



# Minutes

## EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE

### Meeting of April 26, 2019

#### PRESENT:

#### MEMBERS:

David Kiguel, Chair  
Changiz Sadr, Vice-Chair  
John Smith  
Zeljko Sucevic  
Peter Jarrett  
Berta Krichker  
Devinder Bahra  
Tibor Palinko  
Hisham Alkabie  
Andrew Cornel  
Titus Rusu  
Cameran Mirza  
Bill Jackson  
Mohinder Grover  
Christian Bellini  
Branislav Gojkovic

Ravi Gupta  
Jim McConnach  
George Apostol  
Spiridon Bot  
Duncan Blachford  
David Kahn  
LeRoy Lees  
Gordon Ip  
Bosko Madic  
Lionel Ryan  
Matthew Xie

#### STAFF:

Pauline Lebel  
Faris Georgis  
Daniel Mandefro  
Gersan D'Souza  
Mark Hekimgil  
Edward Tahiri  
Ann Pierre  
Una Mehta  
Jasmina Kovacevic  
Claire Riley

#### REGRETS:

Antonio Paz  
Duncan Sidey  
Eugene Puritch  
Eric Nejat  
Francis Sigouin-Allan  
Franz Newland  
Jega Jeganathan  
Jim McConnach  
Mihir Thakkar  
Michael Dang  
Rishi Kumar  
Saleh Tadros  
Saverio Pota  
Savio Desouza  
Vasantha Wijeyakulasuriya  
Venkat Raman  
Santosh Gupta

#### GUEST :

Marisa Sterling  
President-Elect,  
Council ERC Liaison

Guy Boone  
Councillor

1. Call to Order and Chair's Remarks

The meeting was called to order at approximately 1:30 p.m.

David reported on the following:

On February 27th an email was sent to all Professional Engineers Ontario (PEO) volunteers to inform them about the requirement to complete an Online Occupational Health and Safety and Accessibility Training Module. He indicated that the Government of Ontario mandate that all volunteers receive Occupational Health and Safety Training. The intent of the training is to educate them about their rights and responsibilities as well as what is expected from them while performing their duties so that they could work safely and in compliance with the law. The training consists of three modules:

- (i) Accessibility of Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) Customer Service,
- (ii) Understanding Human Rights and;
- (iii) Workplace Violence and Harassment Training for Employees (Ontario – Bills 168 and 132).

Each Module is approximately thirty minutes and there is a quiz at the end of each module. Volunteers must complete a registration survey and all information from that survey will be kept confidential and it will only be used by Professional Engineers Ontario (PEO) for training, registration and compliance purpose for volunteers. The deadline to complete the Training Module is the end of December 2019. David encouraged the ERC members who did not complete the Training Module to take the initiative to do so at their earliest convenience.

The election of PEO officers and Council has concluded. Marisa Sterling, Vice-President and ERC Council Liaison was elected to the position of President-Elect, Leila Notash, Past Chair of the Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) was elected as Councillor-at - Large, Ramesh Subramanian, Chair of the ARC was elected Northern Regional Councillor and Christian Bellini, ERC member and Past Chair was elected as Vice-President of PEO.

David wished all the appointees the very best in their new positions.

The positions for the New Officers and Council members will be officially initiated at the Annual General Meeting which will be held on Friday May 3<sup>rd</sup> and Saturday May 4<sup>th</sup>. David encouraged the ERC members to attend the Annual General Meeting.

Changiz Sadr, Vice-Chair of the ERC was elected by Council to be a Board Member of Engineers Canada representing PEO.

Tom Murad is now a Board Member of the Ontario Society of Professional Engineers (OSPE).

The National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE) and Engineers Canada issued a joint statement on April 25<sup>th</sup> to indicate that last Fall they held a conference call to discuss engineering licence mobility between Canada and the United States following the submission of the NSPE's public comments to the United States Trade Representative regarding wording in the Canadian Provincial Licensure Legislation which establish work requirements that create barriers for engineers who are licensed in the United States but who seek to obtain a licence in different provinces in Canada? There was positive discussion between the two organizations regarding licence mobility and they identified

steps that the United States and Canada could take which are fair, consistent to protect the public and help to ease mobility for Professional Engineers between the two countries.

