



Minutes

NATIONAL FRAMEWORK TASK FORCE MEETING

Friday, November 30, 2012 - 10:00 a.m.
PEO Offices - Suite 210

Members:

Christian Bellini, P. Eng. (Vice-Chair)
Tony Cecutti, P. Eng. *[via teleconference]*
Roydon Fraser, P. Eng.
Ross Judd, P. Eng.
Kathryn Sutherland, P. Eng.

Regrets:

Diane Freeman, P. Eng. (Chair)
Santosh Gupta, P. Eng.

Staff:

Bernie Ennis, P. Eng.

1. Opening Remarks

C. Bellini opened the meeting at 10:17 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

R. Fraser asked to add the following item with Item 7:

- Discussion re CFL Process.

A motion was made to approve the agenda as revised.

Moved by: R. Fraser

Seconded by: K. Sutherland

CARRIED

3. Approval of Minutes of July 6, 2012 Meeting

There were no comments.

A motion was made to approve the Minutes of the July 6, 2012 meeting as written.

Moved by: R. Judd

Seconded by: K. Sutherland

CARRIED

4. Review of Past and Present CFL Elements

Competencies and Requirements for the P. Eng. Element

- The Task Force reviewed their comments made on the draft to see if the element had been revised and were satisfied that the suggested changes had been incorporated.
- R. Fraser stated that, visually, this element was distorted, with more emphasis on work experience than on academics; inconsistent level of detail for academics.
- R. Fraser stated that the academic requirements were much more than “engineering concepts, theory and knowledge”, and that “basic science, report writing, communication skills and complementary studies” were missing.
- There was discussion regarding the need to define “depth and breadth” in this element, although it might be included in the companion document, “Assessment Tools and Protocols”. Without seeing that document, it is difficult to determine whether this element is suitably described.
- Summary of key feedback on this element:
 - o Inconsistent level of detail.
 - o Depth and breadth need to be defined, either in this element or somewhere else. The preference is not to duplicate details in different documents. A document missing this information makes it difficult for the licensing bodies to agree on the equivalency of the assessment processes.
 - o Academic focuses solely on engineering topics: it should capture basic studies and complementary studies as well.
 - o Not clear in this document that assessment must be based on individual, not institution.

- o R. Judd has issue with work “affect” in “Law and Ethics Requirements”; should be “guide”. After some discussion, it was decided that “affect” should be replaced by “applies to”.
- o It was suggested that “Law and Ethics Requirements” should be changed to read “have knowledge and understanding”.
- o It was suggested that “good character requirement” should be revised to read “exercise good and ethical judgment”.
- Some comments regarding the process in general came up during the discussion:
 - o R. Fraser raised a question regarding the process; specifically, do these comments go to Council to consider as part of the concurrence vote, or are they sent to Engineers Canada for the National Task Force to consider?
 - o The Briefing Note, with all Task Force feedback, goes to Council in documents; the original document and an edited version with suggested changes. The Task Force agreed that this will be the procedure to follow.
 - o C. Bellini pointed out that PEO has no obligation to adopt these elements if they are approved by other provinces.
 - o There was discussion regarding whether provincial concurrence will actually change the way provinces interpret the document.
 - o The process does not allow for historical documentation of the input received during consultation.
- Recommendation to Council regarding the Briefing Note:
 - o The Task Force agreed that its recommendation to Council would be to accept the current version of the element (with one change), with the rest of the feedback being passed on to Engineers Canada for consideration for future iterations of the element. The change that was recommended to be immediately incorporated was the Law and Ethics Requirements where the wording would be “have knowledge and understanding”.

Competencies and Requirements for the Limited Engineering Licence Element

- The Task Force agreed that previous suggestions had been incorporated into this draft.

- R. Judd pointed out that environment is used in two different ways in the document:
 - environment as eco-sphere (Work Experience - D)
 - environment as context (Work Experience - G)
- R. Fraser suggested that, in Key Consideration 2, the phrase “within the scope of practice” should be changed to “applicable to the scope of practice”.
- R. Fraser questioned why there was no timeframe for Canadian experience. The Task Force decided that this was a high-level concept document that does not include this kind of detail.
- Recommendation to Council regarding the Briefing Note:
 - o The Task Force agreed that its recommendation to Council would be to accept the current version of the element (with one change), with the rest of the feedback being passed on to Engineers Canada for consideration for future iterations of the element. The change that was recommended to be immediately incorporated was the Law and Ethics Requirements where the wording would be “have knowledge and understanding”.

Competencies and Requirements for the EIT Element

- Similar feedback as per the other elements.
- The Task Force was concerned regarding the mandatory nature of EIT described in Key Consideration 3. T. Cecutti noted that, without a value-added EIT program, it should not be mandatory. The Task Force agreed that this consideration could be modified as follows:
 - delete “all”
 - replace “must” with “may”
 - remove second sentence
- R. Fraser pointed out that the element does not require that the applicant meet academic requirements prior to enrolment as an EIT.
- It was noted that not all of the Key Considerations given in the EIT document are competencies and requirements.
- It was noted that there is no need to have a harmonized EIT program across all provinces. C. Bellini suggested that the nature of another province’s EIT program would not affect PEO’s opinions when evaluating an applicant from another province applying to Ontario, whether they were already licensed or not.

- It was decided that the only changes required are those associated with Key Consideration 3.
- Some discussions regarding the procedure also took place, with the following notes:
 - o The Task Force agreed that their strong response to the National committee is that the elements must be a living document.
 - o The Task Force would like the comments on each element from other constituent associations to be circulated to all.
 - o The Task Force agreed that the National group should be asked for their definition of “depth” and “breadth”, and to inform them that PEO has a definition.
- Recommendation to Council regarding the Briefing Note:
 - o The Task Force agreed that its recommendation to Council would be to accept the current version of the element (with one change), with the rest of the feedback being passed on to Engineers Canada for consideration for future iterations of the element. The change that was recommended to be immediately incorporated was the change to Key Consideration 3.

5. Debrief of October 16, 2012 CFL Workshop Held at PEO Offices

The Task Force agreed that this item had really already been addressed during the discussion which had occurred during the review of the elements. No further discussion was necessary at this time.

6. Review of Upcoming Elements

Code of Ethics Document

There was discussion on this document:

- 1) Tenets are not organized in an appropriate manner.
- 2) R. Fraser stated that many of the tenets are general and really part of a preamble.

- 3) Comments to make:
 - (a) Has this research covered everything?
 - (b) Are there other issues to be considered?
- 4) The table of tenets comparison is confusing; for example, Item 6 does not recognize that this issue is covered by professional misconduct regulations in PEO legislation. The Code of Ethics section should only be done in conjunction with professional misconduct.
- 5) The Task Force agrees that the Engineers Canada Code of Ethics is not the best one to use since it is not used for governance of the profession. Engineers Canada should rely on the actual code of ethics and professional misconduct provisions of the provincial regulators.
- 6) There was general discussion on the application of the Code of Ethics and professional misconduct in the complaints process.
- 7) PEO should want both lofty goals (Code of Ethics) and the minimum standards (professional misconduct), but they must be kept separate.
- 8) The Task Force strongly recommends that the element cannot include the requirement that violations of the Code of Ethics are professional misconduct.
- 9) The Task Force agreed that the CFL must provide an additional element on “professional misconduct”.
- 10) The Task Force suggested that, in the Elements Schedule, recycled elements should be dated so as to indicate when recycling occurred.
- 11) The Task Force did not provide detailed assessment of the Key Considerations since there is no information on professional misconduct considerations.
- 12) The Task Force agreed that unethical behaviour is a case of professional misconduct, but failure to comply with the code of ethics will not necessarily be unethical.

Titles, Rights and Responsibilities Document

More discussion is required on the distinction between “Right to Practice” and “Right to Title”.

7. Licensure Principles and Philosophies re Assessment Processes and Tools

- R. Fraser stated that there are major problems with constitutive associations' positions on licensing principles and philosophies; many people have very broad interpretations of certain principles such as "individual assessment". For some, checking that the applicant has a diploma is considered "individual assessment". If associations do not agree on principles, then getting the elements right will be impossible.
- Engineers Canada has initiated a working group of representative ARC members from across the country to work on the element "Assessment Tools and Protocols". R. Fraser has been asked to participate. However, he expressed the concern that, in his opinion, the scope of this group will be too narrow and will not address the main philosophical differences in how the provinces assess academics. In his opinion, the Task Force is either going to drive this process or react to it; need to get either the Task Force or ARC members into the room with everyone and convince the other associations regarding the philosophies behind the licensure process. He noted resistance by Engineers Canada to arrange a breakout of ARC members from other associations at the recent workshop.
- R. Fraser suggested that the Task Force should get a budget to invite ARC members from other associations to PEO for small group discussions regarding licensure philosophies by going through an actual assessment; suggestion of three member groups once every month or two. It is important for PEO to understand where other provinces stand on assessment processes. Engineers Canada is not geared to seeking understanding; they are geared to concurrence.
- A concern was raised that this approach might lead the other associations and Engineers Canada to think that PEO is hijacking the process.
- It was suggested that a preferable approach would be for PEO members to visit other associations for fact-finding.
- The Task Force agreed to observe the current Engineers Canada initiative regarding academics for the next six months to see how it evolves. The Task Force will then re-evaluate its progress at that point and decide whether to initiate a PEO initiative on this subject.

8. Other

No discussion.

9. Next Meeting

B. Ennis to send an e-mail with possible meeting dates, using D. Freeman's suggested dates as a first round of choices.