

Minutes

National Framework Task Force (NFTF)
March 23, 2012 1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
40 Sheppard Avenue West – Room 507

Attendees: Diane Freeman (Chair)
Christian Bellini
Ross Judd
Santosh Gupta
Roydon Fraser
Kathy Sutherland

Regrets: Tony Cecutti

Staff: Kim Allen
Anne Chhangur

1. Review of the Agenda

The agenda was revised with the addition of one item – Hosting a conference with the Constituent Associations.

2. Minutes from the Previous Meeting

It was moved by S. Gupta and seconded by R. Judd that the minutes of the January 6, 2012 meeting be approved.

3. Canadian Framework for Licensure Summary Statistics

The summary reports, prepared by the Canadian Framework for Licensure Task Force, showing the list of elements and proposed schedule for the development of each element were reviewed.

It was suggested by R. Fraser that a table should be developed to track revision dates and dates comments received from the peer review committees at various stages of consultation by PEO. All agreed that it would be helpful to have a table prepared by PEO that is explanatory of the consultation process followed.

ACTION: Table showing the process followed in consultation to be developed.

ACTION: The CEO/Registrar said that when he sends out the elements in various stages of development, he would include a text box indicating the consultation that has taken place to date.

The question was raised whether the elements should be presented to Council for concurrence after each revision. The CEO/Registrar suggested that the revised elements could be forwarded to individual Council members for consultation.

Another question raised was how the list of elements was compiled. In response, the CEO/Registrar said that the first twelve elements were identified by Canadian Framework Steering Committee and the others by the constituent associations. He said that any constituent association can propose that an element needs to be included in the development of the framework.

R. Fraser suggested that a new element be added to the list – Overriding Guiding Principles to address assessments. He prepared a draft chart on the basic structure of this element which will be discussed by the NFTF and then forwarded to the CEO Group for consideration. (Appendix A)

4. Council Direction

The motion passed at the March 2012 Council meeting was discussed. It was agreed that the wording of this motion would be used as a template when presenting future elements to Council for concurrence:

“That Council concur with the continued development of the policy direction and key considerations for inclusion as elements of the Canadian Framework for Licensure - (list elements).”

- Continuing Professional Development

R. Fraser felt that this element needed broader review and should be sent to other legislative committees for peer review. The CEO/Registrar suggested that the elements could be forwarded by the committee identified for peer review to another committee to get additional feedback, recognizing that the element is still being developed. The feedback obtained could then be consolidated by the lead review committee and forwarded to the NFTF.

After some discussion on the first Key Consideration of the Continuing Professional Development document, it was agreed to remove the word “measurable” as it could be interpreted differently by the Constituent Associations.

- Negotiating International Agreements

There was agreement to forward the feedback provided by the ARC on this element outlined in the memo from the Chair of the committee dated February 27, 2012 to the CEO Group.

ACTION: The three elements (Accountability of Engineering Organizations; Continuing Professional Development and Negotiating International Agreements) to be forwarded to the CEO Group with PEO comments/concerns.

5. Two-Step Process Regarding Documents for Concurrence

The CEO Group has implemented a two-step consultation process on the elements forwarded to the Constituent Associations. When the document is at the consultation/discussion stage it would be shown as “Constituent Association Concurrence (Proposal)” and when the document is being forwarded for concurrence by Council, the word “(Proposal)” would be removed.

6. Fairness and Service Level Norms

The document on this element was reviewed by the task force and there was some discussion on the order of the terms that can broadly define “fair” in Key Consideration #1.

ACTION: It was agreed to send this element being developed to all legislative committees for peer review.

7. Competencies and Requirements for the P.Eng. Licence

In order to finalize PEO’s comments on this element, the NFTF agreed to send it back to the Experience Requirements Committee for review.

8. Competencies and Requirement for the Limited Licence

The NFTF agreed to send this element back to the Experience Requirements Committee for review.

9. Process of gaining comments from PEO within the required timeframes

There was some discussion that PEO may miss an opportunity to provide feedback if this is not done by the required timeframe and the other constituent associations are ready to move on to the next stage. It was pointed out that 60% completion by the constituent associations was required to move forward. It was then suggested that members of the NFTF propose to their Committee Chairs that review groups with expertise on the subject matter be formed to handle reviewing the elements of the Canadian Framework for Licensure. When consultation is sought from other legislative committees, the feedback could be forwarded to the expert review group and then summarized for the NFTF.

10. Competencies and Requirements for the Engineer-in-Training

The research document on the Competencies and Requirements for the Engineer-in-Training element was reviewed by the task force. Under the Key Considerations, it was suggested that there is a need to have some consistency in the wording of the four key considerations which should be stated as facts and the word “should” be removed.

