

BRIEFING NOTE

TO: Council

FROM: Governance Committee

DATE: October 8, 2019

SUBJECT: 16.0 Involvement of Non-council Members in Closed (in-camera) Sessions

For Decision

For Information

Monitoring Report

Purpose:

To determine whether to allow non-Council members to attend as observers during closed (in-camera) Council discussions.

Background:

On May 27, 2019, Council tasked the governance committee to review the existing practice around whether appointed non-Council members should be allowed to observe Council closed (in-camera) sessions.

The current practice is that only Council members are permitted to participate, given the sensitive and confidential nature of the discussions, which may include:

1. matters involving public security;¹
2. financial or personal or other matters may be disclosed of such a nature that the harm created by the disclosure would outweigh the desirability of adhering to the principle that meetings be open to the public;
3. a person involved in a criminal proceeding or civil suit or proceeding may be prejudiced;
4. personnel matters or property acquisitions will be discussed;
5. instructions will be given to or opinions received from the solicitors for the College; or
6. the Council will deliberate whether to exclude the public from a meeting

For Consideration:

It is consistent with Council's fiduciary duty to ensure information is kept confidential and only shared as necessary. Each Council member has a duty to the organization and its public interest mandate:

¹ Parameters for in-camera discussions are set out in [7.\(2\) of the Health Professions Procedural Code](#)

“Board and Council members should treat information obtained through their involvement with the regulator the same way as they would handle the regulator’s money. The information belongs to the regulator and should not be used for any purpose other than advancing the regulator’s mission.”²

Council has committed to transparency as one of its core values, which is defined as access to information that is not confidential. To this end, appointed members are invited to attend each open session of Council.

In a recent poll done by the College, of the 11 colleges who responded, none allowed non-council appointed members to attend closed council sessions.

The Committee Came to the Following Conclusions:

1. A member of a board of directors has a fiduciary duty of undivided loyalty and good faith to the mandate of the College and its public interest objects
2. Only matters of a highly sensitive and personal nature are heard in closed sessions
3. Global, national and provincial trends are seeing college councils shrinking in size
4. None of the colleges polled are allowing non-council members in-camera (Best practices)
5. Nonverbal communication of those in the room may be seen to have an influence or be a distraction which may detract from the meeting’s effectiveness
6. The need to know; keeping non-council members in the loop on highly confidential matters is individualistic, adds no value to the meeting nor does it serve the public good
7. Truncated results of in-camera matters are put on the public record

Recommendation:

That council keep the status quo and not allow appointed non-council members as observers to Council closed (in-camera) discussions.

² Steinecke, R. (2009, July). The Fiduciary Duty of Board and Council Members. Grey Areas, 137. 1-3. [See Below](#)
Involvement of Appointed Members in-camera

A COMMENTARY ON LEGAL ISSUES AFFECTING PROFESSIONAL REGULATION

The Fiduciary Duty of Board and Council Members

The Board or Council of a regulator acts in the capacity of the board of directors of a non-profit corporation. As such, each Board or Council member has a fiduciary duty to the organization and its public interest mandate.

A fiduciary is a person who has an undivided duty of loyalty, good faith and diligence to act on behalf of another person or group. For example, if you hold a power of attorney over the affairs of your Aunt Bertha, you must ensure that all of your decisions about the use of her money are for her benefit and not yours. In the regulatory context, the Board or Council member's Aunt Bertha is the regulator and its public interest objects.

The fiduciary duty has the following components:

Avoid Conflicts of Interest. A Board or Council member must not participate in any decisions or have any relationships that would create even the appearance of a divided loyalty. While the most frequent example given by commentators is voting on a contract involving oneself or one's

family; this is hardly ever a concern for regulators. The more common issues are relationship and regulatory related. Having a leadership role in another professional organization, particularly an organization that advances the interests of the profession, is a recurring problem. So is participating in regulatory decisions (e.g., policies, programs, regulations) that affect the Board or Council member disproportionately compared to most others in the profession.

