the five experienced adjudicators over the summer of 2021. At least five years of experience as an adjudicator was required, although those selected had considerably more experience.

Out of nearly 100 applicants, we selected 20 for interviews. The interview panel was made up of one public member and one professional member of the Discipline Committee, Tribunal Counsel and the OPSDT Chair. In addition to a structured, scenario-based interview, each interviewee was required to watch a video of a mock hearing and write a decision. The written decisions were subject to a blind evaluation, ensuring that the evaluators did not know who had written which decision. Another important consideration was diversity. Four of those selected are women, two are racialized, one is Franco-Ontarian and two can conduct hearings in French. Three live in Toronto, one in Niagara Region and one in the Ottawa Valley. Four have previous adjudicative experience in human rights and three have previous experience in professional discipline for other regulators.

A brief summary of some of their previous and current experience shows the cross-pollination in the tribunal sector. These adjudicators were appointed to the Pilot Tribunals for the Pilot period.



Raj Anand: Multiple adjudicative and public service roles including Chief Commissioner of the Ontario Human Rights Commission and member of the Law Society Tribunal (current). Raj led the working group that proposed the reform of adjudication at the Law Society and the creation of the Law Society Tribunal.



Shayne Kert: Alternate Chair of the Ontario Review Board (current); Alternate Chair of the Nunavut Review Board (current); member of the Law Society Tribunal; member of the Consent and Capacity Board.



Sherry Liang: Assistant Commissioner with the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario; Vice-Chair of the Ontario Labour Relations Board, the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario, and the Grievance Settlement Board.



Sophie Martel: Vice Chair of the Workplace Safety and Insurance Appeals Tribunal and the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario; workplace investigator; member of the Law Society Tribunal (current).



Jennifer Scott: Presiding Officer with the Office of the Chief Coroner; Associate Chair of the Child and Family Services Review Board, Custody Review Board and the Ontario Special Education Tribunals; Vice-Chair of the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario.

For their complete biographies, see <https://opsdt.ca/adjudicators>.



Building an Independent Identity

Renaming the Discipline Committee

The CPSO’s Board renamed the Discipline Committee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario the Ontario Physicians and Surgeons Discipline Tribunal through a by-law amendment. The OPSDT established its own web site (opsdt.ca) and logo.

The use of “Tribunal” identifies more accurately that we conduct open, formal hearings, rather than the type of work done and paper-based process typically used by committees. Given that the College as prosecutor is a party to every case before the Tribunal, the new identity underscores its independence from the College.

The CPSO received an outside legal opinion confirming that the renaming was not contrary to the Code. In accordance with that advice, key documents like

notices of hearing include the note that the OPSDT is the discipline committee established under the Health Professions Procedural Code. There have been no legal challenges to the change of name.

The only other Pilot College to change the name of its discipline committee thus far has been CRPO, in May 2024. It is now known as the Ontario Registered Psychotherapists Discipline Tribunal, pursuant to a by-law similar to that of CPSO.

HPDT Identity

We have begun the process of developing an identity for HPDT. It has its own logo, and we have obtained the internet domain hpdt.ca.

Mission and Core Values

The OPSDT developed the mission and core values set out below to help define its new identity.

MISSION


To hear and decide allegations of physician misconduct and incompetence with independence and fairness, making just decisions in the public interest.

CORE VALUES




Fairness

We are neutral and ensure all parties are heard. Our decisions and processes are accessible and clearly explained.



Excellence

We aim for high quality decision-making and service.



Respect

We actively listen with humility and empathy. We strive to understand the diverse identities and experiences of parties, witnesses and those affected by our decisions.



Openness

Our decisions, hearings and processes are transparent, balancing openness and privacy.



Timeliness

We recognize the importance to participants and the public of promptly resolving cases. We act and require parties to act in a responsive and timely way.



Panel Composition and Roles

Composition

Panels hearing the merits and penalty are made up of five individuals: two public members of the Board, two professional members, at least one of whom is a member of the Board and one experienced adjudicator who chairs the panel. One-member panels consisting of only an experienced adjudicator sometimes hear pre-hearing motions on issues like adjournments, evidentiary or procedural issues.

As mentioned above, panel composition flows from the Code. There are no restrictions in the Code on who the Board may appoint as a member of a discipline tribunal. Each panel must consist of 3-5 members of the discipline tribunal, two of whom must be public members of the Board and one of whom must be a professional member of the Board. The other two spots may be filled by any member of the discipline tribunal, and our practice is to always appoint another professional, either a member of the Board or not, and an experienced adjudicator.

Roles

While the panel chair is responsible for managing the hearing and writing the first draft of the reasons, all panel members are equal in decision making. Skills in leading inclusive discussions and encouraging participation were one of the core criteria in selecting the experienced adjudicators. A key part of our training focuses on the role of all panel members in deliberations and reason writing.

Here are some quotations from experienced adjudicators about how they promote participation:

- “During deliberations I may start by framing the questions for discussion but ask the panel for their thoughts before offering my own. I will canvass each

panel member for their thoughts on each decision point, if they have not already jumped into the discussion... At the beginning of a hearing (especially with panel members I haven't worked with before), I discuss our mutual expectations around asking questions during the hearing, dealing with objections on the fly (whether it is necessary to consult with the entire panel and how they may signify if they wish to go into breakout.)”

- “At nearly every break, I check in with the other panel members to see if they are comfortable with how I am chairing and whether they have questions or comments. In deliberations, I ask the panel members about how the reasons should be written, often seeking input about specific choices on things like tone and how much detail should be included on certain issues. Where there is a reprimand, it is almost always drafted and always delivered by a professional or public member of the panel.”
- “I have been very deferential to the other panel members, essentially trying to intervene mostly to frame discussions/issues. I have also ensured all panel members are heard by specifically asking for comments from those who have yet to participate in any discussion. For hearings, it has also been important to join hearings well ahead of the scheduled start time to introduce myself and answer any questions or concerns panel members may have. During hearings, it has been important to take breaks and ensure that questions are first discussed among the panel members before being raised with the parties.”

As set out in more detail in the survey results in Part II, nearly all Tribunal members felt they were contributing, with some saying it was easier to do so than in the previous system. Many noted that the experienced adjudicators made sure all voices were heard.

Panels hearing the merits and penalty are made up of five individuals: two public members of the Board, two professional members, at least one of whom is a member of the Board and one experienced adjudicator who chairs the panel.

Nearly all Tribunal members felt they were contributing, with some saying it was easier to do so than in the previous system.



Legality of the Model

Some lawyers in the regulatory legal community have expressed concerns, including in their feedback on the Pilot for this report, that the presence of a lawyer on a panel is improper on the basis that the lawyer is giving “legal advice” to the other members of the panel that is not being shared with the College and the defence and that the process is therefore less transparent. Section 44 of the Code, similar provisions in other legislation and the common law require that if a panel in any administrative tribunal obtains formal legal advice, it must disclose that advice to the parties and give them a chance to make submissions on it. The concern raises both legal and transparency grounds.

An example of the concerns is the following response to our survey:

“Transparency may be lacking as legal advice provided by the Experienced Adjudicator to the panel is not made available to the parties (as compared to ILC who provided their advice on the record).”

In light of concerns such as this, we obtained a legal opinion in May 2023 from Nadia Effendi, a partner at Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Ms. Effendi is recognized as one of the leading administrative and public lawyers in Canada. Her detailed opinion, which can be provided on request, concludes that a lawyer serving as a panel member is not providing legal advice and the panel composition is not improper.

