

Trustee Decision on Student Complaint

Complainant: [REDACTED]

Institution: 3147 – Stenberg College

1. Introduction

The Complainant was enrolled in the Regional Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing Program [Program] and filed a complaint against the Institution [Complaint] on July 17, 2025, after having been dismissed on May 26, 2025.

The Complainant exhausted the Institution's dispute resolution process [DRP] prior to filing this Complaint.

The Complainant alleges she was misled in respect of her final dismissal from the Program. Specifically, she disputes the reasons for her dismissal and claims the Institution did not provide adequate support or notice prior to her dismissal.

For the reasons outlined below I find the Institution did not mislead the Complainant regarding a significant aspect of the Program and, accordingly, deny the claim.

2. Statutory Scheme

Section 23(1) of the *Private Training Act* [PTA] provides that, a student may file a claim against the Student Tuition Protection Fund [Fund] on the ground that a certified institution misled the student regarding any significant aspect of an approved program of instruction in which that student was enrolled. Claims are filed with the Trustee, being the minister or the person to whom the minister has delegated the relevant powers or duties.

Claims must be filed no later than one year after the student completed or was dismissed or withdrew from the program and only after the student has exhausted the institution's dispute resolution process.

Following receipt of the complaint, the process is as follows:

Claim the student was misled		
Who	What	When
Trustee	Gives a copy of the claim to the institution	As soon as practicable
Institution	May respond to the claim [Response]	Within 15 days of receiving a copy of the claim from the Trustee
Trustee	Gives the Response from the institution, if any, to the student	Within 15 days of receiving the Response from the institution
Student	May reply to the Response from the institution [Reply]	Within 15 days of receiving the Response from the Trustee
Trustee	Must give the Reply from the student, if any, to the institution	Within 15 days of receiving the Reply from the student
Trustee	Adjudicates the claim to determine whether any refund should be issued, and provides written reasons to the student, the institution, and the registrar.	

If a claim is approved, the Trustee may authorize payment from the Fund of all or a portion of the tuition paid to the institution by or on behalf of the student. Section 25(4) of the *Fees and Student Tuition Protection Fund Regulation* requires that payments from the Fund be directed first to the government if all or a portion of the tuition was paid using funds from a provincial or federal student assistance program, and then to the claimant.

3. Program Information

Program:	Regional Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing
Student Enrolment Contract 1:	
Start date:	March 27, 2021
End date:	May 5, 2022
Dismissal date:	October 25, 2021
Student Enrolment Contract 2:	
Start date:	July 18, 2022
End date:	May 16, 2023
Student Enrolment Contract 3:	
Start date:	May 17, 2023
End date:	July 29, 2024
Dismissal date:	July 18, 2024
Student Enrolment Contract 4:	
Start date:	December 16, 2024
End date:	July 21, 2025
Dismissal date:	May 26, 2025
Total charged:	\$ 53,650.94
Tuition:	\$ 46,290
Registration Fee:	\$ 150
Texts & Supplies Fees:	\$ 0
Student Fee:	\$ 2,111.30
Re-entry Fees:	\$ 5,099.64
Amount paid to date by Complainant:	\$ 50,720.94
Amount of tuition paid to date by Complainant:	\$ 46,290

4. Issues

The following issues arise for consideration: Did the Institution mislead the Complainant in respect of her final dismissal from the Program?

5. Chronology

March 2021	Complainant enrolls in Program
October 2021	Complainant dismissed for failing two exam re-writes [Dismissal 1]
July 2022	Complainant re-enters Program and is required to repeat courses and retake exams
May 2024	Preceptor notifies Institution they have concerns with Complainant's performance
June 8, 2024	Meeting between Patient Site Coordinator and Program Director related to Complainant's performance on preceptorship

June 14, 2024	Clinical Manager performs Final Mental Health Preceptorship Evaluation
July 18, 2024	Complainant dismissed from Program for failing Final Mental Health Preceptorship [Dismissal 2]
August 9, 2024	Complainant re-enters Program and is required to audit and repeat courses, and rewrite two final exams
May 26, 2025	Complainant dismissed from Program for failing Final Mental Health Preceptorship [Final Dismissal]
June 2, 2025	Complainant submits Academic Appeal
June 12, 2025	Institution issues decision on Academic Appeal and reaffirms dismissal decision
June 18, 2025	Complainant initiates DRP and submits complaint to Institution
July 3, 2025	Institution issues decision reaffirming dismissal decision and agrees to refund \$3,000 repeat fee
July 17, 2025	Complainant files Complaint

6. Analysis

The Complainant was dismissed twice and re-entered the Program twice before being dismissed a third and final time with no option to re-enter the Program.

Dismissal 2 and Final Dismissal were based on the Complainant failing the Final Mental Health Preceptorship.