The agreement between the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) and Engineers Canada provides a foundation for achieving enhanced mobility. It recognizes the substantial equivalence of accredited engineering education programs between Canada and the United States. It was established in 1980 and it provides benefit for engineers who seek licensure in both countries. Additional work is required to ensure that provincial, territorial state law and regulation reflect the principles and goals of this agreement and similar agreements in the future.

The NSPE and Engineers Canada are committed to work together to identify additional viable solutions and strive for continued dialog to enhance the recognition of qualified engineers and to promote mobility between Canada and the United States.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Ravi Gupta requested an additional Agenda Item under Other Business: “*External Regulatory Review.*”

It was **moved** by George Apostol and **seconded** by Ravi Gupta that the agenda be approved as amended.

**CARRIED**

3. Approval of Minutes of the February 22, 2018 Business Meeting

It was **moved** by Andrew Poray and **seconded** by Berta Krichker to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2019 Business Meeting.

**CARRIED**

4. Matters and Action Items Arising from the Minutes and the ERC Motions and Action Lists

The ERC Sub-Committee members reviewed the ERCSC Action List and identified the status of each item on the list.

5. Chair’s Report

David Kiguel reported on the following items:

- Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) Meetings

The ERC Chair and Vice-Chair attended the ARC meetings on March 15<sup>th</sup> and April 12<sup>th</sup> and reported on ERC activities.

- Licensing Committee (LIC)

He and members of the ERC (Santosh Gupta, Mohinder Grover, Christian Bellini) who are also members of the LIC attended the LIC meeting on March 14<sup>th</sup>. Changiz Sadr, Vice-Chair of the ERC also attended that meeting as an observer. There will be further discussion regarding LIC matters under Agenda Item #11.

- Changes to the Experience Requirements for Licensure Document

The Briefing Note pertaining to the Monitor Policy was modified to indicate that it was peer reviewed by the Professional Standards Committee (PSC), however the ERC was not in agreement with their request to seek legal review of the Monitor Concept. The document was re-submitted to be included in the Agenda for the Council meeting in March; nevertheless, it was not included as an Agenda item.

- External Regulatory Review

It was reported in December that an independent consultant from the United Kingdom Professional Standards Authority is conducting a regulatory performance review of Professional Engineers Ontario (PEO). They are expected to provide recommendations to Council in June 2019.

- ERC Business Meeting Minutes

All the ERC Business Meeting Minutes are now posted on the PEO website. Claire Riley took the initiative to ensure that the website was updated.

- ERC Sub-Committee Activities

The ERC Sub-Committee met on April 8th and discussed the following matters:

- (a) Interviews Quality Review

The ERCSC developed a process to review randomly selected video recordings of the ERC interviews and to verify that the ERC members follow guidelines and policies when they conduct the ERC interviews. The results of the review will assist in developing better training for the ERC members. The Working Group which include Changiz Sadr, Jim McConnach and Andrew Cornel was also involved in that process and they reported on their progress to date. The ERCSC is seeking approval to implement the review of the selected video recordings on a trial basis. Changiz will further report on this matter under Agenda Item #9.

- (b) Implementation of the Consultant's Recommendations

The ERCSC reviewed the status of each of the recommendations that the Consultant proposed to improve the ERC interviews. Implementation of some of these recommendations are not completed and the ERCSC will keep the ERC informed of the progress.

- (c) OIQ Changes

At the ERC Business on August 17, 2018, it was recommended that the ERCSC should prepare a response to the OIQ changes to the Experience Requirements. The ERCSC discussed this matter and more information will be provided under Agenda Item #12.

- (d) Inclusion of the Licence number when Sealing Documents and Drawings

This matter was discussed at the ERCSC meeting on April 8<sup>th</sup> at the request of the Vice-Chair, Changiz Sadr.