There are other factors that give us confidence that the model is appropriate:

- The model was recommended by Justice Goudge, also recognized as an expert on administrative law.
- As discussed above, panels that combine lawyers and non-lawyers without using independent legal counsel are common in Canadian administrative tribunals, and to our knowledge the model has not been challenged or overturned in the courts.¹³

- The panel is required to raise with the parties any analysis, factual or legal, that the parties did not raise. The parties then have the opportunity to make submissions about it. Indeed, panels have done so in OPSDT and Pilot cases.¹⁴
- Under the previous model, discussions or communications with lawyers that are not known to the parties and are not formal “legal advice” take place, including through review and assistance with decisions by independent legal counsel or the drafting of decisions on behalf of the panel by legally trained decision writers.¹⁵

Adopting Adjudication Best Practices

Active Adjudication and Case Management

Under the new model, the Tribunal takes a more active role in moving cases forward by promoting early settlement or partial agreement where possible, identifying pre-hearing issues and deciding them sooner with less formality. Panel chairs also take a more active role in hearings. This stems directly from the HPDT Chair and the experienced adjudicators’ expertise in alternative dispute resolution.

The first case management conference is scheduled immediately upon filing of the Notice of Hearing. Depending on the nature of the case, more CMCs are often held before the hearing is scheduled. Given the HPDT Chair’s availability, a CMC can be scheduled on short notice to quickly deal with issues.

The first case management conference is scheduled immediately upon filing of the Notice of Hearing. Depending on the nature of the case, more CMCs are often held before the hearing is scheduled. Given the Chair’s availability, a CMC can be scheduled on short notice to quickly deal with issues.

¹³ The principles set out in s. 44 are a codification of common law principles of fairness, so the same principles apply whether or not there is an explicit provision to this effect. Some statutes under which tribunals use this model have a similar section to s. 44. *Health Insurance Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. H.6, s. 23 (2) (Health Services Appeal and Review Board); *Health Care Consent Act, 1996*, S.O. 1996, c. 2, Sched. A, s. 77 (2) (Consent and Capacity Board).

¹⁴ *R. v. N.C.*, 2024 ONCA 239. This occurred, for example, in *College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario v. Becker*, 2024 ONRPDT 7 (legal issue) and *College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario v. Fagbemigun*, 2022 ONPSDT 11 (factual issue).

¹⁵ *Khan v. College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario*, 1992 CanLII 2784 (ON CA).



Some examples of the use of the case management process are:

- A matter that had been referred to a discipline committee in 2019 began case management when the Pilot began in spring 2023. After several case management conferences, the parties reached a joint submission. An uncontested hearing took place in October and the decision was released in early November 2023.
- A self-represented registrant advised at a CMC in early October 2023 that they would bring a motion to disqualify College counsel from acting on the case. The case management chair set a schedule under which the motion would be heard in writing, with submissions to be made in November and early December 2023. The decision on the motion was released two days after the written submissions were complete, allowing the matter to move forward.
- Several hearings where the registrant was not participating were heard in writing, avoiding scheduling challenges and reducing hearing costs.
- Through changes to scheduling practices and the use of case management, payments to OPSDT members for late cancellation of hearing dates decreased by 81% between 2021 and 2023.

There may be cases in which it would be helpful for the registrant to hear the perspective of another member of the profession. If this is identified by either of the parties or the case management chair, a CMC can be conducted jointly with a professional member.

Issues-Based Reason Writing

Best practices for writing of court and tribunal reasons have undergone a revolution in recent years. Led by Justice John Laskin, formerly of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, and Ed Berry, an English professor at the University of Toronto, most legal decision makers now write very differently from the way that the courts and tribunals did previously. This approach rejects legal formality and templated decisions in favour of an audience-focused approach that emphasizes the organization of the decision based on the issues in the case, plain language and conciseness.¹⁶

Our approach to decision writing reflects this. The experienced adjudicators have all written many decisions using this approach, and indeed, their ability to do so was an important criterion when evaluating decisions during the recruitment process. Reasons look quite different than they used to and, we believe, better capture the expectations of the courts. We also promote quality decisions through a formal decision review process.

New Rules of Procedure

OPSDT implemented new Rules of Procedure to replace the previous OPSDT Rules, which were similar to those of most other health professions' discipline committees.¹⁷ They took effect on January 1, 2023, and were developed following an extensive process of research, consultation and drafting.

The approach to the revisions was centered around several principles (see Rule 1.1.1):

- the overarching importance of fairness;
- accessibility and understandability, using plain language and simplified processes;
- flexible processes, allowing for adaptation to the circumstances of each case;
- adopting successful practices used at other regulators and tribunals; and
- ensuring that matters move forward expeditiously.

¹⁶ See Edward Berry, *Writing Reasons: A Handbook for Judges*, 5th Edition, 2020.

¹⁷ <https://opsdt.ca/hpdt/rules-of-procedure>



Here are some of the most significant changes:



Rule 2 – Openness

Under most Colleges’ current rules, a member of the public who wishes to obtain copies of documents in the discipline tribunal’s record must file a motion to do so. This can take some time. Pursuant to a 2018 decision of the Superior Court of Justice, the “open courts principle” applies to administrative tribunals. Among other things, the public must have timely access to hearing materials.

Rule 2 adapts to these changes. It establishes an automatic publication ban on the names of patients and anything that could identify them. If a party asks for additional information to be subject to a publication ban or made not public, it sets out the test to be applied, which comes from Supreme Court of Canada caselaw.

Materials in the record are public, and if there is personal health information or other personal information, it must be redacted by the party filing the document. This can be done by filing two versions: one public and one not public. A process like the old process applies to documents filed before the rules came into effect, to protect reasonable expectations of the parties.



Rule 3 – Accommodation and Language

The rule codifies the rights of participants to accommodation in accordance with the Human Rights Code, to communicate with the discipline tribunal in English or French and to an interpreter. It also sets out the right of the registrant to choose the language of the proceeding, subject to reasonable limits.



Rule 8 – Statement of Particulars

The tribunal may direct either party to provide more information (particulars) about their position.



Rule 9 – Case Management

This rule sets out the discipline tribunal’s case management approach and the values that underly it. It sets out the following four goals of case management:

- a. hearings progress in a fair and timely way, in the public interest;
- b. hearing time is used efficiently and effectively;
- c. procedural and legal issues are identified early; and
- d. adjournments are only necessary in exceptional circumstances.

This rule requires a case management conference in every proceeding, and describes what the case management chair may do, including exploring and applying alternatives to traditional adjudicative or adversarial processes.



Rule 12 – Hearing Preparation

Rule 12.3 – This rule is used mostly when the registrant is not participating. If one party sends a request to admit and the other party does not respond, the other party is deemed to have admitted the facts contained in the request to admit. This avoids the need to call evidence if the registrant isn’t participating, since the hearing can proceed based on the deemed admissions. A similar rule at the Law Society Tribunal was recently upheld and applied by the Divisional Court.¹⁸

Rule 12.4 – This rule requires each side to provide the other with a list of witnesses and a summary of their anticipated evidence. It also requires the parties to file the documents they may rely upon, including any agreed statement of facts or joint submission on penalty, one week in advance so that the panel may prepare.



