



## MINUTES

### ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE (ARC)

Friday, November 23, 2018

#### PRESENT

##### Members

Leila Notash, Chair  
R. Subramanian, Vice-Chair  
Remon Pop-Iliev  
Amin Rizkalla  
Sanjeev Bhole  
John Yeow  
Joe Lostracco  
Amir Fam  
Shamim Sheikh  
Stelian George-Cosh

Jüri Silmberg  
Ian Marsland  
Waguïh ElMaraghy  
Barna Szabados  
Medhat Shehata  
Michael Hulley  
Bob Dony  
Ross Judd  
Roydon Fraser  
Seimer Tsang  
(Via Teleconference –  
Item 8.4)

##### Staff

Michael Price  
Moody Farag  
Pauline Lebel  
Faris Georgis  
Anna Carinci Lio  
Esther Kim  
Irene Zdan  
Claire Riley

##### Regrets

Meilan Liu  
Allen Stewart  
Gosha Zywno

Judith Dimitriu  
George Nakhla  
Magdi Mohareb

##### Guests

David Kiguel, ERC Chair  
Changiz Sadr, ERC Vice-Chair

#### 1. Call to Order and Chair's Remarks

The meeting was called to order by Chair Leila Notash at 10:40 AM. She welcomed everyone to the meeting.

#### 2. Approval of the Agenda

##### MOTION

It was **moved** by Waguïh ElMaraghy and **seconded** by Ramesh Subramanian that the agenda be approved by unanimous consent.

**CARRIED**

3. **Approval of the October 19, 2018 Minutes**

Seimer Tsang emailed the Chair pointing out the following typo in reference to Page 8, Item 8.6, Bullet 1:

- ...15 [exams] is the limit for an engineering **technician** applicant's examination program. The word technician should be replaced by **technologist**.

**MOTION**

It was **moved by** Ramesh Subramanian and **seconded by** Waguih ElMaraghy that the minutes of the October 19, 2018 meeting be approved as amended.

**CARRIED**

4. **Matters Arising from the Minutes**

There were no matters to discuss.

5. **Chair's Report**

The Chair reported on the following:

- As the Vice-Chair of the Kingston Chapter, she attended the Chapters Leaders Conference on November 17, 2018. There were presentations by Ann English, P.Eng., Chief Executive Officer and Registrar of Engineers and Geoscientists British Columbia.
- Several PEO committees received a November 20, 2018 letter from PEO President David Brown informing them that Council passed a motion in September 2018 to commission an independent consultant to conduct a compliance audit of PEO's regulatory practices review. Through the committee staff advisor, the consultant will be requesting assistance from PEO volunteer leaders and regulatory committees by providing documentation of their work. The consultant may also make a request to attend committee meetings.

6. **Deputy Registrar's Report**

Deputy Registrar Michael Price reported the following:

- Based on President Brown's letter, to the committees, the regulatory review will commence in January 2019, to be completed by April 2019. The consultant will be at PEO during the week of the February 2019 Council meeting. He noted that the ARC, Experience Requirements Committee (ERC) and the Consulting Engineer Designation Committee (CEDC) does not meet that week so unless these committees move their meetings up, the consultant will not get to see any of the licensing and registration-related committee work. In this case, the consultant will have to rely on any information posted by the ARC, ERC and CEDC. Hopefully, the consultant will have conversations with these committees and staff, although he is not aware of the consultant's plans as to how the review will be conducted.
- As requested by the Waguih ElMaraghy, the Distance Education Subcommittee Chair, he followed up on the ARMATURE program for engineering education accreditation for

universities. The software is not intended as a membership or applicant database. As he understands, the program objective is to assist universities to prepare for accreditation.