Regulation 941 Section 52 (Seals) states the following:

52. (1) Every Member shall have a seal of a design approved by the Council, the impression of which shall include:

- (i) the surname and initials or given names of the member;
- (ii) the words “licensed Professional Engineer” and Ontario;” and
- (iii) the licence number R.R.O 1990, Reg. 941, s. 52(1); O.Reg. 13/03, s. (15 (1).

(1.1) If a Member’s seal was issued before the day subsections (11 (1) to (65) of Schedule B to the Government Efficiency Act, 2001 come into force, clause 1(c) does not apply. O.Reg. 12/03, s. 15(2).

He stated that the Professional Engineering Licence Stamps that are issued currently include the licence number of the Licence Holders; however, this is not the case for Professional Engineering Licence Stamps that were issued prior to the 2001 amendments to the Regulations. These Stamps did not include the licence number which makes it sometimes difficult to verify the engineering work that pertains to the appropriate Licence Holder because there are many Licence Holders in the PEO database with the same initial for their first name and their last name is identical.

The ERCSC discussed this matter and a letter was drafted and sent to the PSC to recommend that they develop a policy that require Licence Holders whose Professional Engineering Licence Stamp does not contain their licence number that they should include that number with their signature.

## 6. Staff’s Report Including OFC Update

Pauline Lebel reported on the following:

- A. A letter was sent to the Ontario Fairness Commission (OFC) on March 4<sup>th</sup> to address outstanding issues regarding the Recommendations.
- B. Johnny Zuccon, Registrar made a presentation to Council on March 21<sup>st</sup>. That presentation focused on the licensure process and changes to the Regulations since 1984.
- C. On April 3<sup>rd</sup> she attended the Ontario Regulators for Access Consortium (ORAC) which consists of all the different Regulatory Bodies in Ontario. They meet approximately four times a year to discuss various issues relating to licensing requirements. The Registrar of the Veterinary College made a presentation that dealt with five questions of an effective Regulator. The topics included the following (i) “Why We Do What We Do” (ii) “What Are the Problems We Are Trying to Solve” (iii) “What Are the Top Five Risks That

Your Team Is Focused On” (iv) “Are You Placing Emphasis on Building Trustworthiness” and (v) “How Do We Know That We Are Making A Difference.”

- D. On April 8<sup>th</sup> she participated in a teleconference call on the Competency-based Assessment Users Group. It dealt with an update on each Association with respect to the Pan Canadian Competency Based System which was developed by Engineers and Geoscientists in British Columbia and it was adopted by the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists in Saskatchewan and the Association of Professional Engineers in Prince Edward Island. On April 24<sup>th</sup> there was another meeting to look at other requirements to manage the Pan Canadian Competency Based System and to set-up Validators to verify the experience requirements for licensure. The Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA) has their own online competency-based system and there are over a thousand applicants who are registered and who does their own competency assessment; however, they indicated that there is a possibility that they might adopt the Pan Canadian Competency Model.
- (a) There was a Press Release from Engineers Nova Scotia which stated that they would accept alternatives to the one year of Canadian Experience requirement for licensure. They identified four different alternatives that they would consider instead of the one year of Canadian experience:
- (i) Successful completion of The Immigrant Settlement Association of Nova Scotia’s Study Program Orientation and Communication Skills for Engineers.
  - (ii) Successful completion of the Online Working in Canada Seminar offered by Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists in British Columbia.
  - (iii) Successful completion of the competency-based system which may be offered by another engineering Regulatory Body in Canada.
  - (iv) Successful completion of a similar course or program as approved by Engineers Nova Scotia.
- (b) There is an internationally educated applicant who was assigned a Confirmatory examination program and attended an ERC interview two years ago, however, the exam program was not modified, and he was required to write the assigned exam program. He disagreed with the ERC decision and has requested a Registration Hearing. She stated that before an application could be considered for a Registration Hearing, the applicant must demonstrate that he/she has met the academic requirements, completed the Professional Practice Exam (PPE) and his/her engineering experience was assessed. However, for applicants who have not met the academic requirements, the ERC states that they cannot assess them because they do not have an experience start date. She suggested that this applicant should be informed about the ERC decision because he has not met the academic requirements. She also said that she informed our Legal Counsel about the ERC requirements with respect to this applicant.