Rule 13 – Registrant Applications to the Tribunal

Rule 13.3 – The Divisional Court decided, in *Li v. College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario*,¹⁹ that the Health Professions Procedural Code implicitly allows a discipline committee to remove or vary an indefinite term, condition or limitation on a certificate of registration. The CPSO Discipline Committee had previously concluded it had no power to do so. The court found that it was “not for us [the court] to determine the circumstances in which a member may seek a variation of a term as that issue is not before us on this application.” (para. 30) This rule sets out these conditions.

¹⁸ *Khan v. Law Society of Ontario*, 2024 ONSC 3092.

¹⁹ 2008 CanLII 37613.



Rule 14 – Hearings

Rule 14.1 – This rule sets out a set of factors to be considered when determining a request that a hearing be held all or partially in person.



Rule 17 – Costs

Rules 17.1.1 and 17.1.2 – The *Statutory Powers Procedure Act* allows a tribunal to make rules to order costs in circumstances other than those set out in the Health Professions Procedural Code if a party has

acted in a way that is unreasonable, frivolous, vexatious or in bad faith, and this rule does so. Examples of new situations in which this rule would allow costs include before the end of the hearing (for example, after a frivolous motion) or in favour of a third party who had to respond to a third-party records motion. Rule 17.2.1 allows for costs because of an adjournment less than two weeks before the hearing.

There are also several provisions of the Rules that, while not new to OPSDT in 2023, would be changes from some other Colleges' discipline committee rules.

Rule 9.4.1 – Both parties, rather than only the College are required to prepare a case management conference memo.

Rule 10 – Adjournments are granted only where it is necessary for a fair hearing, even if both parties consent.

Rule 12.4 – Both the College and the registrant are required to provide the other, in advance, a list of witnesses, a summary of what each witness will say and a copy of all documents the party may rely upon. This is sometimes called “reciprocal disclosure.”

Rule 14.3 – This rule allows the parties to agree that the registrant will plead “no contest.” This means that the registrant does not admit the allegations. The registrant accepts that the discipline tribunal can rely on the facts set out in a Statement of Uncontested Facts provided by the College, but only for the purposes of the College proceeding.

Rule 14.5.1 – This rule mirrors a similar provision in the Criminal Code that prevents the use of a complainant's sexual history except in certain circumstances.

Companion Resources and Adoption

The Tribunal has prepared practice directions, forms, frequently asked questions, and guides to provide plain language information for registrants, witnesses and members of the public about the process as a whole and specific issues. These work together with the rules to promote understanding of the process and transparency. They also assist in meeting our responsibilities to self-represented registrants.

All three Pilot Colleges kept their existing Rules of Procedure for the first year, with the addition of a modified version of the OPSDT's case management rules for their Pilot cases. When the Pilot was extended in spring 2024, both the CASLPO Discipline Committee and the ORPDT adopted the new rules, forms and guidelines. They were all amended to remove any OPSDT or CPSO-specific references and are now on a separate portion of the website (opsdt.ca/hpdt). CASLPO, CRPO and OPSDT all link to this webpage from their own websites. Each retained their previous approach to costs, reflected in Tariff A.



Education

Orientation

We have designed a four half-day orientation program, delivered mostly virtually, for new public or professional discipline tribunal members. Its topics include: the RHPA, the Code and its discipline provisions, procedural fairness, the burden of proof, rules of evidence, reason writing, deliberations, myths and stereotypes in sexual abuse cases, joint submissions, penalty principles and making credibility determinations. It is interactive and uses a variety of teaching techniques to support different styles of adult learning. It has been coordinated and delivered by Dionne Woodward, Tribunal Counsel and David Wright.

We have tailored the orientation to the new model. For example, we emphasize the role of panel members in deliberating, reviewing and commenting on reasons in a way that will strengthen the final product and ensure their voices are heard. In relation to hearing management, while they must have an understanding of the role of the panel chair and the principles applied, they do not need to be trained to chair themselves.

In each Pilot College, there has been an orientation to the profession for the experienced adjudicators delivered by professional members of the discipline tribunal, as well as an introduction to the Pilot for the other members provided by the HPDT Chair and counsel.

In the spring of 2024, a joint orientation was conducted for new members of the OPSDT and the CASLPO Discipline Committee. When orientation is urgent, for example when a new member is needed to sit on hearings shortly after their appointment, they have watched a recording of the most recent training.



Ongoing Professional Development

The OPSDT has had semi-annual business/education meetings, with sessions facilitated by both Tribunal Office staff and guests. These have included:

- reason writing and deliberations;
- discussions with judges;
- lessons for our work from cognitive science;
- reprimands;
- trauma-informed adjudication;
- the law of evidence;
- deliberation scenarios; and
- the role of counsel cross-examining complainants where there is a self-represented registrant.



Annual Conference

A one-day conference was held in November 2023, in person with an on-line option, for the members of all four discipline tribunals. It provided an opportunity both for learning and for the decision makers from different Pilot Colleges to network with each other and discuss their work. Sessions included:

- a panel of lawyers who prosecute and defend health discipline cases providing insight on hearings from their perspective and that of their clients;
- a deliberation exercise with breakout “discipline panels” made up of public and professional members from each College;
- equity in adjudication;
- mandatory revocation and sexual abuse: a legislative history;
- freedom of expression and professional discipline; and
- a networking reception.

Sessions were organized and delivered by Angela Peco, Manager and Tribunal Counsel at CMTO, Dionne Woodward and David Wright. Guests included Superior Court Justice Andrew Pinto, Palma Paccioco, a professor at Osgoode Hall Law School and Grace Vaccarelli, a mediator and investigator with over 20 years of experience in human rights.

Our second annual conference is scheduled for November 2024.

Feedback on the sessions was very positive. The overall rating for the conference by the participants who completed the evaluation was 4.72 out of 5. Here are some comments we received on the evaluation:

“Great conference, well organized, education sessions were really good. The deliberation exercise was excellent and allowed networking as well as education.”

“I hope this will become a yearly event!”

“...[A]ll of the sessions seemed short, but I think that was because they were so interesting and time went by fast.”

“Great day of learning. The deliberation exercise and comparison of decisions from each group was very interesting.”

“I liked the varied style of presentations. Fireside chat was excellent.”

“Breakout session was great! Really liked the design of the exercise. Seemed daunting at first but we rolled into it quickly. Really liked hearing thought process of other professionals from different backgrounds and Colleges.”



The Pilot has also led to benefits for individual Colleges' education. For example, Angela Peco presented to the OPSDT about the CMTO Discipline Committee's experience with appointing counsel to cross-examine complainants in contested sexual assault cases where the registrant is self-represented. This situation is common at CMTO, but recently arose at OPSDT for the first time. Similarly, David Wright made presentations at CMTO business meetings on topics such as evidence, reason writing, and updates on caselaw. Tribunal Office staff will coordinate a business/education meeting for the ORPDT in the spring of 2025.

Newsletter

We send all members of the Pilot Tribunals and OPSDT a monthly newsletter, containing updates on decisions released in the Pilot, as well as other decisions of significance for health discipline. The newsletter, which began with the OPSDT before the Pilot and then expanded, is largely written and edited by Dionne Woodward. David Wright also writes a monthly column, usually about practical issues that arise in adjudication. All members also have access to an archive of all previous issues.



