



College of Paramedics of Manitoba		
Policy Name: Complaints Against the Executive Director/Registrar	Policy Number: GP-26	Total # of Pages: 3
Approval Signature: <i>Original Signed by J. Wade</i>	Section: Governance	
Original Approval Date: June 9, 2020	Last Revision Date: May 23, 2023	Next Review Date: May 2026

**1.0 PURPOSE:**

To ensure a fair and transparent process for handling complaints about the Executive Director/Registrar.

**2.0 POLICY:**

**In the event the Executive Director/Registrar is not a registered member of the College of Paramedics of Manitoba (CPMB):**

- 2.1. In the event a complaint in writing is made to the College about the Executive Director (ED)/Registrar, it shall be received by the Chair of the CPMB Council.
- 2.2. The Chair of the CPMB Council or delegate shall acknowledge receipt of the complaint within five (5) business days and will notify the ED/Registrar that a complaint was received.
- 2.3. The complaint will be forwarded to the Chair-Elect. If the Chair-Elect is satisfied that that the matter is, on its face, trivial, vexatious, or obviously unsustainable, or that there is no or insufficient evidence of breach of College policy, they may dismiss the complaint, but must issue written reasons for the decision within thirty (30) days of receiving the complaint. The Chair will also notify the ED/Registrar of the disposition of the complaint.
- 2.4. If the Chair-Elect concludes that there are grounds for further action by the Council, they will form a review-panel of three Council members, 1/3 of who will be public members.
- 2.5. The review panel will review the complaint and undertake such interviews and investigations as it deems necessary in the context of CPMB policies, procedures and executive expectations. The review panel will provide a decision in writing to the complainant within thirty (30) days. Specific details of any corrective action will not be shared with the complainant.
- 2.6. The complainant may apply for an appeal of the decision by the Chair-Elect or review panel in writing within 30 days of receiving the decision.
- 2.7. The appeal will be directed to the Chair who will review the complaint appeal and the disposition of the review-panel with the Executive Committee.
- 2.8. The Executive Committee will prepare a report and a recommended course of action for presentation to the Council.



[collegeparamb.ca](http://collegeparamb.ca)

- 2.9. The decision of Council will be final. The Complainant shall be informed of the decision of Council in writing within thirty (30) days.

**In the event the Executive Director/Registrar is a registered member of the CPMB:**

- 2.10. In the event a complaint in writing is made to the College about the Executive Director/Registrar, it shall be received by the Executive Director/Registrar who shall refer it to the chair (the "Chair") of the Complaints Investigation Committee (the "CIC") for their review.
- 2.11. The Chair, in lieu of the Executive Director/Registrar, shall process the complaint in accordance with section 91 of The Regulated Health Professions Act (the "RHPA").
- 2.12. If the Chair is satisfied, in accordance with subsection 91(2)(c) of the RHPA, that the matter is, on its face, trivial, vexatious, or obviously unsustainable, or that there is no or insufficient evidence of conduct about which a finding could be made under subsection 124(2) of the RHPA, the Chair may dismiss the complaint but must issue written reasons for the decision.
- 2.13. If the Chair dismisses the complaint, the Chair must promptly notify the complainant and the Executive Director/Registrar of the dismissal and the reason(s) and notify the complainant of their right to have the decision reviewed by the CIC.
- 2.14. The complainant has 30 days after being notified of the dismissal to apply in writing with reasons to the Chair for a review by the CIC in accordance with subsections 92(2) to 92(5) of the RHPA.
- 2.15. If the complainant submits a request for review of a dismissal made by the Chair, the CIC will consider whether the decision was within a range of reasonable decisions in light of the information in the possession of the Chair at the time of their decision.
- 2.16. If the CIC concludes that the Chair's decision to dismiss was within a range of reasonable decisions, the CIC will not substitute its own decision for that of the Chair.
- 2.17. If the CIC concludes that the Chair's decision to dismiss was not within a range of reasonable decisions, the CIC shall then process the complaint in accordance with sections 93 - 113 of the RHPA.
- 2.18. In the event the complaint is unable to be considered at first instance by the Chair, the CIC shall process the complaint in accordance with section 91 of the RHPA.
- 2.19. If the CIC is satisfied, in accordance with subsection 91(2)(c) of the RHPA, that the matter is, on its face, trivial, vexatious, or obviously unsustainable, or that there is no or insufficient evidence of conduct about which a finding could be made under subsection 124(2) of the RHPA, the CIC may dismiss the complaint but must issue written reasons for the decision.
- 2.20. If the CIC dismisses the complaint, the CIC must promptly notify the complainant and the Executive Director/Registrar of the dismissal and the reason(s) and notify the complainant of their right to have the decision reviewed.
- 2.21. The review of the decision will be conducted by a person external to the College (the "Complaint Adjudicator") selected by the chair of the Council from a roster of qualified individuals.



[collegeparamb.ca](http://collegeparamb.ca)

- 2.22. The complainant has 30 days after being notified of the dismissal to apply in writing with reasons to the CIC for a review by the Complaint Adjudicator, in lieu of the CIC, in accordance with subsections 92(2) to 92(5) of the RHPA.
- 2.23. If the complainant submits a request for review of a dismissal made by the CIC, the Complaint Adjudicator will consider whether the decision was within a range of reasonable decisions in light of the information in the possession of the CIC at the time of its decision.
- 2.24. If the Complaint Adjudicator concludes that the CIC's decision to dismiss was within a range of reasonable decisions, the Complaint Adjudicator will not substitute their own decision for that of the CIC.
- 2.25. If the Complaint Adjudicator concludes that the CIC's decision to dismiss was not within a range of reasonable decisions, the Complaint Adjudicator shall then process the complaint in accordance with sections 95 - 113 of the RHPA.
- 2.26. In the event the complaint is unable to be considered by the CIC, the Complaint Adjudicator shall process the complaint in accordance with section 91 of the RHPA.
- 2.27. If the Complaint Adjudicator is satisfied, in accordance with subsection 91(2)(c) of the RHPA, that the matter is, on its face, trivial, vexatious, or obviously unsustainable, or that there is no or insufficient evidence of conduct about which a finding could be made under subsection 124(2) of the RHPA, the Complaint Adjudicator may dismiss the complaint but must issue written reasons for the decision.
- 2.28. If the Complaint Adjudicator dismisses the complaint, the Complaint Adjudicator must promptly notify the complainant and the ED/Registrar of the dismissal and the reason(s) and notify the complainant of their right to have the decision reviewed by an ad hoc CIC panel (the "Panel") which meets the requirements of section 94 of the RHPA.
- 2.29. The complainant has 30 days after being notified of the dismissal to apply in writing with reasons to the Complaint Adjudicator for a review by the Panel, in accordance with subsections 92(2) to 92(5) of the RHPA.
- 2.30. If the complainant submits a request for review of a dismissal made by the Complaint Adjudicator, the Panel will consider whether the decision to dismiss was within a range of reasonable decisions in light of the information in the possession of the Complaint Adjudicator at the time of its decision.
- 2.31. If the Panel concludes that the Complaint Adjudicator's decision to dismiss was within a range of reasonable decisions, the Panel will not substitute their own decision for that of the Complaint Adjudicator.
- 2.32. If the Panel concludes that the Complaint Adjudicator's decision to dismiss was not within a range of reasonable decisions, the Panel shall then process the complaint in accordance with sections 95 - 113 of the RHPA.