## 7. Council Liaison`s Report:

Marisa Sterling, President-Elect, Council ERC Liaison commented on the following:

### Council ERC Liaison Role

- Her role as Council ERC Liaison will end in September 2019 and she recommended that the ERC should seek to find a replacement for this role for next year as quickly as possible so that it could be taken into consideration at the Annual General Meeting in April. She stated however, that if the ERC agrees, she is willing to remain the Council Liaison for the ERC.
- In her new role as President-Elect, she requested that the ERC should inform her if she could be of assistance to them.
- On April 21<sup>st</sup> there was a preliminary and open discussion before the Council Meeting on April 22<sup>nd</sup> and the Registrar, Johnny Zuccon gave an update on the licensing process. She stated that many Councillors are very interested in the licensing process particularly the experience review process. The Incoming President, Nancy Hill is also interested in the experience review process and she will be communicating with ERC regarding this matter. Many Councillors are approached by applicants who raised questions about the experience review process, i.e.(i) Why the engineering experience requirement is four years and not two years; (ii) The value of the Provisional Licence and does it add value to applicants and the administrative requirements for PEO to maintain this licence; (iii) How does PEO assess applicants whose undergraduate degree is different to their area of practice (iv) The robustness of the Professional Practice Exam Program (PPE) and whether it is still required, (v) How is the Canadian Experience requirement considered for applicants who work on global projects; (vi) Does the Seamless Transition Taskforce still exist and if not, could be reintroduced; (vii) If an applicant is on maternity or paternity leave and there is instability in the job market, how does that affect the closing of his/her file; (viii) How are applicants assessed if they have an EIT Monitor but not a Professional Engineering Referee; (ix) Last year ninety-seven percent of the experience assessment was done by Staff and fifty percent of applicants who attended the Experience Requirements Committee interviews passed the interview. Council requested more information about the applicants who failed their ERC interviews; (x) Many foreign applicants with a bachelor's degree are registered in the Financial Credit Program (FCP) which allow them a free application to apply for a Professional Engineering Licence after six months of landing in Canada and they could get the application fee waived for one year if they register in the Engineering In Training Program (EIT). One third of these applicants have been licenced over the past ten years; concern was raised as to whether this is a good approach to PEO financially. (xi) How is the experience review process keeping abreast with the evolving Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) programs. Staff is requested to gather information to clarify these questions by September 2019.
- Council also passed a White Paper to return to the two years of experience requirement for licensure and Staff will be required to evaluate it.
- There was discussion pertaining to the questions that the President-Elect, Council ERC Liaison identified especially the requirement for the years of experience with respect to the experience requirement for licensure. Concern was raised as to whether Councillor's understand the concept of the licensure process and the role of the ERC. It was pointed out however, that the mandate of Council is to ensure that the Public is protected and the requirements for licensure are met. They rely on PEO Staff to implement the Regulations to achieve these requirements. There are new engineering disciplines that are evolving and requirements in the engineering workplace is different than in previous years, Council is seeking alternative approach to better enhance the licensure process.

The President-Elect, Council ERC Liaison encouraged the ERC members to consider this as an opportunity to share information so that there could be clarity about the licensure process.