- He attended the November 2018 Council meeting and reported on items related to the 2019 budget which may require by-law changes or the rescinding of previous motions before they can actually come into effect.
- There will be an increase in all fees by 20%, other than the P.Eng annual fee. Technically, the increases would take effect January 1, 2019, but may require the by-laws to be ratified as the fees are in the by-laws.
- A new fee has been introduced, that of an ERC interview after a referral by the ARC, the fee will be the equivalent of an examination program assignment, as well as one exam. The current fee would be \$580, and with the increase of 20% the fee will be \$700 for an ERC interview.
- One fee that may require a Council motion is the Financial Credit Program (FCP). The FCP was instituted by Council in 2007 and it allows Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) applicants to apply to PEO within six (6) months of graduating in order to be eligible to apply at no cost and, as well, to receive a one-year registration as an Engineer-In-Training (EIT). Under existing fees, the application fee is \$300 and \$75 for the first-year EIT fee, plus H.S.T. — a saving of over \$400. The FCP also applies to non-CEAB graduates if they apply to PEO within six (6) months of arriving in Canada.

Council proposes to eliminate the FCP free application and free first-year EIT registration and, instead, the applicants will receive a credit for the current equivalent of the \$375 fee, plus H.S.T. if the applicant obtains a licence. November 2018 graduates will still be eligible for the FCP, however, by May 2019 there could be some modifications made to the process.

- In summary, Council approved changes to the 2019 budget in terms of monetary figures and approved adding two (2) new fees: one for the ERC interviews; the second is a \$10 fee for processing of credit card payments. The new fees may require changes to the by-laws, which has yet to be confirmed. For the FCP, Council may have further discussions on the matter.

## 7. Endorsements

### 7.1 Reading Assignment of Technical Reports/Synopses

There were three synopses:

1. **Mechanical Engineering** — Title: Characteristic tool wear mechanisms in hard part machining and the optimization of tooling and cutting methods to prolong tool life with PcBN cutting inserts: submitted by applicant with File Number 100183745. The applicant confirmed that the report was not work-related. Ross Judd suggested examiner Stephen Veldhuis.
2. **Manufacturing Engineering** — Title: Design Calculations for Upper Feeder Template Table: submitted by applicant with File Number 100167914. It was reviewed and accepted by Stelian George-Cosh.
3. **Electrical Engineering** — Title: Designing of a 500 watt microcontroller based smart uninterruptible power supply-UPS: resubmitted by applicant with File Number 100218549. It was re-reviewed by Barna Szabados and according to his request, the applicant was

provided with the new ER Guidelines and Preparation. The resubmitted report was accepted.

Report-related comments:

- Waguih ElMaraghy recommended that as a standard procedure, PEO conduct a similarity check, or ask the applicant to submit one. Instituting this new policy would greatly assist the reviewers.
- Make the applicants aware that plagiarism is a serious offence. Proof of similarity checks could potentially become an additional requirement on the part of the applicants when submitting reports. The report approval by the employer could also be considered a requirement.
- The Chair suggested that the ARC identify and inform the applicants as to which tools they accept for similarity checks.
- W. ElMaraghy further added that there are no officially published guidelines. There is a difference between a publication that is supposed to be original, and a key note paper which reviews a lot of existing literature. At some point, PEO should consider writing some guidelines. A 10%-15% similarity could be acceptable. If the principle is presented to the applicants, the reviewers would feel more protected.
- The Chair remarked that the ARC Technical Report Subcommittee could continue to explore the matter of similarity checks. She invited other members to join the subcommittee.

## **7.2 Issues Arising from ARC/Deputy Registrar Recommendations**

There were no issues to report.

## **7.3 Issues Arising from ERC Recommendations for Applicants Referred by ARC**

There were no issues to report.

## **7.4 Professional Practice Examination (PPE) Report**

Anna Carinci Lio reported on the statistics for the additional PPE sitting written on October 17, 2018. In this report, she indicated an 89% attendance rate; a 90% passing rate; and a 10% failure rate. Applicants who failed once (7) will be permitted to re-write the exam. They will be sent a guidance letter suggesting general preparation techniques to promote future success. The passing rate of 90% is in keeping with previous PPE results.