ACTION: It was agreed to send the research document on this element to the Experience Requirements Committee for peer review.

11. Implementation of Elements

The CEO/Registrar advised that there will discussion on the development of implementation details at the CEQB meeting at the end of this month.

12. Hosting a Conference with the CA's

At this point of the meeting, it was suggested that PEO host a conference with the admission staff of two provincial associations to share information on their licensing processes with the ARC and ERC and try to find common ground on the areas that we differ. Subsequently, meetings with the admission staff of the other constituent associations would be arranged.

ACTION: The Chair and CEO/Registrar to draft an invitation and agenda for the first conference with two provincial associations for review.

13. Defining Disciplines/Fields of Practice

The CEO/Registrar sought input from the NFTF on the definition of a discipline and whether or not a new area is the practice of professional engineering.

He referred to a table which listed the Approved CEQB Syllabi, Identified Emerging Disciplines, CEAB Accredited Programs and PEO Approved Disciplines and suggested that it would be beneficial to compile a list of CFL Recognized Disciplines to be used by all constituent associations.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

OVERRIDING GUIDING PRINCIPLE			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Protect and Serve the Public Interest:</i> This is PEO’s mandate. 			
	<p>ADMISSIONS COMPONENT OF OVERRIDING GUIDING PRINCIPLE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Assure Competency:</i> Only qualified practitioners shall be licensed. <p>[FUNDAMENTAL OPERATIONAL PRINCIPLE 1: Admissions process must measure both <i>depth and breadth.</i></p>		
PRIMARY GUIDING PRINCIPLES			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Fairness of Process:</i> A fair process is just and impartial. • <i>Transparency of Process:</i> The procedures should be open to public scrutiny. 			
DISCIPLINE PRIMARY GUIDING PRINCIPLES	ADMISSIONS PRIMARY GUIDING PRINCIPLES	COMPLAINTS PRIMARY GUIDING PRINCIPLES	COMMUNICATION PRIMARY GUIDING PRINCIPLES

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Fairness of Process:</i> A fair process is just and impartial. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Transparency of Process:</i> The procedures should be open to public scrutiny. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Fairness of Process:</i> A fair process is just and impartial. <p>[FUNDAMENTAL OPERATIONAL PRINCIPLE 2: It is the <i>individual</i>, not the institution, that is accessed.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Transparency of Process:</i> The procedures should be open to public scrutiny. 		
--	---	--	--

SECONDARY GUIDING PRINCIPLES

<p>DISCIPLINE SECONDARY GUIDING PRINCIPLES (Used to interpret Primary Guiding Principles)</p>	<p>ADMISSIONS SECONDARY GUIDING PRINCIPLES (Used to interpret Primary Guiding Principles)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adaptiveness of Process:</i> An adaptive process is capable of accommodating the variety of existing engineering disciplines, and is capable of accommodating emerging disciplines. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consistency of Process:</i> The same process must be applied and accessible to all. The process may include multiple, but equivalent, routes to license. 		
	<p>TERTIARY GUIDING PRINCIPLES (Used to interpret Primary and Secondary Guiding Principles)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Clarity of Process:</i> The process must be explicit. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consistency of Process:</i> The process must be applied and accessible to all. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Clarity of Process:</i> The process must be explicit. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consistency of Process:</i> The same process must be applied and accessible to all. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Dispatch of Process:</i> The process is to be efficient and reasonable in its speed. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Elimination of Subjectivity or Discretion:</i> The evaluation process should be as objective as possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Elimination of Subjectivity or Discretion:</i> The evaluation process should be as objective as possible. 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Meet or Exceed Current Minimum Standards:</i> This maintains or improves protection of the public interest. • <i>Non-discriminatory Process:</i> The process should be independent of an applicant's age, race, ethnic origin, sex, etc. • <i>Predictability of Process:</i> Applicants should be aware of the process at the outset. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Meet or Exceed Current Standards:</i> This maintains or improves protection of the public interest. Caution: If the standard is so high that few are licensed, then the profession could find itself offering decreased protection of the public. • <i>Mobility of Licensee:</i> The process should maintain inter-provincial mobility. • <i>Non-discriminatory Process:</i> The process should be independent of an applicant's age, race, ethnic origin, sex, etc. • <i>Predictability of Process:</i> Applicants should be aware of the process at the outset. 		

TO OPTIMIZE THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- *Clear Delineation of Roles:* To ensure accountability in the process.
- *Simplicity of Process:* The simpler the process, the better.
- *Economy of Process:* The less expensive the process, the better.