She also stated the following:

- Effective May 1, 2019, all the fees pertaining to the application for licensure will be increased due to inflation.
- PEO denied Engineers Canada request for additional funds.
- Changiz Sadr, Vice-Chair of the ERC and Kelly Reid were elected to be members of the Engineers Canada Board to represent PEO.
- There will be a new appointee to The Ontario Association of Certified Engineering Technicians and Technologists (OACETT) at the Annual General Meeting on May 4<sup>th</sup>.
- Bob Dony was reappointed the Chair of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) for 2020.
- The Finance Committee is analyzing a five-year budget plan for PEO. It appeared that many Committees did not inform them of their projected budget for the next five years. She encouraged the ERC to inform the Finance Committee of their anticipated budget plans.
- Engineers Canada has signed an agreement with Toronto Dominion Meloche Monnex which PEO is also expected to sign. This would provide an invitation to members of PEO to learn about Toronto Dominion Meloche Monnex's Home and Auto Insurance Policy. If the PEO members agree to register in the program, Toronto Dominion Meloche Monnex will give PEO 2.14 million dollars based on the number of engineers who are currently registered in the program. PEO Council has decided not to participate in this program at this time because they felt uncomfortable that the organization will be operated on affinity dollars and as a Regulator they did not want to take on that risk. This is still an open issue however and there could be a possibility for consideration in the future. The complexity of this issue is that if PEO decided that they did not want to depend on affinity dollars to operate their budget and they did not like the idea of informing their members to participate in the insurance program, it could affect Ontario Society of Professional Engineers (OSPE) because currently PEO transfers money to OSPE based on a life insurance program. Sixty percent of Engineers Canada's budget is affinity dollars which means that if their members buy insurance they would get money to fund their organization.
- PEO renewed their mortgage with the Bank of Nova Scotia for the next five years at which time the mortgage will be paid off.
- Staff is reviewing the Practice Evaluation and Knowledge Program (PEAK) since its introduction two years ago. There is also a recommendation for mandatory Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and this will be further discussed at the Council meeting in June.
- Some Councillors raised questions about the online voting procedure for elections and this is being reviewed by the Central Elections Committee.

- The Complaints Review Councillor position was reviewed, and it was determined that this position is ineffective. A report is being sent to the Attorney General to indicate that there is no purpose for this position based on the current appeal process.
- She attended the first PEO Presidential On-Boarding with the President Elect, Nancy Hill and they met with the Registrar to discuss possible approach for PEO in the future and to evaluate processes that were effective and those that were ineffective. Concern was raised regarding the approach in which Agendas, Briefing Notes and Communications are forwarded to be included in the Agenda for Council meetings. It was suggested that in the future before items could be approved for inclusion in the Council Meeting Agenda, they must first be brought to the Annual General Meeting.
- There will be discussion regarding the PEO's External Review at the Council Meeting in June.
- At an Annual General Meeting previously, an ERC member suggested that because some volunteers are employed fulltime, PEO should conduct its business in the evenings and on the weekends. The Chair indicated that this matter was discussed at that meeting and the ERC members also discussed this issue in the past. At that time and it was determined that this could be an additional cost to PEO taking into consideration the requirement to pay staff for overtime hours, security accessibility to the building and catering requirements. He stated that it was decided to put this recommendation on hold.

#### 8. 30 by 30 Initiative Update

Christian Bellini reported on the following:

- On March 7<sup>th</sup> the 30 by 30 Initiative Taskforce organized an awareness session with representatives from women groups to explain to them the purpose and goals of the 30 by 30 Initiative and to gain information from them on what would be the most productive approach to meet the 30 by 30 goal. The session was well attended, and it generated great discussion.
- On March 14<sup>th</sup> he attended the Licensing Committee (LIC) meeting and he gave a presentation on the 30 by 30 Initiative.
- On April 11<sup>th</sup> a group of representatives from Chapters attended an awareness session at the PEO office and the 30 by 30 Initiative was presented to them to communicate possible roles that Chapters could be involved in to promote the 30 by 30 initiative and to get feedback from them on functions that they might be able to undertake to help launch the initiative. The 30 by 30 Initiative is a two-year taskforce and the objective is to get as much assistance to complete the two-year mandate.