## **8. Procedural and Related Matters**

### **8.1 Licensing Committee (LIC) Update**

The LIC Chair Barna Szabados reported the following:

- He thanked ARC members who gave their feedback on the *Internal Independent Review of Academic Assessments* briefing note to be presented to Council at its February 2019 meeting. All of the comments were incorporated with the exception of timelines for each of the three proposed stages of review.
- The flowchart was revised with the addition of indicating stages of review. He intends to circulate the final version of the briefing note at the December 2018 ARC meeting to be approved before submitting it to Council.
- The major discussion at the November 22, 2018 LIC meeting was a Competency Presentation by Pauline Lebel and it was suggested that she present it to the ARC. He remarked that the Distance Education Subcommittee could benefit from viewing it as well. He opined that competencies could be looked at from a different angle. He referred to it as a culture change and that PEO should be part of it.

## **8.2 Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) Update**

Bob Dony noted that there were not items to report. However, he informed the Committee that the future CEAB updates should be reported by Ramesh Subramanian.

## **8.3 Canadian Engineering Qualifications Board (CEQB) Update**

Roydon Fraser reported the following:

- There is a CEQB Licensing Entrepreneurs workshop with a diverse group of professionals scheduled for Monday, November 26, 2018. He will report back on the workshop at the December 2018 ARC meeting.
- The National Admissions Officials Group (NAOG) made a request to the CEQB as to how to use the syllabi. He distributed a chart to the Committee titled: *Assessing & Confirming Minimum Breadth & Depth of Academics (a CEAB, CEQB & Higher Education Model)*. The chart indicates a synopsis of the admissions process and summarizes the equivalency between what is done at the CEAB, the ARC and universities.
- A couple of provincial regulators are suggesting that PEO model the CEAB processes. He remarked that the flowchart demonstrates that the processes are already somewhat equivalent. He invited feedback from the members to comment on what is actually similar with all three processes and how the chart may be improved.
- Michael Price remarked that previous discussions with NAOG seemed to have centered on regulators adopting the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientist of Alberta (APEGA) model, which presented concerns for some provinces.

## **8.4 The Procedures Manual of the Academic Requirements Committee (a.k.a. Red Book) Revisions: Sections 7.2.3, 8.2.1 and 8.3.1**

Seimer Tsang joined the meeting via teleconference at 11:30 AM. His submission was distributed to the members.

- He presented some background about a file he had reviewed whereby the applicant was certified by the Ontario Association of Certified Engineering Technicians and Technologists (OACETT) with the Certified Engineering Technologists (C.E.T.'s) designation without any technology level courses. He remarked that there was no choice but to accept the application according to Section 8.2.2 of the Red Book – Canadian Community College Engineering Technology Diploma Holders (3-year program) or OACETT Certified Engineering Technologists (C.E.T.'s) (with ten or more years of experience) or Equivalent.
- He proposes a revision to Section 7.2.3 Specific Examination Program as he assigned sixteen (16) exams to the above-noted applicant, and not the maximum of 15 as stated in this specific section. In addition to up to “fifteen (15) assigned exams,” he proposes to add “*plus the Engineering Report*” as a reminder to technologist applicants that they also have to submit an Engineering Report.
- He also proposes that the following be added to this same section: *More than fifteen (15) examinations may be assigned to OACETT’s C.E.T.’s with the technician/trade academic credentials.*”
- Regarding Section 8.2.1 Canadian Community College Engineering Technology Diploma Holders (3-year program) or OACETT College Certified Engineering Technologists (C.E.T.'s) (with less than ten years of experience) or Equivalent, he recommends another revision. As part of assigned exams, “1 complementary studies examination” is stipulated in this section. He proposes to add “*at least*” 1 complementary studies examination.
- He would like to introduce a new paragraph to Section 8.2.1 for additional clarification of credentials for the following reason: “OACETT seems to have a process to upgrade Certified Technicians to Certified Engineering Technologists without the requirement of completing an academically more challenging technology education, which normally has more breadth and depth coverage of the contents in mathematics, science, technology and engineering subjects.”
- Another proposed revision was presented in reference to Section 8.3.1 International Engineering Technology Diploma Holders (3-year program) or OACETT Certified Engineering Technologists (C.E.T.'s) (with less than 10 year of experience) or Equivalent. He explained that this addition could provide further guidance to ARC assessors and, particularly, to new ARC members. “Engineering technology diploma holders or C.E.T.'s with less than 10 years of experience are normally assigned a full Specific Examination Program by the ARC, the same as described in Section 8.2.1 for Canadian engineering technology diploma holders in a three-year program “*and for C.E.T. holders with technician academic credentials.*”

The following comments related to the proposed revisions were presented by Committee members:

- There is enough flexibility in the current Red Book to allow for applicants who have a substantial deficit relative to the Board Sheet to permit assessors to assign sets of exams which are appropriate, and which would bring applicants up to the desired technical level. Assessors have sufficient flexibility in using their judgement. And occasionally, an assessor can go beyond what is in the Red Book if there are very special cases.
- The ARC is mandated to assess academic performances for an applicant. If OACETT decides to allow applicant to practice as a C.E.T., that falls under their jurisdiction and this should not affect PEO’s academic standards. The ARC should have the authority

to refuse applicants if they do not meet the academic standards set by the ARC. No matter how many courses an applicant is asked to pass, it does not mean that an applicant will ever practice at the level of engineering for what they have learned in the OACETT courses. PEO issues licences to only those who are properly qualified.

The Chair remarked that:

- The number of exams referred to in Section 7.2.3. was discussed at the October 2018 ARC meeting. It was agreed to add a sentence indicating that “*more than 15 examinations may be assigned.*” Members had no objection in adding this sentence.
- Further, to add “*plus the Engineering Report*” to Section 7.2.3 is just emphasis because the Red Book Subcommittee made the decision that for technologists or technicians, assessors will require a technical report.
- Any examination that has the basic studies, once the examination is finished it has to return to the ARC for reassessment in case there is a decrease in the exam program. It is futile to apply any maximum number on exams because the maximum will be decided only after an applicant has finished their basic studies exams. Assessors have the flexibility to reduce the number of exams. However, a flag is a good idea.

Waguih ElMaraghy presented the following suggestions:

- In reference to Section 7.2.3 and the fifteen exams noted therein, he suggested to insert the word “*normally.*” The number of examinations may “*normally*” be up to fifteen (15). “Normally” is also applied in Section 8.2.1 of the Red Book and the Chair reiterated that the word “normally” addresses the matter of an applicant being assigned more basic studies if needed.
- In reference to the added paragraph proposed for Section 8.2.1, he suggests that “ARC academic assessors” be replaced simply by “the ARC” as the ARC ultimately makes the decisions.

Michael Price made the following comments:

- The Regulations state that equivalent educational qualifications to an accredited Canadian Bachelor of Engineering degree is required for an applicant to become licensed. It does not say that an OACETT technologist can apply. There is a Council policy based on the ARC to allow technologists to apply, but it is not in PEO Regulations.
- The policy also states that an applicant has to be registered as a technologist at OACETT. He believes the issue Seimer Tsang was addressing earlier in the meeting is that one can registered as a technologist at OACETT and not actually have a technologist’s diploma. One can have a technician’s diploma and the question is how to assess this particular applicant.

**After a lengthy discussion by members, there was no clear motion passed as to any revisions to Sections 7.2.3, 8.2.1 or 8.3.1 of the Procedures Manual of the Academic Requirements Committee (a.k.a. the Red Book). The consensus was that the word “normally” addresses the issue of assigning more examinations, if needed.**

## **8.5 ARC Distance Education (DE) Sub-Committee**

DE Subcommittee Chair Waguih ElMaraghy reported the following:

- The Subcommittee continues to monitor what is happening in the distance education world. It is advancing in engineering, however, there are no distance education programs in Canada. But there are many courses and programs in other disciplines. Worldwide, there are more and more online courses, starting with electrical and computer engineering. There is a lot more emphasis on technical subjects. However, PEO cannot rely on the online degrees as being equivalent.
- Once a student gets a bachelor's honours degree online, students may not be eligible to work in the country but, the Washington Accord, students may have the opportunity to be licensed abroad. At the undergraduate level, there are already several reputable universities in the United States that offer online distance education in engineering subjects. And there are many more online courses offered at a higher level of education.
- The flowcharts that the Subcommittee presented to the ARC in March 2018 is still valid, however, there is considerable work and detail left to be done. He thinks it is a positive step that the ARC has decided to consider all applications, even if they are through distance education. Although, there are no guidelines in part, or in full, as to the processing of distance education applications. Hence, the work of the Subcommittee is still needed, and the scope is broadening out of necessity.
- He remarked that the chart Roydon Fraser presented illustrated and confirmed that what PEO is currently doing with the Board Sheets is not sufficient, not only with distance education, but for all applications. He referred to a recent, well-publicized Harvard University study citing that engineering, in practice, requires only 15% of technical skills to be successful, and 85% soft skills (professional skills/complementary studies). In the current system, he does not think there is enough focus on the Board Sheets with reference to professional skills in order to assess them sufficiently.
- He believes that PEO's challenge is to deal with applicants in a unified way regardless of the discipline and distance education percentage. In his opinion, the application form has to be modified. He has asked DE Subcommittee members to suggest how improvements can be made.
- CEAB has changed to outcome-based accreditation. However, PEO has not changed its processes. He expects that at the end of the work the Subcommittee does with ample consultation, procedures should be different. What is academics and what is experience? This is how PEO currently assesses. But because of distance education, this demarcation line is not going to be that clear. We have a preliminary assessment of academics and the technical as well as the complementary. There will be gaps in both of these areas that will require corrections as suggested in the DE Subcommittee's first report. We need to address the overlap between the ARC and the ERC for different complementary purposes. The matter is complex and has to be addressed in steps.

The DE Subcommittee Vice-Chair Remon Pop-Iliev reported the following:

- The CEAB outcome-based accreditation became obligatory. We are assessing for applicants' competencies and looking for equivalency with CEAB accredited programs which means PEO should change its approach in assessing those candidates because if we are looking for equivalency, we should be looking for changes in the applicants' programs to match the changes that have been made in order to meet the CEAB criteria.



- He remarked that the chart Roydon Fraser provided was very relevant since it is good to recognize problems. But the question is how to assess and implement changes in order to assess files. Firstly, the ARC has to define the criteria for assessment; what we need to assess; and how to assess.
- Also for consideration is how accurate will the information collected from the online candidates be? The first hurdle has been crossed in allowing distance education applications to be reviewed by the ARC. Now the issue is how to establish a percentage as to what determines whether a distance education candidate is eligible for licensure. There are different variations and components of experiential learning that may or may not take place in distance education, hybrid education or online education.
- He also suggests that applications become available online. Board Sheets will also be affected because of new criteria and new approach to assessment – comprehensive and extensive work. As well, the ARC will have to add chapters to the Red Book reflecting how the ARC assesses distance education. PEO can expect to have an increased number of bachelor-level applicants who have completed a certain amount of distance education but may be missing experiential hands-on learning.
- A database for distance education programs should be considered, otherwise, he sees potential difficulty in correctly assessing applicants.
- DE Subcommittee member Barna Szabados further added that the Experience Requirements Committee (ERC) approved 5 overall engineering competencies with indicators for each. Out of the 5 competencies, he believes that 3 of the competencies and some of their related indicators are also valid for the ARC. He recommends that the ERC and the ARC interact together on the development of the implementation of competencies.
- Others expressed concerns about the ARC considering attributes versus what the ARC does for the academics. The attributes are program-related. If the ARC starts to measure teamwork, communication skills and/or design experience, the ARC would be stepping outside of its academic realm.

CEAB Vice-Chair Bob Dony commented further, noting the following 5 areas that are included in the CEAB's Accreditation Criteria and Procedures. These form the basis for making an accreditation decision.

