Health Professions Procedural Code

1. (1) In this Code, “alternative dispute resolution process” means mediation, conciliation, negotiation, or any other means of facilitating the resolution of issues in dispute; (“processus de règlement extrajudiciaire des différends”)

Health Professions Procedural Code

Alternative dispute resolution with respect to a complaint

25.1 (1) The Registrar may, with the consent of both the complainant and the member, refer the complainant and the member to an alternative dispute resolution process,

a) if the matter has not yet been referred to the Discipline Committee under section 26; and

b) if the matter does not involve an allegation of sexual abuse. 2007, c. 10, Sched. M, s. 30.
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Confidentiality
(2) Despite this or any other Act, all communications at an alternative dispute resolution process and the facilitator’s notes and records shall remain confidential and be deemed to have been made without prejudice to the parties in any proceeding. 2007, c. 10, Sched. M, s. 30.
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Facilitator not to participate
(3) The person who acts as the alternative dispute resolution facilitator shall not participate in any proceeding concerning the same matter. 2007, c. 10, Sched. M, s. 30.
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Ratification of resolution
(4) If the complainant and the member reach a resolution of the complaint through alternative dispute resolution, they shall advise the panel of the resolution, and the panel may,
   a) cease its investigation of the complaint and adopt the proposed resolution; or
   b) continue with its investigation of the complaint. 2007, c. 10, Sched. M, s. 30.
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Timely disposal
28. (1) A panel shall dispose of a claim within 150 days after the filing of the complaint. 2007, c. 10, Sched. M, s. 30.

Not affected by ADR
(2) A referral to an alternative dispute resolution process under section 25.1 does not affect the time requirements under this section. 2007, c. 10, Sched. M, s. 30.

Additional Considerations

• Transparency vs. Efficiency
  ▪ Provisions are there to prevent sweeping anything under the rug
  ▪ There is a risk that any informal resolution not conforming to the ADR process set out in the Code may unintentionally skirt the provisions and requirements of the Code

Lesson Learned

The legislation is somewhat minimal and doesn’t give a substantial amount of guidance
## Why did we want to do this in the first place?

- Offers another way for parties to resolve their complaints and concerns
- Can provide a more active process to the participants
- Opportunity for each of the parties to gain insight into how the other felt/was impacted by the incident
- Can provide outcomes that are not available through the ICRC

## Why did we want to do this in the first place? (Continued)

- Streamlining of cases suitable for ADR to other resources and allowing for greater efficiency
- Can be more timely and less adversarial
- Provides a different face of the College to the public and the members

## Why did we want to do this in the first place? (Continued)

- Because it is a more participatory process, the parties may gain more from the experience than they might through ICRC review
Environmental Scan: Lessons Learned

- Each college was doing something different to fit their own culture and professional practice
- Some used external mediators, others were in-house; some used an in-person process, others used a phone-based or paper-based process
- Some streamed a very small number of files through ADR, others sent a considerable portion through ADR

Environmental Scan: Lessons Learned

- The Code stipulates that ADR is not appropriate where there is an allegation of sexual abuse. All colleges had a list of further excluded criteria
- Some colleges allowed for a financial settlement as part of the ADR resolution and some did not

ADR Working Group

- The ADR Working Group began meeting in August 2012
  - Group was formed from members of the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee (the “ICRC”)
  - Staff were assigned to support the Working Group
ADR Working Group

- The Working Group reviewed ADR programs from other colleges in Ontario and other colleges of pharmacy within Canada
- The Working Group determined the ADR process for the OCP and the documentation to be used

ADR Working Group: Lesson Learned

Learning to give up some control while remaining comfortable with the process

ADR Working Group: Lesson Learned

What happens in ADR, stays in ADR
The ADR Program

The Pilot Project operated under the following parameters:

- Matters Suitable for ADR
- Matters Not Suitable for ADR
- Mediation Ground Rules
- External or In-House Mediator