#### 9. Interview Quality Review Trial

Changiz Sadr pointed out that the Interview Quality Review Trial Program was developed to review randomly selected video recordings of ERC interviews to determine whether there is the need to develop a methodology to enhance the ERC interview process. He stated that the ERC Sub-Committee members reviewed the proposed Interview Quality Review Trial Program document at the last ERC Sub-Committee meeting and they agreed that the Interview Quality Review Program could be adopted on a trial basis; however, he is seeking the approval of the ERC to implement the trial program. A copy of the Interview

Quality Review Trial Program document was distributed to the ERC members for their review and Changiz commented on the document. The ERC members reviewed the document and provided comments which required changes to the proposed program.

In response to a question from an ERC member, Changiz clarified that the Quality Review Program is not the same as the Interview Results Dispute Resolution Process approved by the ERC. The Dispute Resolution Process aims to resolving cases where an applicant disagrees with the interview result, that is, it is initiated by applicants and focusses in the interview result. On the other hand, the Quality Review Process focusses on the ERC and aims at observing ERC Panel Members with the objective of introducing improvements in the training and the way interviews are conducted.

Another ERC member proposed that the selection of interviews to be observed, includes both, problematic cases as well as good ones.

It was **moved** by Changiz Sadr and **seconded** by Andrew Cornel that the Interview Quality Review Trial Program be implemented as modified.

CARRIED

10. Interview Forms

Pauline Lebel commented on the Project Summary Form which applicants receive before they attend their ERC interview to assist them to prepare their projects for discussion during their interview. She said that Staff provided statistics to the ERC Sub-Committee about the number of applicants who filled out the form and returned it and those applicants that did not return the form prior to their ERC interview. The ERC Sub-Committee made minor changes to the Project Summary Form and based on the statistics that were presented to them, they recommended that applicants should continue to receive the document in advance of their ERC interviews. The revised Project Summary Form was also presented to the ERC members for review. The ERC members also reviewed the document and it was decided that the form should be used for the Confirmatory, Directed and Staff Referral interviews. She also spoke about the Experience Requirements Committee Interview Report Form which was modified to take into consideration the competencies which was agreed upon and questions that the ERC members could ask the applicants based on these competencies. The ERC members reviewed the Experience Requirements Committee Interview Report Form and suggested some changes to the document. Pauline will revise the document accordingly and it will be implemented for the ERC interviews.

11. Licensing Committee Update

David Kiguel reported on the following:

- The LIC met on March 14<sup>th</sup> and it was noted that Bernard Ennis, P.Eng., Director, Policy and Professional Affairs will be the new Staff Advisor of the LIC.
- Christian Bellini gave a presentation on the 30 by 30 Initiative at the LIC meeting on March 14<sup>th</sup>.
- There was discussion about a presentation that George Comrie gave on how PEO assesses Good Character and how it is considered in the Licensing Process.

- There is concern from the Ontario Fairness Commission (OFC) about the Professional Practice Exam (PPE). Their intent is to change the format for the PPE exams from essay type questions to multiple choice questions.

## 12. OIQ Changes to Experience Requirements

David Kiguel pointed out that at the ERC Business Meeting in August 2018, the Interim Deputy Registrar, at that time, Moody Farag reported that he and the President of Professional Engineers of Ontario (PEO), David Brown met with the OIQ President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) who was on a Canada wide tour to gather information from other licensing organizations regarding their licensure process and to provide details about the OIQ approach for licensure.

David said that the Interim Deputy Registrar reported on the following changes that have already been implemented or will be introduced to the licensure process in Quebec:

- Removal of the Engineering- In-Training (EIT) mandatory requirement before acquiring a Professional Engineering Licence and removal of the EIT or junior engineer phase/structured internship for licensing.
- The format for the Professional Practice Examination (PPE) is no longer essay type questions; it has been changed to multiple choice questions for at least two years. The multiple-choice examination option for the PPE was introduced by Professional Licensing Organizations across Canada. PEO is the only licensing organization that did not introduce that approach for their PPE examination.
- The required number of years for licensure in Quebec is three years while in all other jurisdiction the requirement is four years. The OIQ will further reduce that requirement to two years.
- The OIQ will completely remove the requirement for Canadian experience.
- The OIQ will proceed with a competency model assessment soon. In addition, as part of the experience assessment requirements, they will introduce an online module of thirty hours for licence applicants so that they could get exposure to the Canadian environment.