The main issue complained about is the Institution's failure to provide adequate feedback and support to the Complainant during her preceptorships.

The Complainant writes to the Institution, as part of the DRP:

Throughout both of my preceptorships I was let down. This particular one is really the one that upsets me. I asked for regular feedback and was always told I am improving and doing well. I was never warned or had discussions about any serious issues or given anything in writing to improve on. I was caught off guard and very hurt when I was let go from the program for not meeting competencies, based on concerns that were never shared with me. I had completed all of my clinical rotations and coursework with amazing grades and feedback, including my clinical prior to this placement. I had been given no chance to improve. When I asked for proof when this came about, the school and preceptors were unable to provide any.

The Complainant submits that, following her second re-entry in the Program, after she completed four shifts, she met with the Preceptorship Monitor who raised concerns about her performance. The Complainant says she diligently worked to improve and address the issues identified. The Complainant had a second meeting with the Preceptorship Monitor and "...[b]ased on hearing this feedback and not hearing from my monitor I assumed I was doing well and there were not any concerns".

The Complainant says she was shocked to hear about the issues identified in the final evaluation, upon which the Final Dismissal was based. In her view, the evaluation contradicts the positive feedback she had received from her preceptor.

The Institution denies it misled the Complainant in respect of the Final Dismissal or at all.

In its Response, the Institution provides a detailed account of the three dismissals which I have summarized here:

Dismissal 1: Complainant failed two exam re-writes

The Institution submits that, following the Complainant's re-entry in the Program, there were numerous performance issues: "...her academic record over the following three semesters reflected chronic issues with attendance, missed assignments, absenteeism from clinical and didactic courses, and multiple warnings." The Institution adds: "Despite these concerns, she progressed to preceptorship 2024".

The Institution lists the events that led to Dismissal 2:

- Complainant complains about "interpersonal challenges" with her preceptor and refuses the Institution's offer to change preceptor
- May 23, 2024 Preceptor Report lists "detailed concerns"
- June 8, 2024 meeting between the Patient Care Coordinator (PCC) and Program Director
- June 10, 2024 Preceptor Note confirms performance issues were discussed with Complainant
- June 14, 2024 on-site observation conducted by Clinical Practice Manager who prepared an Independent Observation Summary

Dismissal 2: Complainant failed Final Mental Health Preceptorship

The Institution submits:

Despite a prior re-entry and dismissal, [Complainant] was granted an exception and offered a second re-entry as a demonstration of the College's commitment to seeing her succeed. This exception was paired with targeted remediation, which included a Pharmacology III audit, repeating her Advanced Mental Health Clinical, and 1:1 tutoring.

The Institution submits multiple concerns were identified by the preceptors and clinical monitors which are outlined in the Final Dismissal letter and Preceptorship Midterm Evaluation.

Final Dismissal: Complainant failed Final Mental Health Preceptorship

In response to the Complainant's submission that she was not provided adequate support and notice prior to the Final Dismissal, the Institution submits as follows:

- Institution provided documented feedback and remediation, including verbal coaching, site visits, and clinical monitoring.
- Complainant was notified of ongoing performance concerns and was given multiple opportunities to demonstrate improvement.
- Preceptor met the requirements to precept students within the preceptorship.
- Final Dismissal was based on clinical performance and safety concerns, not on procedural gaps or interpersonal issues.

The Complainant also raises issues with respect to bullying. These allegations fall outside of my jurisdiction, and I have not addressed them in my decision.

7. Decision

I find the Complainant was not misled by the Institution in respect of the Final Dismissal and, for this reason, deny the claim.

The Complainant's Final Dismissal may have been justified. This is not the issue. The adjudicative task for me, as trustee, is to determine whether the Institution's support and communication leading to the Final Dismissal were inadequate or insufficient to the point of being misleading within the meaning of PTA 23(1).

I have carefully reviewed the evidence submitted in support of the Complaint. The Institution's feedback was routinely provided verbally, and I agree that communications, specifically prior to the Final Dismissal, may not have been crystal clear.

Taking into consideration the Complainant's academic history, the two prior dismissals and the conditions set by Institution for the Complainant to re-enter the Program, I am not persuaded by the Complainant's submission that she was "caught off guard" or surprised by the Final Dismissal decision. In other words, I do not find that, overall, the Institution's communications and support prior to the Final Dismissal were inadequate or insufficient to the point of being misleading.

The Institution would benefit from ensuring its communications are clear and provided in a written format to avoid claims of this nature.

This decision is final. The Trustee does not have authority to re-open or reconsider the decision and there is no appeal under the PTA. Parties may wish to seek legal advice regarding a judicial review by the BC Supreme Court.

20 November 2025



Joanna White

Trustee, Student Tuition Protection Fund