



Minutes

NATIONAL FRAMEWORK TASK FORCE MEETING

Monday, January 7, 2013 - 10:00 a.m.
PEO Offices - Suite 104

Members:

Diane Freeman, P. Eng. (Chair)
Christian Bellini, P. Eng. (Vice-Chair)
Roydon Fraser, P. Eng.
Santosh Gupta, P. Eng.

Regrets:

Tony Cecutti, P. Eng.
Ross Judd, P. Eng.
Kathryn Sutherland, P. Eng.

Staff:

Josie D'Aluisio
Johnny Zuccon, P. Eng.

1. Opening Remarks

The Chair opened the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

There was discussion regarding the processes for information exchange for each element, as follows:

- Engineers Canada, through its CEO Group, is the driver behind the Canadian Framework for Licensure and seeks feedback and input from its constituent members, in accordance with the process flow it established.

- The process begins with Engineers Canada issuing the Research document that outlines the basic Key Considerations for an element (item for feedback). Stephanie Price at Engineers Canada is the contact person for all exchanges.
- Once PEO receives this, staff posts it on the NFTF SharePoint site and sends an alert e-mail, attaching the document, to the NFTF members. At the same time, Monique Taylor, Corporate Policy Analyst, PEO, is copied so that she can proceed to initiate external consultation.
- The item is placed on the next NFTF meeting agenda for discussion and direct input, including any input received from the external consultation received to date. Typically, this is provided as a consolidated document directly from Monique Taylor.
- The Task Force reviews all the input and provides feedback to Engineers Canada. The feedback is sent directly to Stephanie Price, along with a copy of the consolidated feedback from the external consultation request. Once, Engineers Canada develops the next level of the document, usually at the element stage, they send it back to the constituent members seeking agreement for concurrence. At this stage, the NFTF is responsible for seeking PEO Council concurrence on the element. This typically involves the Chair if the NFTF needs to appear before PEO Council with the NFTF recommendations.
- With the use of SharePoint, the processes and documents are posted, with copies of the updates on the Engineers Canada log sheet titled "Canadian Framework for Licensure Status Report" to identify where along the development and implementation cycle each element is at and the how each constituent member voted.

2. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made to approve the agenda as written.

Moved by: S. Gupta

Seconded by: C. Bellini

CARRIED

3. Approval of Minutes of November 30, 2012 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the Minutes of the November 30, 2012 meeting as written.

Moved by: R. Fraser

Seconded by: C. Bellini

CARRIED

4. Review of CFL Consultation Responses

Task Force members were referred to the consultation response documents included in the agenda package, which included consolidated stakeholder comments, as well as comments from CEO and OSPE.

Code of Ethics

After review and discussion, the Task Force members made the following proposed revisions to the Code of Ethics Research document.

Purpose Statement (Page 1)

The following revised wording was proposed for the Purpose Statement:

***“Purpose Statement – establishing a Code of Ethics for all engineering licence holders will promote common ethical goals across the country, that leads to the high ethical behavior expected of the profession.*”**

A single Code of Ethics to guide all Canadian engineering licence holders is fundamental to national mobility.”

Note: Task Force did not want to dilute the lofty goals of the Code of Ethics to get them to a minimum standard.

Key Considerations (Pages 9-10)

The following proposed revisions and/or comments were proposed/made to the Key Considerations section:

Key Consideration 1: New proposed wording: ***“The Code of Ethics is focused on engineering ethical issues and professionalism. It does not include references to business practices, but could be supported by a Code of conduct which would address these issues.”***

Key Consideration 2: Delete. Task Force questioned why this was required.

Key Consideration 3: New proposed wording: ***“Enforceable violations of the Code of Ethics must be clearly defined as professional misconduct.”***

Task Force commented that there needs to be distinction between lofty goals and conduct.