The ADR Program (Continued)

- Discovery of Additional Information
- Options available for ADR Resolution
- Options not available for ADR Resolution
- ICRC Ratification Process

The ADR Program (Continued)

- Considered a “Prior Decision”?
- Limited Access for members to ADR Process
ADR Process

- Voluntary and confidential process
- Parties may withdraw from the process at any time
- College pays the costs of the mediator
- Mediation can be via teleconference or in person

ADR Process (Continued)

- Parties cover any costs outside of the mediation (i.e., travel, accommodation)
- Created the position of a dedicated ADR Liaison
- Pharmacy Practice Advisor may be involved if impartial information about pharmacy practice is necessary

Financial Matters in the ADR Process

- The ADR Working Group initially decided to exclude financial compensation as part of a possible ADR resolution
- The ADR Working Group later revised this position and allowed for a nominal amount of money to be part of an ADR resolution
Financial Matters in the ADR Process: Lesson Learned

Important to ensure that the parties understand that the OCP cannot require a member to financially compensate a complainant, and that if a member chooses to do so, it is entirely his or her choice, and should be considered a gesture of good will.

Pilot Project Statistics
June 2013 to May 2014

Files initially identified as appropriate for ADR: 30
Files later determined to be unsuitable for ADR: 6
Files in which the complainant declined ADR: 7
Files in which the complainant decided not to proceed with matter: 3

Pilot Project Statistics
June 2013 to May 2014 (Continued)

Files for which ADR did not proceed for other reasons: 3
Files for which the ADR was in progress: 2
Files that reached a settlement: 4
Introducing ADR to the Parties

- An important component of the ADR process is the initial communication with the parties and the approach taken in this communication.

- This communication must be neutral and impartial.

Why Parties Consent and Decline

- Not all complainants agree to participate in the ADR process
  - The parties generally maintain their initial position of being open or closed to ADR
  - Conversely, all members (so far) have agreed to participate in the ADR process

Pilot Project: Lessons Learned

It is important to be flexible.

You won’t be able to anticipate all circumstances.
Pilot Project: Lessons Learned
Address day-to-day procedural matters that arise

- Issues with documentation
- Can the complainant withdraw?
- Can a party be represented during ADR?
- Records management

Pilot Project: Lesson Learned
An ethical wall may be necessary.

Pilot Project: Lessons Learned
Building an ethical wall:
- Determine which staff need access to what information
- Determine how records management works with an ethical wall
- Plan what should happen if the Practice Advisor has a conflict of interest
Pilot Project: Lessons Learned

Ethical Wall (Continued):

- Determine which staff the mediator can contact if he/she has questions
- Ensure that all parties understand their respective confidentiality obligations within the process
- If the ICRC refuses to ratify an agreement, ensure that those ICRC members do not review the final investigation

Pilot Project: Final Lesson Learned

Have a good lawyer on speed dial.

Expansion of the ADR Program

After the Pilot Project, the ADR Working Group decided to expand some of the criteria to allow more matters to go through the ADR process
Moving Forward

- ADR is no longer in the pilot phase and has been incorporated as one of the mechanisms for resolving complaints
- Important to open up public education about ADR

Successes

- Thus far, all settlement agreements have been adopted by the ICRC
- Surveys have been provided to the parties and feedback has been generally positive
- Some resolutions speak to the learning of new conflict resolution skills

Speaker Contact Information

Tracy Wiersema, R.Ph.
- Pharmacist and ADR Working Group Member
- taa.arone@sympatico.ca

Katharine Neufeld
- Decisions Coordinator
- Ontario College of Pharmacists
- kneufeld@ocpinfo.com
Speaker Contact Information

Charlene Rochman
- ADR Liaison
- Ontario College of Pharmacists
- crochman@ocpinfo.com

Maryan Gémus
- Manager, Investigation and Resolutions
- Ontario College of Pharmacists
- mgemus@ocpinfo.com