

COLLEGE OF DIETITIANS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Meeting of the Inquiry Committee

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

2:30 to 3:10pm

Via teleconference

MINUTES

Present: Tina Hartnell (Chair), Maria Dedegikas (Vice-Chair), Heather Lovelace and Diana Stephenson
Staff: Fern Hubbard (Registrar), Mélanie Journoud (Deputy Registrar and Appointed Investigator), from 2:38 to 3:10pm for items 3 and 4.
Regrets: Jamila Kanji and Joyce Statton

Item No	Agenda Item	Discussion/Decision
1.	Call to Order and Remarks of the Chair	The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:30pm and confirmed quorum.
1.1	Agreement on Agenda	The agenda was adopted by consensus as circulated.
1.2	Minutes of October 16, 2013	<i>The Committee resolves to approve the Minutes of the October 16, 2013 teleconference meeting as circulated. Carried.</i>
2.	Reports	This agenda item was deferred to the Friday, December 6, 2013 in-person meeting.
3.	Orientation for Meeting – IC Training	Mélanie joined the meeting and provided a brief orientation to the options available to the Inquiry Committee under the <i>Health Professions Act</i> (HPA). She referenced the flow chart that is part of the College’s “Complaint Resolution Process” document.
4.	Case #13-09	
4.1	Investigation Report (draft)	<p>Committee members reviewed the pre-circulated draft Inspection Report and Appendices of evidence gathered. Melanie reviewed the investigation process, noting that the complainant and respondent were interviewed but not the complainant’s adult child who was the recipient of care (herein called “the client”). The client at first declined to be interviewed then reported not being available for the next six months. For each of the complainant’s allegations, Mélanie highlighted key points from the respondent’s written and interview responses and related them to the evidence gathered and relevant research references. Committee members then discussed each allegation in the context of the CDBC bylaws, including Schedule A, Code of Ethics, and Schedule B, Standards of Practice, and determined if the evidence supported unethical or substandard practice as alleged.</p> <p>Committee members discussed the evidence relating to allegation #1, negligent/unethical care, and determined that the respondent followed generally accepted dietetic consultation steps for an initial consultation and provided care for the client who reported a history of anorexia that appeared to be consistent with care guidelines for clients with a history of eating disorders. The evidence did not suggest the respondent had not considered the client’s eating disorder or that the respondent provided the client with a weight loss meal plan. Allegation #2, the fee charged, was not considered “exorbitant”. Internet research of dietetic consultation and meal plan fees advertised by private practice dietitians in the city</p>

		<p>determined that the respondent's fees are within the norm. For allegation #3, lack of communication, the evidence indicated that the respondent communicated with her client throughout their therapeutic relationship and respected the client's confidentiality. There was also no evidence to suggest the respondent was unprofessional or disrespectful to the complainant, the client's father.</p> <p>As no further investigation was required, the draft Inspection Report was approved as the final Report. <i>The Inquiry Committee approves the Inspection Report for Case #13-09 as circulated. Carried.</i></p>
4.2	Committee Determination and Outcome	<p>Based on the information available to the Inspector, Committee members determined that the complainant's three allegations were not supported by evidence.</p> <p><i>In regards to Case #13-09, the Inquiry Committee resolves to act under section 33(6)(a) of the Health Professions Act and take no further action as the respondent's dietetic care meets the CDBC's bylaws including Schedules A and B, the Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice. Carried.</i></p>
4.3	Case Finalization	<p>Fern will write to the complainant and respondent, informing them of the case outcome and reasons, and, as required, inform the complainant of the right to appeal to the Health Professions Review Board. Fern will also draft a gender-neutral, non-identifiable Case Outcome Report for the Committee's review and approval that will be circulated to registrants for quality assurance purposes, reported to the Board and posted on the College's website for complaint resolution transparency and education purposes.</p>
5.	Next Meetings	<p>The annual in-person Orientation meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 6, 2013 from 9:30am to 2:00pm in the CDBC office. Jamila has sent regrets.</p>
6.	Announcements	<p>Mélanie announced that Friday December 6 is her last day of work prior to a one-year leave. Members wished her well.</p>
7.	Adjournment	<p>The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3:10pm. Mélanie was thanked for her work on the Case and for assisting with the Orientation.</p>

Minutes approved as circulated on January 17, 2014.