Timeliness



Deadlines are set so that decisions are released within 84 days of the last hearing day or final submissions. This standard has been met in every case under the new model, both at OPSDT and in the Pilot, with most decisions being released more quickly. We have prepared a policy on reason preparation, review and release that establishes deadlines for each step in the process, from the first draft being provided to the panel to legal and peer review. It also establishes a process and expectations for these reviews, consistent with the requirements set out by the Court of Appeal.²⁰

The average number of days to complete a discipline file at OPSDT decreased from 429 to 285 between 2020 and 2023. In 2023, the OPSDT's key performance indicator was 15 months from referral to the completion of the discipline process (80th percentile). As of December 2023, the 80th percentile was 11 months. In 2024, the KPI has been reduced to 12 months, with tighter criteria for exclusion from the measure. Considering that before the new model, the CPSO Discipline Committee was struggling to meet a target of starting hearings within one year, this is a dramatic change.

Data on timeliness at Pilot Colleges follows later in this report.

Financial Implications for CPSO



While the primary motivation for change was not financial, the new model has resulted in significant cost savings for CPSO. Given other changes in recent years, in particular a lower volume of referrals and the shift to virtual hearings, it is difficult to separate how much of the savings are due to each of these factors.

Significant savings have resulted from the following:

- elimination of fees for independent legal counsel to attend hearings, provide advice and support to staff in the Tribunal Office and review decisions;

²⁰ *Shuttleworth v. Ontario (Safety, Licensing Appeals and Standards Tribunals)*, 2019 ONCA 518.



- reduced hearing time;
- reduced reason writing time;
- reduced cancellation fees;
- reduced time for decision review and editing;
- CMCs and hearings conducted by the OPSDT Chair; and
- education organized and delivered by the OPSDT Chair and Tribunal Counsel rather than ILC.

Electronic Hearings and Hearing Support



The new model coincided with the general adoption of electronic hearings by professional regulators and other tribunals throughout Canada because of the pandemic. All OPSDT hearings have been conducted by videoconference. The OPSDT has established a Rule and Practice Direction that sets out the factors to be considered when there is a request that all or part of the hearing be held in person.

The move to electronic hearings has had various advantages. In particular, it has assisted with the challenges of scheduling five-member panel hearings with a small pool of members who meet the statutory requirements for public and physician board members and live across Ontario. Largely eliminating the need for travel means that an out-of-Toronto panelist with a commitment one evening during the week in their home city can still sit, or a panel can sit on Monday, Tuesday and Friday to accommodate schedules without wasted costs. The same advantages apply to witnesses, registrants and lawyers from outside Toronto.

Electronic hearings have also had significant benefits for transparency. Anyone, such as complainants, the registrant's family, media or members of the public can watch a hearing without travelling to downtown Toronto.

OPSDT piloted various methods of supporting electronic hearings before reaching an agreement with First Class Conferencing Facilitation (FCCF). FCCF specializes in supporting electronic legal hearings and also supports coroners' inquests and arbitrations, among other hearings.

FCCF, among other functions:

- sets up the Zoom hearing and the livestream accessible only through a private link;
- sets up and manages a webpage that automatically sends users who provide their name and email address the link to watch a hearing, together with relevant information;
- moves panel members, counsel, witnesses and other participants in and out of the breakout rooms;
- has expertise in troubleshooting technical issues, resolving them quickly;
- displays documents as requested by the parties or the panel, which, if appropriate, can be blocked from being viewed by the public;
- displays information on the livestream if the hearing is delayed or on a break;
- marks exhibits and other documents;
- prepares a report for the Tribunal Office staff summarizing what occurred at the hearing, including a witness list and exhibit list;
- provides a video recording from which a transcript can be generated by a court reporter, making it unnecessary to have a court reporter present during the hearing.

Among other advantages, we have found that using FCCF rather than staff allows for flexible scheduling, since FCCF can support multiple hearings on the same day. It has led to less delay due to participants' technical issues and allows staff to focus on case processing, with other work less disrupted by hearing days.

In the Pilot, CMTO and CRPO staff have continued to support virtual hearings, while CASLPO has used FCCF.



Ongoing Consultation

The OPSDT established the Practice Advisory Group for feedback from those who regularly represent the College and defence before the Tribunal. A similar roundtable was established under the Pilot.

Appeals

There have been two appeals from OPSDT decisions under the new model. Both were dismissed, with positive comments from the court. There have not yet been any appeals from Pilot decisions in the other Colleges.

In *Fagbemigan v. College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario*, 2023 ONSC 2642, the registrant argued that the Tribunal had not fulfilled its duties to him as a self-represented litigant. The court said, at para. 47, “The transcripts clearly demonstrate that the Tribunal patiently and carefully assisted the Appellant throughout the process.” Among the issues in this case was a *Charter* challenge to the College investigators’ having viewed and removed documents during a site visit to the registrant’s clinic. The court fully upheld the Tribunal’s constitutional and professional misconduct analyses.

In *Aboujamra v. College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario*, 2023 ONSC 3344, the court spoke of the Tribunal’s “detailed and nuanced credibility findings” (para. 77) in rejecting the multiple challenges to the decision in a highly contested sexual abuse case. An application for leave to the Court of Appeal for Ontario was dismissed.

There have been two appeals from OPSDT decisions under the new model. Both were dismissed, with positive comments from the court. There have not yet been any appeals from Pilot decisions in the other Colleges.

IMPLEMENTING THE PILOT

Differences Between Colleges

During the Pilot phase, the division of responsibilities between the OPSDT and each participating College varied. Each College brought unique backgrounds and experiences in discipline matters, leading to different approaches. This diversity assisted us in evaluating the pros and cons of different options, and allowed the Pilot Colleges to adopt the arrangement that best suited their needs.



CMTO has the highest volume among the Pilot Colleges: 20 new referrals and 46 cases closed in 2022. It has a high volume of sexual abuse cases relative to its size; 56% of the cases before the CMTO Discipline Committee in 2022 were sexual abuse matters. The CMTO has a Hearings Office with several full-time staff, well-established processes and

experience in many different types of cases. Its staff and Discipline Committee members, because of this volume, have extensive experience and involvement in all aspects of discipline work under the existing model.

CMTO established two tracks. Any case in which sexual abuse was alleged and there was no activity prior to the start of the Pilot was assigned to the Pilot track. Cases with sexual abuse allegations in which there had been activity under the existing model, and cases where sexual abuse was not alleged, were assigned to the standard track. As a result of its higher case volume and experience, CMTO staff did all administration and hearing support for all cases, including those assigned to the Pilot. CMTO adapted some of the OPSDT’s policies, practices and precedents for its Pilot cases. Other cases continued as before. The two tracks were important to CMTO, among other reasons, so that it had the option to easily return to the previous system after the Pilot if either it or OPSDT decided not to continue, and so that it could make comparisons as part of evaluating the success of the new model.



CRPO’s Discipline Committee received five referrals in 2022. For the first year of the Pilot, CRPO staff continued to do all case processing and hearing support,



under the primary direction of the HPDT Chair. It adopted the policies, practices and procedures of the OPSDT, with modifications to reflect the fact that the Rules were not the same. In the spring of 2024, when the Pilot was renewed and the Rules of Procedure were harmonized, the Tribunal Office took over case processing, using the same templates and processes as for OPSDT cases.



CASLPO's Discipline Committee received four referrals in 2022. At CASLPO, the OPSDT staff did case processing from the beginning of the Pilot. Tribunal Office staff prepared modified versions of the guides

and practice directions (where possible), to reflect the differences between the OPSDT and CASLPO Discipline Committee Rules of Procedure. The CASLPO-specific versions were no longer needed when the Discipline Committee adopted the HPDT Rules of Procedure.