Key Consideration 4:

- i. Task Force commented that the following are examples of ethical lofty goal principles: confidentiality, conflict of interest, disclosure, fairness, competence, integrity, whistle-blowing, etc. Task Force further commented that these can be turned into conduct elements but conduct elements are not Code of Ethics principles. Also, the Code of Ethics needs to reveal priorities; specifically, that higher priority is to be given to the public/society over the employers. PEO's priority order, as an example, from highest to lowest priority, is as follows: society, employer, clients, colleagues (including employees and subordinates), the engineering profession, and himself/herself.
- ii. Task Force Comments: Code of Conduct element - not lofty ethical goal - move to another CFL Element.
- iii. Task Force Comments: Code of Conduct element - not lofty ethical goal - move to another CFL Element.
- iv. New proposed wording: ***"Keep themselves informed in order to maintain their competence, strive to advance the body of knowledge within which they practice."***

Task Force Comments: Ethic principle, not enforceable in and of itself.
- v. Task Force Comments: Ethic principle, not enforceable in and of itself.
- vi. Task Force Comments: Code of Conduct element - not lofty ethical goal - move to another CFL Element.
- vii. Task Force Comments: Code of Conduct element - not lofty ethical goal - move to another CFL Element.
- viii. Task Force Comments: Code of Conduct element - not lofty ethical goal - move to another CFL Element.
- xi. Task Force Comments: Code of Conduct element - not lofty ethical goal - move to another CFL Element.

Titles, Rights and Responsibilities

After review and discussion, the Task Force members made the following proposed revisions to the Titles, Rights and Responsibilities Research document.

Purpose (Page 1)

The following revised wording was proposed for the Purpose Statement:

“Purpose – establishing similar titles for engineering licences across Canada, and defining the rights, scope and responsibilities associated with those licences, will promote a common standard across the country, to ensure work is held accountable through the licence and enhances the knowledge and safety of the public, facilitates increased mobility and allows for licence holders to work wherever necessary.”

Key Considerations (Page 8)

The following proposed revisions and/or comments were proposed/made to the Key Considerations section:

Key Consideration 1: New proposed wording: ***“The engineering regulatory bodies define classes of licences for membership that are distinct.”***

Key Consideration 2: New proposed wording: ***“The rights and responsibilities associated with each class of membership must be commensurate with required scope, qualifications and competencies.”***

Key Consideration 3: New proposed wording: ***“Professional Engineers have the right to practice professional engineering, have full membership rights, and have the right to use the protected title of Professional Engineer (P. Eng.)”***

Task Force Comments: Task Force understands that, in some jurisdictions, a temporary licence holder is deemed a professional engineer (P. Eng.), yet they do not have full membership rights. This needs to be corrected.

Key Consideration 4: New proposed wording: ***“Engineers-in-training have not met all requirements for the professional engineering licence and, therefore, are not licensed to do professional engineering. They have limited membership rights and have the right to use the title Engineer-in-Training (EIT).”***

Task Force Comments: The newest Act in Ontario uses the term Engineering Intern, not Engineers-in-training. Please advise if Engineering Intern can be used in this CFL Element? Reasoning for change relates to foreign-trained engineers do not see themselves as being in training, but rather an intern in the Canadian system.

Key Consideration 5: New proposed wording: ***“Limited licence holders have the right to practice professional engineering within a restricted and specified scopy, have limited membership rights, and have the right to use the protected title of Limited Engineering Licence (LEL).”***

Task Force commented that they did not understand the value or need of them having full membership rights.

Key Consideration 6: New proposed wording: ***“Engineering students are an important part of the overall sustainability of the engineering profession. They are affiliated with the engineering regulatory bodies through outreach and membership programs. Engineering students do not have the right to practice professional engineering, and may use the title Engineering Student.”***

Action: Staff to forward the proposed revisions to the Code of Ethics Element and the Titles, Rights and Responsibilities Element, as well as the stakeholder comments, to Stephanie Price at Engineers Canada.

5. Other

No discussion.

6. Next Meeting

It was proposed that the next meeting be held on one of the following dates: February 12, 13, 14, 19, 20 or 21, 2013.

Action: Staff to send a Doodle poll to the Task Force members to canvass their availability for these dates.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting.

Moved by: S. Gupta

Seconded by: R. Fraser

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.