



**Council Meeting  
By Teleconference  
Wednesday, March 19, 2014**

A meeting of the Council of the College was held on March 19, 2014 by teleconference. The meeting was called to order at 8:33p.m.

- 1. Attendance:** Dr. Dennis Ruskin, President; Dr. Thomas Noel, Vice-President; Dr Pooya Hemami, Treasurer; Ms. Irene Moore, Mr. John Van Bastelaar, Dr. Dino Mastronardi, Dr. Marlee Spafford, Dr. Bill Chisholm, Mr. Emad Hussain and Dr. Patrick Quaid, Mr. John Costen and Dr. Derek MacDonald.

Regrets: Mr. Francis Christopher, Dr. Areef Nurani, Ms. Luisa Morrone, Mr. Ira Teich, Dr. Richard Kniaziew

**Staff:** Dr. Paula Garshowitz, Ms. Hanan Jibry

- 2. Agenda:** The agenda was circulated to Council prior to the meeting and consisted of the following two items:

- National Credential Assessment process
- Proposed CORA voting structure

Moved by I. Moore and seconded by P. Hemami **to approve the agenda as circulated.**

**Motion carried.**

i. Conflicts of Interest: Councilors were asked to declare any conflicts of interest with the agenda item; none were declared.

ii. Councillors were asked if they had any comments on the draft Council minutes of January 16, 17, 2014. No comments were provided. The minutes will be reviewed and approved at the April 7 Council meeting.

- 3. National Credential Assessment Process-** On February 6, copies of the Consultant's report and the draft procedures manual for the proposed National Credential Assessment process were circulated to Council by e-mail. All provinces were asked to have their Councils review the documents and provide the Steering Committee with any questions and comments regarding the process. The questions/comments received were sent to Council, including a memo summarizing the review of the Registration Committee with its comments/questions. Council was asked to provide any further comments and to indicate whether or not it supported CORA's continuation of the development of this process based on information provided to date.

42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85

Councilors made it clear that in order to fully support the process, it would need to have the questions answered and the comments addressed by the CORA Steering Committee. The Registration Committee has recommended that the College be prepared to provide funding for the program that is not covered by applicant fees based on the percentage of applicants intending to practice in Ontario. Currently that number is around 80%, but may change in time. It is expected that the process would become self-sufficient once it is fully in place.

Council has asked to see the next draft of the documents, including any changes made to the procedures manual, based on this review by the provinces, prior to giving final approval.

Moved by M. Spafford and seconded I. Moore **to support moving forward with the National Credential Assessment process with feedback on questions and comments provided by the provinces.**

**Motion carried**

**4. CORA Voting Structure-** Council had previously approved a '7/50' voting structure that required the approval of 7 provinces and over 50% of the population. This voting structure was debated at CORA and was not supported by all provinces. In order to find a solution that was acceptable to all provinces, an alternate voting structure was proposed with all provinces agreeing to take this back to their councils for consideration:

- 1 vote per province
- In order for a motion to be approved, it would require unanimous approval; however, provinces may abstain from voting and abstention votes do not count against the motion – only negative votes would count against the motion.
- Quorum to be 7 provinces

Councilors considered that it had already approved a voting structure but would like to work with the other provinces to find an arrangement that would work out. There was support to see how this structure would operate. Council was informed that most provinces had agreed to the 7/50 proposal, however, not all provinces were in favour, so an alternate approach was proposed. There was support for seeing how this would work and have a mechanism in place that CORA would re-evaluate the system. It was recognized that a vote by special resolution was required by Council to re-open the discussion on the voting structure.

Moved by P. Hemami and seconded by P. Quaid **to re-open the discussion on a voting structure for CORA.**

**Motion carried by special resolution**

Council continued to debate the proposal and considered that this structure would give each province a veto, not just the larger provinces. There was concern expressed that if a motion is not approved, that observers could report that a motion had (for example) 9/10 support. There

86 was support for seeing how this works and ensuring that it is reviewed, possibly in a year to 18  
87 months' time.

88

89 Moved by J. Van Bastelaar and seconded by B. Chisholm to **move forward with the proposed**  
90 **CORA voting structure as follows:**

91 ○ **1 vote per province**

92 ○ **In order for a motion to be approved, it would require unanimous approval;**  
93 **however, provinces may abstain from voting and abstention votes do not**  
94 **count against the motion – only negative votes would count against the**  
95 **motion.**

96 ○ **Quorum to be 7 provinces**

97 **with the caveat that the voting structure be reviewed in a year's time.**

98

99 It was agreed that this type of structure would require the provinces to fully discuss any issues  
100 before bringing it to a vote. Council asked to be informed of motions at CORA and if a pattern  
101 exists in the voting.

102

**Motion carried**

103

**One opposed**

104 Council concluded that it would be in agreement with a funding formula that was deemed to be  
105 fair by the other provinces.

106

107

108 **5. Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

109

**Motion carried**

110