- 3.1 Graduate Attributes
- 3.2 Continual Improvement
- 3.3 Students
- 3.4 Curriculum Content
- 3.5 Program Environment

He read the reference to 3.4 Curriculum Content:

*The curriculum content and quality criteria are designed to assure a foundation in mathematics and natural science, a broad preparation in engineering sciences and engineering design, and an exposure to non-technical subjects that supplement the technical aspects of the curriculum. All students must meet all curriculum content and quality criteria. The academic level of the curriculum must be appropriate to a university-level engineering program.*

- The sentence about “all students must meet” does not appear in 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, nor in 3.5. The ARC is assessing for its regulatory requirements for issuing a licence under

the *Professional Engineers Act* to individuals who meet a minimum academic requirement.

- 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.5 are all about the program. They do not address the minimum requirements of an individual. The basis of licensure is for safety of the public. We have a system in engineering that does not have technical exams for all in Canada. For an exclusive right to practice licence anywhere else, there is a need for technical exams as well as an accredited program. Through 3.4 and meeting “every single student must meet the minimum academic requirements,” the accreditation system ensures that every student has effectively passed exams. What we do as a committee is to assign exams to those applicants who have not fulfilled the requirements.
- The program environment-based criteria are for the program and not for the individual. However, the applicants are exposed to these criteria. This is part of the culture, the environment, but nowhere does it say that every student must have this quantity of teamwork defined by these criteria. This is not anywhere in the minimum path.
- The ARC mandate is to ensure that applicants have a minimum technical competence that we, as a regulator, are happy with and that we can say to the public, on entry, here is the minimum technical competence required.
- 3.1 and 3.2 are really no different than the previous existing 3.3 and 3.5, and the ARC has never insisted on asking the applicants: What was a student’s environment? Do you have sufficient counselling for your program? This has always been in the criteria.
- The fact that the CEAB is adding extra program environment criteria does not affect what the ARC does in terms of assuring minimal technical competencies for the individual.

The DE Subcommittee Chair remarked that change to accommodate a distance education program is very complex. The Subcommittee is not concerned about the programs. There will be more questions on the distance education application form and more data to collect and address. The Board Sheets may also have additional items.

#### **8.6 Approval of Revised Syllabi for Mining & Mineral Engineering (A) and Geomatics (B)**

Admissions Manager Moody Farag reported on two revised syllabi. The first is Mining and Mineral Engineering; the second is Geomatics Engineering. He provided the syllabi to the ARC members who regularly review the applicant files corresponding to these disciplines and there were no concerns for either syllabus reported.

#### **MOTION**

It was **moved by** Ramesh Subramanian **and seconded by** Bob Dony to approve the Mining and Mineral Engineering syllabus, as revised, by unanimous consent.

**CARRIED**

#### **MOTION**

It was **moved by** Medhat Shehata and **seconded by** Amin Rizkalla to approve the Geomatics Engineering syllabus, as revised, by unanimous consent.

**CARRIED**

Following Council’s approval, the syllabi will be implemented in December 2019.

## 8.7 Office of the Fairness Commissioner (OFC) Update

Michael Price reported the following:

- The OFC update will be moved up to Item 8.4 on the agenda for future ARC meetings to be reported with other updates.
- The OFC conducted an assessment in 2012, 2014 and 2017. In the 2012 and 2014 assessments, PEO had to develop an action plan and it was approved by the OFC.
- In 2017, there were four recommendations by the OFC. There was a new procedure, whereby, if there were less than ten recommendations, the OFC only requested to meet with PEO semi-annually to discuss the progress.
- This year, PEO presented its progress on the four recommendations and the Acting Director of the OFC expressed its concerns with the progress reported by PEO. In response, there is a staff meeting scheduled for the week of November 26, 2018, and the following week PEO staff will be meeting with the OFC's acting director.
- The November 13, 2018 OFC cover letter reads, in part: The OFC is recommending changes to current practices of PEO which, if implemented, would demonstrate compliance with the specific duties required by the legislation. The timeframe for implementation to come into compliance is 90 business days from the date of this letter. [March 19, 2019.] Or an alternative agreed upon by the Fairness Commissioner 30 days prior to the period expiring.

Failure to demonstrate compliance with respect to the outstanding recommendations within a 90-day implementation period may result in a Compliance Order under the Fairness Legislation.