Memorandum of Agreement

The Pilot was implemented through a memorandum of agreement between the CPSO and each College. The significant provisions were:

- The College would make changes to its by-laws, where needed, to allow for the experienced adjudicators to be appointed to its Discipline Committee and for the appointment of the HPDT Chair.
- Staff would recommend to the Board the appointment of the Pilot Chair and the five experienced adjudicators to the Discipline Committee for a term parallel to the term of the Pilot. The agreement would be null and void if the Board did not make the appointments.
- The independence of the HPDT Chair and adjudicators would be protected.
- A participants' committee consisting of representatives from all four Colleges would meet bimonthly.
- A dispute resolution process.



Cost Sharing and Billing Structure

The financial arrangements were designed to reflect the following:

- CPSO is not making any profits.
- The financial approach should be clear and simple, with as little time as possible spent on administration.
- Rates should compensate CPSO for its expenses on the Pilot and for a share of salaries and administrative costs based on the time spent by its staff (including the HPDT Chair) on Pilot matters.
- Common costs should be shared equitably between the Pilot Colleges.

For the first year, the Pilot Colleges were billed only based on the time spent by the experienced adjudicators and HPDT Chair on cases and their attendance at College-specific educational programs. The OPSDT has a remuneration policy that sets out the activities for which adjudicators are compensated, including preparation, hearing and CMC time, deliberations and reason writing. There are also limits on the number of hours that can be claimed based on the nature and length of the case, which can be increased where appropriate based on the circumstances of a case with authorization of the HPDT Chair. The Pilot Colleges also reimburse CPSO for the disbursements on their behalf.

The hourly rate compensates for the adjudicator time and the time spent on administration, education, set-up and other costs. There are no separate charges to the Pilot Colleges for matters like education, administration, decision review or meetings attended by Tribunal Office staff and the HPDT Chair.

The first year's hourly rate was \$275 per hour for Colleges where their staff did case processing and hearing support and \$325 per hour where OPSDT staff were doing that work. These amounts were increased for inflation in 2024 to \$282 and \$334. The OPSDT staff recorded the amount of time they spent so that calculations could be done to determine whether the gross-up from the amounts paid to the adjudicators was over or under compensating CPSO for its staff's



time. The agreements provided that if CPSO was over compensated, it would use the surplus for future HPDT activities or return it to the Pilot Colleges. If the CPSO was under compensated, it could use future revenues to compensate for the deficit but there would be no extra charges to the Pilot Colleges.

During the first year, CPSO was under compensated. We concluded that was for three main reasons: the large amount of time and expenses associated with start-up, that the rates had been set too low and a higher-than-expected amount of time spent in meetings with and adjustments to policies and practices for individual Colleges.

In addition, the costs paid by some Colleges were disproportionate to the amount of time spent on their matters. This was because, first, there were differential amounts of time spent adapting to the needs of individual Colleges. Second, case processing and pre-hearing work often did not correspond with the amount of remunerable time on a particular file, particularly if a lot of work was put into case management that successfully reduced hearing time. Third, there was a base amount of non-remunerable time that did not vary with caseload, for example preparing the newsletter, offering educational programming or preparing invoices.

Accordingly, when the Pilot was extended, participants agreed that rather than raising the hourly rate, each Pilot College would pay a base fee of \$1,000 per month. While it is too early to reach any conclusions, it appears that with this change the compensation is more accurately reflecting CPSO’s costs and equitable sharing of expenses.



Information Technology

IT proved to be a challenge. Initially, CPSO IT was not used for any case-related matters in the other Pilot Colleges. This required experienced adjudicators to juggle multiple laptops, email addresses and other systems. Additionally, Tribunal Office staff had to monitor multiple email boxes and learn different systems. This proved to be unwieldy, time consuming and prone to error. Accordingly, in

2024 the IT arrangement was changed so that the adjudicators use their CPSO equipment and email addresses, and staff use CPSO systems. An internal CPSO protocol has been established so that Pilot Colleges’ data cannot be accessed by anyone other than Tribunal Office and CPSO IT staff without the authorization of the Chair or the Registrar of the College concerned. Once a discipline file has been closed, the file is returned to the College concerned for retention and the CPSO does not retain the data. A common email box is used for the three discipline tribunals whose cases are administered by the Tribunal Office.

Scheduling

The requirements of the Health Professions Procedural Code for panels that include three Board members -- two public and one professional – created challenges for scheduling at all Colleges, given the numbers of public members and the limitation on theirs and professional members’ schedules. This often increased the amount of time and back-and-forth needed to set hearing dates.

Fitness to Practise Committee

At CPSO and CRPO, the HPDT Chair is also Chair of the Fitness to Practise Committee and the membership is the same as the discipline tribunal. There has not yet been a hearing of a Fitness to Practise case at either College since the new model was implemented.

Summary of Current State

- OPSDT, ORPDT and the CASLPO Discipline Committee have common rules, guides, practice directions and forms, and a common “resources” website that contains them. The Tribunal Office does case processing, decision review and decision preparation and release throughout the life of a discipline file, using common processes, templates and forms. With some exceptions, the Tribunal Office is responsible for all aspects of the file from referral to final reasons.



- CMTO has two streams: a Pilot stream for cases that allege sexual abuse and a regular stream for other cases. It maintains its own Hearings Office, which does the case processing and decision review and release for Pilot and non-Pilot cases, using materials for the Pilot cases adapted from but not the same as those used elsewhere. CMTO has separate rules, policies and procedures, and has adapted the Pilot templates as appropriate.
- Each Pilot College pays a base fee plus an hourly rate for adjudicator time. The hourly rate varies depending on the level of service provided by the Tribunal Office.
- The experienced adjudicators and the HPDT Chair are cross-appointed to each Pilot Tribunal.
- The Tribunal Office offers, without additional charge, educational programming including a full day or two half days of College-specific business/educational programs, a monthly newsletter and a full-day conference. There is a registration fee per attendee to cover the costs of outside speakers, food, the venue, IT support and related matters.



Part 2

Feedback and Data

Feedback and Data



QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

We sought feedback through a Microsoft Forms survey, which asked open-ended questions. We sent separate, tailored surveys to lawyers on the HPDT Counsel Roundtable, to discipline tribunal members (including at OPSDT) and to the experienced adjudicators. We received 12 responses from counsel, 51 from discipline tribunal members and five from experienced adjudicators. Participants were free to reply anonymously or provide their name as they wished.

Overall, the responses were extremely positive, although some discipline tribunal members were limited in their ability to comment because they had not yet sat on a case in the new model. Most respondents believed the Pilot had met its objectives, that the changes were positive and that it should continue. The discipline tribunal members were generally more positive than counsel. As discussed below, a theme among counsel respondents was a concern that there was a lack of transparency because independent legal counsel was not present.

Discipline tribunal members reported a greater ability to focus on the substance of the case rather than legal procedure and an improved deliberation process.

Panel Composition

Leveraging diverse skill sets

The discipline tribunal members who had participated in Pilot hearings were nearly universally supportive of the change to panel composition. They reported a greater ability to focus on the substance of the case rather than legal procedure and an improved deliberation process.

"The difference is that with the experience our discussion time has reduced and the adjudicator makes sure that all the panel members' concerns are heard."

"My concerns as we made the change between the outside legal advisors and the experienced adjudicators was gone working with individuals with strong interpersonal skills in addition to a wealth of legal knowledge."

"I was surprised and very pleased with this new approach. Initially I was concerned with the reduction in physician members of the panel but the new arrangement works very well..."

"[T]he experience and skill sets that the Chair brings to the hearings allow us to be more effective while providing us with an educational component that would have been lost if they were not part of the process. They lead us through support and collaboration."



Every perspective counts

We asked the discipline tribunal members whether they felt their perspectives were heard and considered. There was nearly unanimous agreement.

“Absolutely. The adjudicator/chair of the hearings I participated in made a point of including all members in the discussion, circulated written drafts in a timely manner, incorporated suggestions/edits and opened further discussion on items as required.”

“Fantastic job ensuring that everyone is heard, their questions are answered and reinforcing that there are no stupid questions.”

“Deliberations have been handled well. It’s definitely easier to review and comment on shorter, more plain-language documents that are provided in reasonable time following a hearing.”

“During deliberations all voices are encouraged and heard better than ever.”

Other Comments

A small number of discipline tribunal members expressed concerns. One was concerned that an adjudicator did not have sufficient skills and knowledge. Another expressed concern that the non-lawyer discipline tribunal members’ legal knowledge was not being developed. A third explained as follows:

“Compared to a traditional deliberation I do not feel as involved. It felt more like the experienced adjudicator gathering a small amount of input from the panel to satisfy the requirement. I do not necessarily see this as a negative.”

Several lawyers expressed concern that without independent legal counsel providing legal advice on the record, the process was less transparent. They expressed concern that the panel chair was improperly providing “legal advice” in deliberations. One expressed concern that the panel chair was improperly dominating:

“My other concern is that the Chairs dominate the proceedings, which has happened in every hearing to date.”

Other counsel expressed the opposite view, for example:

“I think it makes eminent sense to hire experienced lawyer adjudicators in lieu of ILC. As much as the ILC work is excellent for lawyers such as myself, it does not make sense from a resource perspective.”



Perspectives of the Experienced Adjudicators

Most respondents commented that the Pilot was effectively achieving its objectives. Many commented on the collegiality and discussions among the experienced adjudicators, who meet once a month to discuss issues and approaches. All appreciated the relationships they had built with professional and public discipline tribunal members, although some found it challenging given the number of members of the different Pilot Tribunals and often small volume. The HPDT Chair has been informally assigning a subset of adjudicators to each Pilot Tribunal where possible, and in general the adjudicators supported this approach.

Experienced adjudicators expressed concern about differences in technology and process, between the Colleges, but were pleased with changes that had been made in that regard in 2024. Generally, they were pleased with administrative support.

Case Management

There was strong support among both discipline tribunal members and counsel for the more intensive case management. Respondents felt that it improved the efficiency of the process. One respondent noted that the ability of the CMC chair to provide information to self-represented litigants from a neutral perspective was helpful. Examples of the comments are:

“The robust case management, in my experience has been extremely effective. Parties are able to schedule a case management conference with very little notice. The CMC directions are usually issued within 24 hours, and the directions I have received have been clear and fair.”

“Also, the CMC Chair has the power to make procedural orders, which is helpful and brings more certainty in the process. We also appreciate that the CMC Chair adopts flexible approaches and is open to waive certain procedural requirements to be efficient.”

Several discipline tribunal members mentioned that the case management process had reduced surprises and cancellations.

Two lawyer respondents emphasized that the CMC chair should not be heavy-handed in promoting settlement. One suggested that the CMC process should better take into account different policy approaches to resolution at different Colleges and better coordinate ADR techniques with College counsel. One suggested that pre-hearing hearing conferences were less effective than they were with a member of the profession serving as chair. As set out below in the description of the new model, we can include members of the profession in CMCs along with the case management chair as appropriate.



Quality of Hearings and Reasons

The strong view among the discipline tribunal members was that hearings were smoother and the process more efficient. Many commented on the quality of the reasons and the benefits of receiving them more quickly after the hearing.

There was near unanimous support among discipline tribunal members for obtaining the parties' materials in advance, with several respondents noting that the amount of preparation could be heavy.

Most counsel commented positively on the quality of hearings and reasons. Two respondents suggested there was little difference from the previous model and two suggested that some reasons were difficult to understand. One respondent commented that reasons in joint submission cases were sometimes too short.

"I have always found that having an experienced Chair that is able to navigate the system allows for a more effective and efficient process, allows for more genuine conversations, and provides the panel a solid foundation of experience and application."

"The Pilot has been extremely effective. The quality of hearings has increased drastically with experienced chairs and removing ILC. As a public member, I feel a lot more confident in the proceedings under the Pilot than previous Discipline Panels. Decisions have been released a lot faster and more well written. Overall this has benefited our College and the public interest and we should continue this process."

"I've noticed a significant quality improvement of deliberation discussions under the Pilot."

"Increased efficiency, increased clarity of writing, and in my view increased accuracy on important points of law."

"In my opinion, the Pilot project is such an asset to the CMTO discipline system. Hearings progress so much more efficiently with expert tribunal and panel leadership. The experienced lawyer is able to keep panel members from straying into the weeds while deliberating. Detailed reasons for decisions are received in a timely manner. The efficiency of this whole process is astonishing. Love it."

"Although it takes time pre-hearing, time is saved during the hearing/deliberation phase, making it a worthwhile activity."

"[Receiving materials in advance] is the best part of the Pilot project for me. It is such a benefit to be able to review and absorb this information prior to the hearing."

"Very significant impact – allows opportunity to review the material which enhances the panel discussion and makes for an efficient use of time."



Education

Comments on the educational offerings were nearly universally positive.

"I have found the education to be the most beneficial part for me so far. Being a member of the CMTO we have two discipline streams and the education from the HPDTP has been an immense benefit to my work on the non HPDTP stream as well as the HPDTP stream."

"Joint educational conference enabled me to see the road block or ways others have overcome. The complexity of the different Colleges and the relationship with their clientele impacts the type of hearings."

"I find that David's presentations are always educational and engages all the members. He brings scenarios and case examples from other institutions and his personal experiences as well. The newsletter keeps us informed about the current cases and outcome of the tribunals."

"Education has struck the right balance with business meetings, complemented by other learning opportunities, presentations and the newsletter which I thoroughly enjoy and learn from. Keep up the great work."

"My orientation session to discipline hearings was very elaborate and informative. I use this as my reference point for any hearing meetings. The monthly newsletter is a valuable tool and helps me understand the jargon used in the process."

"The joint educational conference was outstanding. The newsletter is well done and very informative."





A Selection of General Comments

"Very impressive conceptualization and work by many. Very positive impact."

"I think this has been a successful experiment."

"Not having to Chair hearings and write D and Rs has eliminated the significant anxiety associated with those tasks."

"I believe the Pilot has been effective. The proceedings are more focused, the Case Management and decision writing much better. I support adopting this model going forward."

"It is an exciting initiative that has done a great job with our committee so far. Thank you for everything you've done to date."

"My peers seem pleased, and I have heard only good things from those who have sat on panels. It is great to hear the experienced adjudicators refer to their experience with other Colleges and their processes, as it gives insight into what we do at ours."

"In the matter of fairness and credibility the Pilot model is essential, but I on occasion feel we are relinquishing our own College's responsibility to regulate our own."

"I believe that this initiative should definitely continue to become our 'new normal.'"

"The Pilot has been a huge success thanks to David's leadership. It is also a great example of cross sectoral collaboration."

"Turn the Pilot into a full tribunal."

"It is exciting to be a part of a program that is growing in the right direction, for the right reasons. Thank you!"

"At this time, all I have to share is, 'Keep doing what you are doing.'"

"I would recommend this Pilot to all Colleges."

Feedback from Non-Pilot Colleges

We reached out to RHPA colleges not currently in the Pilot to canvass interest in the Pilot and their needs and held multiple meetings with senior staff. There is considerable interest in the possibility of joining, and the most common preference is to have the HPDT take on the administration and case processing as well as sharing adjudicative resources.

Some Colleges have a very low volume of discipline proceedings, which can be as infrequent as one case every two or three years. These Colleges have a different set of needs from larger ones. Rather than orienting all committee members and providing them regular education, their preference would be to have an infrastructure in place to take on the processing and management of cases, as well as the training of adjudicators when a referral is made and the need arises.




QUANTITATIVE MEASURES

Total of 30 hearings have been held

General

From the start of the HPDT Pilot to the end of June 2024, a total of 30 hearings have been held. Of these, 16 hearings, 53% were uncontested, where the merits, penalty, and costs were agreed to by the parties. In 10 (33%) of the cases, the registrant did not participate. In contrast, four hearings (14%) were contested, with the parties disagreeing on some or all issues, typically resulting in longer hearings.



Fifteen cases involving allegations of sexual abuse were completed: 11 at CMTO and four at CRPO.

Contested hearings made up less than one sixth of Pilot hearings but accounted for just over 40% of total hearing days.

Breakdown of Hearings by College

Agreement level	CASLPO	CRPO	CMTO	Total
Contested	0	2	2	4
Uncontested	2	9	5	16
Not participating	3	2	5	10
Total	5	13	12	30

All four contested cases involved sexual abuse allegations

Hearing Length

Six multi-day hearings have been held, four of which were contested. In the other two, the registrant did not participate in the hearing. The lengthiest contested hearing, in a CMTO case, was scheduled for five days but was completed in four-and-a-half days, covering both merits and penalty hearing days.


Nineteen cases were heard over a single or half day, all of which were uncontested or the registrant did not participate. There were five written hearings; in four of these, the registrant did not participate, and one involved an uncontested motion to withdraw allegations.



Timeliness

Cases Referred Before the Start of the Pilot

At CRPO, seven cases had been pending for an average of 402 days at the time the Pilot began. They were subsequently completed within an average of 193 days from the start of the Pilot.



At CASLPO, four cases had been pending for an average of 426 days. These cases were completed within an average of 274 days from the start of the Pilot. Two of these cases were case managed together with one other case involving the same registrant referred after the Pilot.

Cases Referred During the Pilot

Cases that were both opened and completed after the start of the Pilot were completed on average 201 days from the date of the notice of hearing.

At CRPO, six cases that were opened after the Pilot began were completed in an average of 200 days.

At CMTO, four cases that were opened after the start of the Pilot were completed in an average of 204 days.

At CASLPO, we have yet to complete a case that was opened after the start of the Pilot.



On average, Pilot cases have closed within 201 days.

Decision Release

Overall, there have been 40 decisions released during the Pilot: 16 for CMTO, 9 for CASLPO and 15 for CRPO .


40 decisions released during the Pilot



In the Pilot, decisions have been released within an average of 25 days following the conclusion of a hearing, significantly outperforming the 84-day benchmark.

Average Days to Decision Release

There were four merits reasons released for cases that were contested. These reasons were released in an average of 59 days. There were ten reasons released in cases where the registrant did not participate. These reasons were released in an average of 27 days. There were 19 reasons released in uncontested cases. They were released in an average of 25 days.




There were seven motion reasons released during the Pilot and their average time to release was six days. Of these there were five uncontested motion reasons released within an average of five days. The remaining two were contested motions and their reasons were released within an average of nine days.

Case Management

The Pilot incorporates a comprehensive case management rule designed to streamline the hearing process in a manner that is fair, timely, and aligned with the public interest. This approach ensures that hearing time is utilized efficiently and effectively, procedural and legal issues are identified early and adjournments are reserved for exceptional circumstances only.

Throughout the Pilot, 78 CMCs have been conducted across all Pilot Colleges: 31 at CASLPO, 30 at CMTO, and 17 at CRPO. On average, there were 2.43 CMCs per contested case and 1.78 CMCs per uncontested case. The higher number of CMCs per contested case reflects the greater complexity often associated with these matters, requiring more preliminary management to ensure efficient proceedings.

78 CMCs have been conducted across all Pilot Colleges



The higher number of CMCs per contested case reflects the greater complexity often associated with these matters.



Financial Impact

The impact of the new model on each College will be different, so it is difficult to generalize. Factors that will affect cost and cost comparisons with the previous model include:

- caseload;
- types of cases;
- settlement rates;
- discipline committee size;
- remuneration rates paid to professional members;
- staff resources devoted to discipline;
- current ILC hourly rates;
- current approach to reason writing;
- frequency and nature of education.

To give a sense of HPDT costs, we have summarized the number of adjudicator hours spent for various Pilot cases with a description of the nature of the case.

Hours Spent by Case Type		CMC Hours	Hearing Hours (including preparation and deliberation)	Reason Writing Hours	Total
Joint submission through CMC process	Example 1	5.7	2.50	1.50	9.70
	Example 2	4.00	2.75	3.50	10.25
Written hearing; registrant not participating; complex legal issues		1.00	11.20	15.70	27.90
Contested sexual abuse; registrant represented	Example 1	2.00	27.20	23.70	52.90
	Example 2	1.50	37.00	40.00	28.50
Contested sexual abuse; registrant self-represented		3.00	30.50	14.70	48.20
Consent withdrawal; single adjudicator; in writing		0.00	0.00	1.50	1.50
Indefinite Adjournment after CMCs; single adjudicator		1.00	1.25	0.75	3.00



Part 3

New Model

New Model



PRINCIPLES

This part sets out the model we are proposing be adopted should Pilot Colleges decide to continue or other Colleges choose to join.

The following principles were applied in the design:

- The model has been very well-received and few changes are needed to the overall structure.
- The success of the model has come from the combination of all its elements, most importantly case management, the change in panel composition, enhanced education and modernized adjudicative and administrative processes.
- It is important for each profession's tribunal to maintain its separate identity and jurisprudence and provide opportunities for separate interactions and education.
- Consistency in processes, rules, templates and IT is important for many reasons, including:
 - smoother hearings and reasons through consistent approaches, in particular if the number of Colleges participating grows;
 - consistent approaches and reduced costs for representatives who appear before multiple tribunals;
 - the ability to prepare extensive documentation and support for self-represented and represented litigants that apply to all the participating tribunals;
 - reduced administrative and adjudicative costs and time;
 - changes to ensure continuous improvement are more easily made;
 - consistent fees and fair cost sharing.
- In limited circumstances there may be differences between Colleges in processes, rules and templates including:
 - on costs tariffs, which are a policy question, and do not require changes to adjudicative processes;
 - to respond to differences that relate to the nature of the profession;
 - during transition and to allow a trial period.
- Independence, and therefore the confidence of the public and registrants, is promoted by separation between the College, in particular the professional conduct staff and prosecution counsel, and the discipline tribunal.

The success of the model has come from the combination of all its elements, most importantly case management, the change in panel composition, enhanced education and modernized adjudicative and administrative processes.



PROPOSAL FOR THE HPDT




Identity

The Discipline Committee of each participating College is renamed the Ontario [name of profession] Discipline Tribunal by Board By-Law. The group of tribunals together is known as the Health Professions Discipline Tribunals. Decisions and orders have the HPDT logo at the top, followed by the name of the discipline tribunal. Each discipline tribunal has a separate section on the Canadian Legal Information Institute (CanLII) and other legal reporting services.

Correspondence and emails to and from HPDT Tribunals use a central email address and HPDT branding.

The HPDT website contains an “About Us” section with general information about the HPDT, a “Scheduled Hearings” section with all scheduled dates, which can be sorted by College, a “resources” section similar to that already built and a “contact” section. Discipline tribunals or Colleges will likely wish to maintain their own web pages for information such as cases currently referred, outcomes and a list and/or biographies of discipline tribunal members.




Tribunal Membership and Leadership

Pursuant to the Code, each College’s Board appoints the members and leaders of its discipline tribunal. Unless there is a conflict of interest, all experienced adjudicators are appointed to all HPDT Tribunals. The HPDT Chair is appointed Chair of each HPDT Tribunal and a professional or public member of the discipline tribunal is selected as Vice-Chair. The Chair meets with each Vice-Chair as needed and there are regular meetings of all Vice-Chairs. Particularly with smaller Colleges, the Chair will make efforts to have a smaller group of the experienced adjudicators chair hearings in each HPDT Tribunal.



Rules of Procedure, Practice Directions and Guides

Each HPDT Tribunal adopts the HPDT Rules of Procedure, Practice Directions and Guides. Where agreed by HPDT and the relevant College, Appendix A to the Rules of Procedure allows for rules that apply to one tribunal and a Practice Direction specific to that College can be prepared. Each College determines whether there will be a costs tariff and the amounts.



Case Processing and Administration

Participating Colleges have the option to decide whether they wish to have Tribunal Office staff conduct case processing using common templates and procedures or whether they will continue to do so themselves. Both of the options presented require individual Colleges to provide staffing support, the amount of which will depend on their volumes. There is much less College staff time required with the first option.

Tribunal Office Processes Cases

Where the Tribunal Office does case processing, it is responsible for all file administration from the filing of the Notice of Hearing until the file is closed, including all correspondence, scheduling, canvassing panel members for their availability, maintaining the file, tracking, editing and releasing reasons and preparing the file for storage. Further, the Chair and Tribunal Counsel leverage their legal expertise to advise Tribunal Office staff on file management issues that arise throughout the duration of a case file.



The College remains responsible for:

- advising the Tribunal Office of conflicts of interest of tribunal members;
- all updates to the public register;
- all updates to the College’s website;
- all reports, including statistical updates, reports to the Board and the College’s annual report;
- supporting business or education meetings of the individual tribunal;
- file retention;
- remuneration and reimbursement of professional members and administration of public members’ remuneration claims with the Health Boards Secretariat.

The College appoints a staff member or members outside the professional conduct department as the liaison with the Tribunal Office. The liaison advises the Tribunal Office of all changes to tribunal membership.

Tribunal Office staff and experienced adjudicators use CPSO systems, and members of the other tribunals are given access to documents using SharePoint. Data access and sharing with discipline tribunal members is conducted in accordance with the agreed-upon data protocol.

College Processes Cases

Where the College processes its own cases, it uses the same templates and processes, email address and databases as the Tribunal Office. Tribunal Office staff provide training to the College’s staff on the processes. The HPDT Chair has ultimate responsibility and decision making in relation to case processing and may be consulted by College leadership on the performance of staff working on discipline cases.



Hearing Support

HPDT tribunals are encouraged to use FCCF to support hearings. Where the Tribunal Office is doing administration and file processing, the Tribunal Office makes all relevant arrangements, pays FCCF invoices and invoices the College. When using FCCF, hearings are recorded and there is no need for a court reporter to attend the hearing; the recording is sent if the transcript is ordered.



Education

The HPDT organizes an annual education conference. There is a registration fee to cover the expenses. In consultation with the Vice-Chair, the HPDT organizes up to one full-day or two half-day virtual business/education meetings.

The HPDT provides a combined orientation (four half days) for new discipline tribunal members in all HPDT Colleges. In general, the orientation takes place twice annually. If a member is needed to sit on a hearing before the next orientation, they watch the video of the last training and are invited to an individual question and answer session with the HPDT Chair or Tribunal Counsel.

The HPDT continues to produce the monthly newsletter.

Colleges provide an orientation to the profession for the experienced adjudicators when joining the HPDT and for new experienced adjudicators. The HPDT provides up to a one-day orientation to the HPDT for discipline tribunal members when the College joins the HPDT.



Finances

The financial arrangements continue as in the Pilot. Colleges are only billed for adjudicator time (including time attending College-specific meetings), base fee, reimbursement of expenses incurred on their behalf (such as hearing support) and expense sharing for the conference. Colleges are not charged separately for preparation of education, organizing the conference, the newsletter, case processing, reasons review and editing, etc. The Tribunal Office continues to track the time spent on all other activities to ensure that the program is cost neutral for CPSO.

The 2025 base fee will remain unchanged at \$1,000 per month per College, except that for Colleges with an average of two hearings or less per year over the past five years, it will be \$750. The hourly rates will be \$350 per hour if the Tribunal Office staff are doing case processing and \$300 per hour if the College is doing its own case processing. If more Colleges participate, that will allow for steady or perhaps reduced base fees as base costs can be spread between all participating Colleges. While in the future it may be appropriate to set fees for a longer period, at the outset fees should be reviewed and agreements should be signed on an annual basis.

Smaller Colleges

Colleges that have had an average of less than one hearing per year over the past five years, and that do not wish to regularly participate in education will pay a base fee of \$150 per month (billed on an annual basis) during any period in which they have no active cases. If there is a referral, the HPDT will provide focused training tied to the nature of the case and regular fees will apply during the period the case is active.

Reporting, Feedback and Evaluation

There will continue to be regular meetings of all the participating Colleges and the HPDT. The HPDT-Counsel Roundtable will continue and be expanded as appropriate to include new members.

There are various issues and decisions that may need to be considered in coming years. How these are approached will depend on various factors, including the number of Colleges that join, volume of cases, our experiences under the new model and changes in the sector. These may include:

- the process for selecting the HPDT Chair;
- whether full-time experienced adjudicators in addition to the HPDT Chair should be recruited;
- the possibility of statutory and/or regulatory changes to promote effectiveness and efficiency, including to the requirement for Board members on discipline panels, methods for appointing public members and the size of panels;
- HPDT office location and financial structure;
- the duration of agreements and appointments;
- mechanisms for determining future structure and independence; and
- continuous improvement and strategic planning.

Commencing in 2026 for the year 2025, the HPDT will prepare an annual report of its activities. The HPDT will establish annual performance metrics in consultation with all participating Colleges to be reported on in the next year's annual report.

In the first half of 2028, we will consult participants from the regulatory community and prepare a report on the first three years of the HPDT and possible improvements to all aspects of the model, including the structure and the Rules of Procedure.

Timing of New Participants and Transition

We are open to new Colleges participating at any time after January 2025. Transition, and any special arrangements during a trial period, can be discussed individually.

Fitness to Practise

The HPDT is able to take on fitness to practise cases. Rules and processes for fitness to practise cases will be developed as needed.

HPDT
Health Professions
Discipline Tribunals



TDPS
Tribunaux de discipline
des professions de la santé

tribunal@opsdt.ca