A related concept is avoiding an appearance of bias when making a decision in a member-specific matter (e.g., complaints, discipline). Any connection to the member or the issue raises concerns as to one's neutrality and impartiality.

It is, of course, best to avoid conflicts of interest and appearances of bias from the get-go. Resigning from a leadership position in other professional organizations should be a given. Board and Council members should also shun involvement in incidents that are likely to result in a complaint or an investigation (e.g., as a consultant or "fixer"). Where the issue is unavoidable, the facts should be disclosed and, where there is any doubt at all, the Board or Council member should leave the room for the entire

FOR MORE INFORMATION

This newsletter is published by Steinecke Maciura LeBlanc, a law firm practising in the field of professional regulation. If you are not receiving a copy and would like one, please contact:

Richard Steinecke
Steinecke Maciura LeBlanc
Law Chambers, University Centre
Suite 2000, 393 University Avenue
Toronto, Ontario M5G 1E6

Telephone: 416-626-6897 Facsimile: 416-593-7867
E-Mail: rsteinecke@sml-law.com

Grey Areas is also available on our website: www.sml-law.com. Some back issues are also available.

WANT TO REPRINT AN ARTICLE

A number of readers have asked to reprint articles in their own newsletters. Our policy is that readers may reprint an article as long as credit is given to both the newsletter and the firm. Please send us a copy of the issue of the newsletter that contains a reprint from Grey Areas.

discussion and decision-making process and should not try to indirectly influence the decision.

Confidentiality. Board and Council members should treat information obtained through their involvement with the regulator the same way as they would handle the regulator's money. The information belongs to the regulator and should not be used for any purpose other than advancing the regulator's mission. Any personal use of the information is unacceptable. This duty applies not only to member-specific information, but to information related to policies, programs, personalities and even future regulatory directions. The fact that no one would be "deprived" by the use of the information is irrelevant. Just the perception of personal benefit of the Board or Council member through the use of such information would damage the organization.

Diligence. Board and Council members need to be conscientious in the fulfillment of their duties. This involves attending all meetings unless there are exceptional circumstances preventing their attendance. Attendance is particularly important when each member is expected to constitute part of the quorum of a committee or hearing panel. Reasonable participation in the discussions is also anticipated. Of course, neither of these means much if the Board or Council members have not done their homework, reviewing the background materials and considering the issues.

Perhaps because the absence of diligence is not generally viewed as a breach of ethics (like, say, a conflict of interest or a breach of confidentiality) and because diligence is

a matter of degree (not an either/or proposition), some Board and Council members do view it seriously. However, the damage to the regulator (and the public) can be as significant and sometimes greater by a dereliction of this duty as any other. Perhaps if the lack of attentiveness was viewed as "stealing" resources from the regulator, it would be viewed more seriously.

Competence. Generally the courts do not apply an objective standard to the competence of Board or Council members. People are selected to serve on the Boards and Councils of regulators for reasons other than business skills or knowledge (e.g., to offer a unique perspective, to provide diversity of backgrounds, reputation and respect in other fields). However, to the extent of their abilities, Board and Council members must provide thoughtful and prudent direction to the organization.

Diligence and competence go together. Council or Board members are expected to understand their duties (e.g., of confidentiality). Compliance cannot be accomplished if the Board or Council members do not do their orientation homework.

Good Faith. Board and Council members must always act honestly in their genuine view as to the best interest of the public. There are always secondary issues surrounding their activities for a regulator. These include: how each member is perceived by others (reputation), personal affirmation and other emotional needs, long-term career advancement, resume building and wishing to avoid offending others.

For example, if a Board or Council member believes that one of his or her colleagues has

an undeclared conflict of interest, the Board or Council member must act. Hopefully the concern can be addressed privately, but if the colleague declines to address the issue, the Board or Council member must raise the matter before the group.

Often these subsidiary matters would not amount to a conflict of interest. But, personal integrity requires that one applies personal insight and reflective thinking to ensure that choices are made truly for the public interest.

Good governance for a regulator requires Board and Council members to fulfill their fiduciary obligations.