Following the Interim Deputy Registrar's report, questions were asked as to whether PEO has influence on the OIQ and is the ERC considering the requirements that other licensing bodies follow with respect to licensure. This matter was discussed at the ERC Sub-Committee meeting on April 8<sup>th</sup> and it was concluded that it is not the responsibility of the ERC or the PEO to dictate what the OIQ does with respect to their licensing requirements.

## 13. ARC Activities Report

David Kiguel reported on behalf of Ramesh Subramanian, Chair, ARC on the following ARC activities:

- (a) At the request of CEQB, the ARC provided official feedback to the CEQB on (a) Regulators Guideline on the use of Syllabi for academic assessment for non-CEAB applicants for licensure and (B) Consultation Paper on Entrepreneurship following a lengthy discussion by the committee at its meeting on March 15, 2019. It revolved

around how PEO could accommodate Ontario entrepreneurs in obtaining licensure, how potential barriers could be removed as well as the importance of an effective approach to regulating engineering entrepreneurs.

- (b) At the ARC meeting on March 15, 2019, Bob Dony, a member of PEO's 30 by 30 Taskforce and a current member of the ARC shared a 30 by 30 Taskforce presentation on Equity and Outreach in Engineering.
- (c) The staff of PEO presented statistical data of December 2018 sitting of Professional Practice Exam (PPE) as well as Technical Exams. For the PPE exam, 93% of applicants who registered wrote the exam (1358 out of 1458). Of the 1358 applicants who wrote the exam, 1088 passed (80% pass rate). Of the 270 who failed, 134 failed Part "A" Ethics only (nearly 50%), 77 failed Part "B" Law only (nearly 29%) and 50 failed both Part "A" and part "B" (just over 21%). For Technical Exams, 392 applicants from Ontario wrote 573 exam papers. Of these 573 exam papers written, 476 exam papers obtained passing mark (just over 83% success rate).
- (d) The past Chair of the ARC Leila Notash was appointed to the position of Councillor-at-large starting May 4, 2019 and she was also recommended to be the Council Liaison Appointee of the ARC at the ARC meeting on April 12, 2019.
- (e) The Aeronautical Engineering syllabi which was approved by PEO is now being reviewed by CEQB for depth and breadth at all levels (Introduced, Developed and Applied).
- (f) There is a growing recognition at CEQB that the four-year work experience for licensure may have to change if competency-based experience, which may include entrepreneurship is part of the assessment matrix.
- (g) The ARC has proposed and approved a better grading scheme to assess Engineering Report submitted by an applicant. The previous grading scheme had equal weightage (20%) for each of the following categories:
  - (i) Introduction and Objective
  - (ii) Approach and Methods
  - (iii) Analysis, Synthesis, Testing and Design
  - (iv) Results and Conclusions
  - (v) Technical Writing and General Organization

Starting April 12, 2019, the new grading scheme will have the following weightage:

- (i) Introduction and Objective (10%)
- (ii) Approach and Methods (10%)
- (iii) Analysis, Synthesis, Testing and Design (30%)
- (iv) Results and Conclusions (30%)
- (v) Technical Writing and General Organization (20%)

14. Other Business

(a) External Regulatory Review

Ravi Gupta stated that he reviewed the questionnaire that the Consultant gave to Staff and other Committee members to provide their input with respect to PEO External Review and he had concern about the content of the document. He was informed that the Consultant will prepare a Draft Report based on the responses, however that document will be confidential, and it must be reviewed by Council before any Committee could provide their input. He stated that he is hopeful that the ERC would be given the opportunity to give their feedback after that review.

The Chair pointed out that the recommendations that the Consultant proposed will be discussed at the Council meeting in June and it is expected that it will be made public based on Council's approval.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM