



Minutes

LICENSING COMMITTEE MEETING

December 5, 2019

PEO Offices

Members:

Barna Szabados, P. Eng. (Chair)

Santosh Gupta, P. Eng. (Vice-Chair)

Christian Bellini, P. Eng. *[via teleconference at 3:30 p.m.]*

Guy Boone, P. Eng.

George Comrie, P. Eng.

Roydon Fraser, P. Eng. *[via teleconference]*

Mohinder Grover, P. Eng.

Lola Hidalgo, P. Eng. *[via teleconference from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and in person thereafter]*

David Kiguel, P. Eng.

Greg Wowchuk, P. Eng.

Staff:

Bernie Ennis, P. Eng., Director, Policy and Professional Affairs

Guests/Observers:

Leila Notash, P. Eng.

Changiz Sadr, P. Eng.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIR'S REMARKS

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The following items were added to the agenda:

- Item 10.5 - Licensing Committee Roster
- Item 10.6 - Dates for 2020 Meetings

A motion was made to approve the agenda as modified.

Moved by: S. Gupta Seconded by: M. Grover CARRIED

3. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2019 MINUTES

Action: Under Item 6, staff to replace the reference to “Bias Policy” with “ERC Conflict of Interest Policy”.

A motion was made to approve the Minutes of the September 12, 2019 meeting as modified.

Moved by: S. Gupta Seconded by: G. Boone CARRIED

4. APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 17, 2019 MINUTES

Regarding the third Action Item under Item 4, B. Szabados reported that he spoke to President Hill directly.

The Committee discussed the problems with membership arising from difference Committee year (January to December) and Council year (April to March).

Action: B. Ennis to set up teleconference with G. Pope of APEGA for the next meeting to discuss psychometric validation of examinations.

A motion was made to approve the Minutes of the October 17, 2019 meeting as modified.

Moved by: M. Grover Seconded by: D. Kiguel CARRIED

5. REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS FROM LAST MEETING

There was no discussion on this item.

6. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the Minutes.

7. ONTARIO FAIRNESS COMMISSIONER (OFC) UPDATE

B. Ennis reported that PEO wrote to the OFC to ask for clarification as to whether the OFC was referring to all PEO examinations when it wrote in its letter that exams need to be psychometrically validated. The OFC replied that PEO should verify that all examinations are transparent, objective, impartial, fair, and accurately measuring applicants' qualifications. The Committee does not believe that the OFC knows what it is talking about.

B. Szabados advised that the Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) has not reviewed the technical examinations provided as an example of an examination that accepted as an answer only work done using an obsolete method. Exams need to be reviewed against standards of being objective, fair and impartial.

C. Bellini suggested that PEO needs to have a psychometrician assess whether technical exams can be psychometrically evaluated.

G. Comrie suggested starting with the most common exams to see if they measure what PEO wants to measure.

The Committee members expressed concern that academics setting the examinations are writing to the courses they teach. It was suggested that PEO have subject matter experts (SMEs) in subject areas assess whether the exams are testing the standard body of knowledge for the subject.

Action: B. Ennis to send the OFC e-mail to the Licensing Committee members.

There was a discussion regarding the Engineers Canada Board item regarding a national fundamentals exam.

A motion was made that the Licensing Committee requests that the ARC develop a process for assessing technical examinations to determine whether the examinations are measuring what they need to measure for purposes of licensure, and that they are transparent, fair, impartial and objective.

Moved by: G. Comrie

Seconded by: D. Kiguel

CARRIED

The OFC is very concerned about whether examinations are necessary for licensure.

It was noted that, under Section 40 of the Regulations, the ARC has responsibility for form and content of examinations.

B. Szabados noted that, although he, as an ARC member, assigns exams, he has no idea of whether the examinations are assessing what he believes needs to be assessed.

8. REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES: ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE (ARC) / EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE (ERC) / 30 BY 30 TASK FORCE

Councillor Wowchuk reported that GSI gave a presentation to Council regarding principles of governance.

The ERC approved changes to the conflict of interest policy. The next ERC meeting is scheduled for December 20, 2019. J. Zuccon will attend to report progress on activities filter tool. Also, D. Abrahams to describe Council-approved bias policy.

The 30 by 30 Task Force has been carrying out workshops with various parties. The last one will be held on December 6, 2019 with universities. The 30 by 30 Task Force is a licensing initiative. L. Hidalgo reported that industries, even those covered by the industrial exemption, are interested in having their employees licensed.

The Regional Councillors Committee (RCC) is working on a licensing survey to be sent to EITs and new P.Engs. to get data regarding frustrations and experiences with licensing.

9. REMEDIAL PROCESS FOR EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

B. Szabados reported on the inspection scheme that he is proposing (document attached to the agenda package). A P.Eng. inspector has to take responsibility that the work is carried out. He also noted that the inspector does not need to enter workplace. Question: If not, why not just have an ERC interview? It was noted that PEO has no jurisdiction to enter firms, other than Certificate of Authorization firms.

D. Kiguel commented that PEO needs to know the cost of such a program. This scheme should not be a replacement for Canadian experience. Applicants must have one year of Canadian experience. It was suggested that inspectors must be ERC members.

It was commented that a company may not want to allow an inspector to review confidential company data. B. Szabados stated that it would not be necessary to see details.

G. Comrie questioned what the difference was between “inspector” and “monitor”. A described “monitor” program was initially proposed which required an agreement

between applicant, company and PEO that the monitor is not taking legal responsibility for work.

There are incentives for companies to be in compliance with the Act.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

10.1 Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference were not submitted to Council at the last meeting. They will need to be updated to reflect the new Committee composition.

10.2 Work Plan

Approved at Council.

10.3 Human Resources Plan

Approved at Council.

10.4 AODA Training

B. Ennis reported to the Committee that those not completing training by December 31, 2019 will be suspended from the Committee and their expenses will not be paid. If training is not completed by end of February 2020, Council may remove the member from the Committee.

10.5 Licensing Committee Roster

It was suggested that the Legislation Committee representative on the Licensing Committee be eliminated.

The roster approved by Council does not match the Committee composition described in the Terms of Reference.

At some point, the Licensing Committee needs new members, and replacements should be discussed. The "Contributing From/To" does not make sense; why do all members' terms end in December 2020?

10.6 Dates for 2020 Meetings

The members agreed that, starting in February 2020, the Committee will meet every second month before ARC meetings.

The dates agreed upon are: February 13, April 2, June 11, August 20, October 15 and December 3, 2020.

11. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

A motion was made that the current Chair and Vice-Chair be re-appointed to their respective roles for 2020.

Moved by: G. Comrie

Seconded by: D. Kiguel

CARRIED

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 13, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.