

SUMMARY

DR. ROGER DACRE (CPSO# 53606)

1. Disposition

On August 16, 2017, the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee (“the Committee”) required Dr. Dacre (Family Medicine) to appear before a panel of the Committee to be cautioned with respect to his communications.

The Committee also ordered Dr. Dacre to complete a specified continuing education and remediation program (“SCERP”). The SCERP requires Dr. Dacre to:

- Undergo one-to-one instruction in communications, to be facilitated by the College.
- Engage in self-directed learning, wherein he shall review the College *Practice Guide* and College policy, *Physician Behaviour in the Professional Environment* (#3-16), and provide a written summary with reference to how they are applicable to his situation and what changes he has made or plans to make to his practice.

2. Introduction

The patient complained to the College that Dr. Dacre did not respond appropriately when the patient tried to raise a number of questions during one visit, including that Dr. Dacre was not respectful, he was rude and demeaning, and he became very angry and shouted at the patient.

Dr. Dacre responded that at the appointment in question he initially introduced the topic of work his office had done around a referral for the patient and he continued this discussion when the patient offered a different perspective as he was hoping for a “resolution.” Dr. Dacre denied having a one-issue-per-visit policy and said he asks patients to return for non-urgent issues (that are unrelated to the purpose of the appointment). He denied that he became angry or shouted.

3. Committee Process

A Panel of the Committee, consisting of public and physician members, met to review the relevant records and documents related to the complaint. The Committee always has before it applicable legislation and regulations, along with policies that the College has developed, which reflect the College's professional expectations for physicians practising in Ontario. Current versions of these documents are available on the College's website at www.cpso.on.ca, under the heading "Policies & Publications."

4. Committee's Analysis

The Committee noted the parties provided differing accounts of what took place. The Committee observed that it appeared unproductive for Dr. Dacre to spend limited appointment time discussing arrangements about a previous referral for the patient. The Committee was of the view that while Dr. Dacre's description of his usual practice around addressing the number of patient issues per visit was reasonable, if he had moved quickly from this one issue there may have been adequate time to answer more of the patient's questions.

The Committee noted it was limited to a documentary review and in circumstances where parties disagree as to communication it is not typically able to determine exactly what was said, unless there is independent information to confirm or refute either party's version of events (which was not the case here). However, the Committee was also aware that Dr. Dacre has relevant history at the College around communications issues, including previously being counselled and cautioned about his communications style.

The Committee determined that the two-fold disposition set out above was therefore appropriate in this case.