- He shared why the OFC was not satisfied with the progress on its recommendations.
  1. **Develop a policy to ensure internal review of applicant files are not completed by the same assessor who completed the initial review.** PEO submitted the procedure indicating that issues related to applicants providing new information, the file would go back to the original assessor. If it was an appeal, with no new information, a process was in place to address those reviews, going to an assessor in the same discipline. If there was no assessor in the same discipline, a procedure was also in place to address this situation.
  2. **Engage a psychometrician to review the PPE to confirm validity.** The OFC stated that PEO has not demonstrated that the exam measures what it is intended to measure. As recommended, PEO has agreed to engage a psychometrician and PEO Interim Registrar Johnny Zuccon has signed contract with the psychometrician. The psychometrician's assessment should be completed by mid-January 2019.
  3. **Implement guidelines for decision-makers that include clear direction on what to do if they find themselves in a situation of potential bias.** PEO submitted the processes that both the ARC and the ERC have put in place. This did not satisfy the OFC. They requested that PEO record what constitutes bias, types of bias, and the need to avoid bias in the appropriate policy documents and training manuals and explain procedures to follow where potential for bias is identified.
  4. **PEO will develop and articulate timelines to responding to applicant enquiries and requests.** PEO outlined these timelines. Instead, the remedial action is to implement a formalized monitoring and enforcement procedure to PEO's internal policy requiring staff to reply to increased enquiries and requests within a reasonable amount of time.

The OFC also wrote: Should PEO have any further developments on the requirement for prior Canadian work experience, to update and inform the OFC prior to the OFC's formal responses to that portion of PEO's August 2, 2018 letter.

## **8.8 Experience Requirements Committee (ERC) Report**

ERC Chair David Kiguel reported the following:

- There were no ERC meetings since the last ERC update presented at the October 2018 ARC meeting, however, there have been some developments.
- ERC elections were conducted via email in October 2018. The first election was for the ERC representative to the LIC. Mohinder Grover was elected as the new representative. This was followed by the election of the Chair and Vice-Chair, for a one-year term, starting January 2019. Both the Chair David Kiguel and Vice-Chair Changiz Sadr were re-elected.
- The ERC Subcommittee held a meeting on November 13, 2018. One of the items extensively discussed was the issuance of limited licences. A member expressed concern with respect to the criteria the ERC uses for assessing an applicant's understanding of engineering principles. The ERC must verify that applicants have a depth of knowledge which is equivalent to that of a CEAB graduate, but within a narrower scope of practice. Based on these issues, the ERC Subcommittee decided to form a working group of ERC members to address limited licences. Depending on how discussions evolve, the working group may communicate with the ARC for consultation.
- The next ERC Business Meeting is scheduled for December 13, 2018 and it will be an all-day event. A training workshop for ERC members will take place in the morning and will include a presentation by Pauline Lebel, Manager, Licensure, titled Competency-Based Assessment. The presentation will touch on competency-based assessments using the 5 criteria that are defined in the licensing requirement guidelines. The ERC has introduced indicators for each of the criteria and has plans to implement them during ERC interviews.
- After the presentation, the ERC will host its traditional, year-end festive luncheon, followed by the ERC Business Meeting.
- The ERC recently welcomed three new members who have expertise in the fire protection field, which was lacking in its membership. The Committee is seeking more members with expertise in this area as there are more applicants in this discipline.
- He referred to Council's approval of a \$700 fee for interviews. The ERC looks forward to seeing how the fee will be implemented with regard to the parameters and implications of this new policy; the timelines for implementation; how the fee will affect current and new applicants in the assessment process; whether the new fee will pose any challenges to licensure; and whether any changes to the Regulations will have to be considered.

Members engaged in a discussion on the potential implications and authority for introducing this newly proposed \$700 interview fee including potential repercussions with the Ontario Fairness Commission.

**9. New Procedural Matter(s) for Discussion**

There were no items to discuss.

**10. Other Business**

No other business to report.

**11. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 PM

**The next meeting is schedule for December 7, 2018**