



Minutes

LICENSING COMMITTEE MEETING

February 18, 2021

Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Members:

David Kiguel, P. Eng. (Chair)
Changiz Sadr, P. Eng. (Vice-Chair)
George Comrie, P. Eng.
Roydon Fraser, P. Eng.
Mohinder Grover, P. Eng.
Santosh Gupta, P. Eng.
Lola Hidalgo, P. Eng. *[from 5:07 p.m.]*
Wayne Kershaw, P.Eng.
Luc Roberge, P. Eng.

Guests/Observers:

Andrew Cornel, P.Eng.
Waguih ElMaraghy, P. Eng.
Ramesh Subramanian, P. Eng.

Staff:

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

Regrets:

Leila Notash, P. Eng. (Observer)
Barna Szabados, P. Eng.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIR’S REMARKS

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m.

The Chair introduced A. Cornel, Vice-Chair of the Experience Requirements Committee (ERC), who will be an observer on the Committee.

The Chair thanked the Committee for honouring him by electing him as Chair.

The Chair provided the following Council updates:

- Council will be approving a By-Law at its February 26, 2021 meeting to adopt Nathan and Goldfarb’s Rules of Order as a replacement for Wainberg’s as the rules to be used by Council, Committees and Chapters. Nathan’s is the continuation of Wainberg’s. Nathan took over the authorship of these rules following the death of Mr. Wainberg.
- Council has adopted a decision that Councillors will serve only on governance committees. The Chair wrote to President Sterling, providing his opinion that this would intensify silos within PEO.

The Chair noted that he has drafted the Licensing Committee annual report and has circulated it to the Vice- Chair and staff for review and comments.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

No changes to the agenda were requested.

A motion was made to approve the agenda as written.

Moved by: S. Gupta Seconded by: L. Roberge CARRIED

3. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 26, 2020 MEETING MINUTES

The Chair requested that the appendix attached to the Minutes be removed as this information was not presented at the meeting.

A motion was made to approve the Minutes of the November 26, 2020 meeting as amended.

Moved by: M. Grover Seconded by: W. Kershaw CARRIED

Action: Staff to amend Minutes of the November 26, 2020 meeting as discussed.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

G. Comrie provided the Committee with material regarding monitoring and the pilot project.

5. REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS FROM LAST MEETING

The Committee members were referred to the updates in the Action Log included in the agenda package.

Action: For next meeting, staff will revise the Action Log to remove items that are no longer relevant.

6. REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES AND STAFF

6.1 Academic Requirements Committee (ARC)

R. Subramanian reported that D. Abrahams, PEO's General Counsel, met with the ARC. The ARC feels that the new governance policies are breaking the line of communication between Committees and Council.

R. Dony, L. Notash and R. Subramanian are performing online assessment of files, as a pilot, in order to prepare a manual for training of other ARC members. The process worked fine. An invitation to attend a training session has been sent to the ARC members.

W. ElMaraghy reported that the CEO/Registrar met with the ARC. The committee wanted to know when they could resume ARC work and how many files were in the pipeline. The ARC expressed their dissatisfaction that neither the CEO/Registrar nor the Deputy Registrar were attending ARC meetings regularly. Following the meeting, staff reported that there were 2,100 files in the pipeline, of which 1,700 were in electronic format. There was confirmation that the online ARC assessment process does not allow for discussion between ARC members.

There was also a discussion regarding the recording of Minutes for ARC meetings. Currently, the Minutes are essentially transcripts. The CEO/Registrar would like them to be simplified. The ARC needs to define the purpose of the

Minutes. A suggestion was made that it would be wrong to simplify them; that Minutes should record the entirety of the Committee's deliberation process.

6.2 Experience Requirement Committee (ERC)

C. Sadr reported that there was not much to discuss at the ERC subcommittee meeting. A business meeting scheduled for February 12, 2021 was cancelled due to operational and staff issues.

C. Sadr reported that he and A. Cornel met with Deputy Registrar L. Latham, who reported that virtual interviews were ready to commence. Training of ERC members is also to commence soon. Training will be directed to the 59 members of the ERC who responded to the survey requesting information regarding their technical capabilities and familiarity with virtual environments.

During its December 2020 meeting, the ERC presented a recognition certificate to the family of the late Richard Furst and re-elected S. Gupta as representative to the Licensing Committee for a three-year term.

6.3 30x30 Task Force

L. Hidalgo reported that the Task Force met with Chapters regarding a plan for Chapters to reach out to members and employers regarding the 30x30 initiative. T. Caruana is now the staff advisor for the Task Force. L. Hidalgo also reported that there were many questions regarding licensing at the Task Force meetings.

6.4 Council Report

W. Kershaw reported that Council was working on a governance model. As there was no meeting in January 2021, there were no specifics to report.

6.5 Legislation Committee (LEC)

W. Kershaw reported that the LEC met on February 12, 2021. The only item discussed was the By-Law to adopt Nathan's Rules of Order.

6.6 Regional Councillors Committee (RCC)

L. Roberge reported that the RCC has not met, and there was nothing to report.

7. TRUSTED REFEREE

Summary of discussion from November 2020 meeting:

- What needs to be assessed is knowledge and skills, regardless of length of experience.
- Need to define what PEO wants to assess and how it will be done.
- Can PEO do a pilot project?
- Process needs to be flexible; who would deal with situations where an applicant does not have a professional engineer as a supervisor?

Where does PEO go from here?

PEO should discuss whether assessment of the applicant by the referee is the appropriate method.

The referee must be someone who knows the applicant and certifies that the person possesses good character and meets the licensing qualifications. The referee also has to determine whether the applicant's work is acceptable. This can be done by an ERC inspection of the work of the applicant.

Where the applicant has P.Eng. supervision, the supervisor is doing the following things: assessment of character and the work. PEO needs consistency of this assessment. PEO should provide a paper presenting the various options on how referees can evaluate applicants. The outcome should be a guideline outlining the responsibilities of a referee and the proper way of assessing applicants.

PEO should be sure that it is not creating an additional barrier, especially by requiring the ERC to visit the workplace. Monitoring referees may make individuals less likely to act as referees.

As there is reciprocity among all provincial engineering regulators, there must be standards. PEO cannot be the only regulator facing these issues. Can PEO talk to other Associations and see how they deal with these issues? PEO should build on what other provinces are doing. The Chair asked if PEO could produce a table describing how other provinces handle experience assessment.

Other provinces may have other purposes for the assessment, for example, competency-based assessment, so their processes may not work for PEO. Sending a referee to the workplace may generate a number of problems, such as the employer prohibiting the referee from entering the workplace.

It was suggested that PEO should consider a self-assessment by the applicant. The ERC could review the self-assessment form, rather than going to the workplace.

Action: C. Sadr to contact Engineers Canada to see if they have a current jurisdictional scan of the experience assessment processes done in other provinces.

Entrepreneurs do not fit into the regulatory schemes of any professional regulators; do not expect that other provinces will provide any approach that can be used in Ontario.

Workplace visits are also problematic as a single visit is not informative; need to observe the applicant over a long-term period in order to form a proper assessment.

PEO could consider a “trust but verify” approach, relying on self-assessment by the applicant that is checked by PEO. Based on work done by the ERC on competencies, it is possible to develop a questionnaire for either self-assessment or use by referee.

The Chair reported that the ERC looked at the EGBC competency-based experience assessment method and found that it was overkill.

Action: M. Grover and D. Kiguel to review the ERC document on competencies and prepare a document to be used as a basis for assessments that they will distribute to the Licensing Committee members for the next meeting.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Action: Chair and Vice-Chair to work with staff to schedule a meeting for April 2021.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.