



Minutes

ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE

Friday, July 20, 2018

PRESENT:

Members:

Leila Notash, Chair
R. Subramanian, Vice Chair
Bob Dony
Ross Judd
Roydon Fraser
Seimer Tsang
Remon Pop-Iliev
Stelian George -Cosh

Allen Stewart
Jüri Silmberg
Joe Lostracco
Ian Marsland
Waguih ElMaraghy
Judith Dimitriu

Staff:

Moody Farag
Faris Georgis
Anna Carinci Lio
Esther Kim
Irene Zdan
Claire Riley

Regrets:

Amin Rizkalla
Barna Szabados
Michael Hulley
Meilan Liu
Gosha Zywno
John Yeow
Amir Fam

Shamim Sheikh
Sanjeev Bhole
George Nakhla
Magdi Mohareb
Medhat Shehata
Pauline Lebel (Staff)

Guests:

David Kiguel, ERC Chair
Changiz Sadr, ERC Vice Chair

1. Call to Order and Chair's Remarks

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Leila Notash, at approximately 10:30 AM.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The Chair requested the following change to the agenda:

- Barna Szabados was absent from the meeting, therefore, there would be no reporting on the Licensing Committee.

MOTION

It was **moved** by Ramesh Subramanian and **seconded** by Waguih ElMaraghy that the agenda be approved as amended.

CARRIED

3. **Approval of the Minutes of the June 15, 2018 Meeting**

MOTION

It was **moved** by Waguih ElMaraghy and **seconded** by Jüri Silmberg that the minutes of the June 15, 2018 meeting be approved as amended.

CARRIED

4. **Matter(s) Arising from the Minutes**

There were no items reported.

5. **Chair's Report**

The Chair reported on the following:

Both she and President David Brown attended the Kingston Chapter Summer Dinner. President Brown is from the eastern region and has been attending Kingston Chapter's AGMs and summer dinners for the past several years. However, at the 2018 Summer Dinner, he officially attended as PEO President.

The Chair asked the President for an update on the ARC's draft response to the PEO 2018-2020 Strategic Plan memorandum. The President confirmed that he had received all the proposals and said if there were any concerns, he would get back to each Committee regarding their feedback.

Becky St. Jean sent a communication on behalf of the President to all PEO Committee Chairs noting that:

- 93 proposals were received, plus 9 strategic objectives; 39 of the proposals apply to more than one objective.
- The Senior Management Team has started their review and scoring of the 93 proposals against the pre-determined criteria: Achieving the strategic objectives that impact the whole organization, not only a specific Committee's current work plan; and being S.M.A.R.T: Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Realistic, and Time-based.

A complete list of costs will be forwarded to the Finance Committee; and a complete list of proposals and individual scores will be presented to the Council in September to determine the total budget and cut-off level. Following budget deliberations in September and November, the Council will report back to each Committee regarding their proposals.

The Chair also noted that:

Over a year ago, she suggested that whenever the ARC prepared documents, that they remain gender-neutral. This note was not included in past ARC minutes. She reiterated that any ARC-related documents remain gender-neutral as opposed to referring to he or she.

6. Staff Report

Moody Farag reported on the following items:

- Canadian Engineers Qualifications Board (CEQB): As delegated by members at the June-15-2018 ARC meeting, he put forward a request to the CEQB regarding the development of syllabi for Aeronautical and Aerospace Engineering. Moody Farag made the request and the QB Executive Committee reviewed it. However, because of a new process put in place at the CEQB to develop their work plan, PEO's request did not make it through in time for consideration. However, the issue was brought to the attention of PEO's representatives on Engineers Canada Board for further discussion.
- CEQB is in the last stage of finalizing 4 new syllabi that will be presented for approval at its September meeting:
 - Software Engineering
 - Biomedical and Biochemical Engineering
 - Mining and Mineral Processing Engineering
 - Geomatics Engineering
- He noted that the ARC would not be able to make any further comments relating to the 4 new syllabi because the process has past the stage for commentary.
- Provisional Licence (PL):
 - A PL can be issued to an applicant who meets all the requirements for a P.Eng. licence, except for the 12 months of Canadian experience and can only be renewed once, at no cost, according to the Regulations.
 - A PL holder who already had the licence renewed before made a request of a second renewal. The matter has been referred to PEO's internal legal Counsel for an opinion. A brief discussion with legal counsel indicates that even if the licence cannot be renewed for a second year, the applicant may request a new PL to be issued. If a new PL is issued the applicant will have to pay its fees but it will be valid for two years.
- Ontario Fairness Commissioner (OFC): PEO is in the process of responding to the March-12-2018 OFC letter. Five issues are noted in the OFC letter:
 1. Canadian experience;
 2. The Psychometrics for the Professional Practice Exam (PPE);
 3. Applicants request for an internal review, should be conducted by a second reviewer.
 4. Potential bias and conflict of interest.
 5. Set time frames to respond to applicants' inquiries.
- Technical examination Performance review: of the 513 applicants who wrote technical exams, 77 applicants had good performance (which means they wrote two or three exams and had some exams were waived). 54 applicants completed the technical

exams; 315 applicants passed, with more exams to write; 21 applicants had poor performance – FTC will most likely be assigned; 10 applicants had their applications closed because of poor performance.

On the topic of syllabi, members discussed the following:

Bob Dony commented:

- That the ARC had discussed splitting off the Biomedical and Biochemical syllabi to its own stand-alone Biomedical syllabus and asked whether the opportunity to do that was gone. Moody Farag reported that PEO provided ARC's comments to the CEQB but confirmed that Biomedical and Biochemical Engineering were noted as one syllabus on the documents.
- He suggested giving notice to the CEQB that PEO should initiate its own Biomedical Engineering syllabus because there are several Biomedical programs in Ontario on their own that have nothing to do with Biochemical. He commented that PEO may have to create its own syllabus as the only realistic alternative at this point. Moody Farag suggested that perhaps the Chair could ask Roydon Fraser to relay what PEO proposes to do regarding the syllabi at the CEQB September meeting – if they approve the two as only one syllabus.
- He volunteered to set up a subcommittee comprised of Biomedical professionals from around the province. Roydon Fraser asked for clarification as to whether the plan was to create two separate syllabi. The Chair reconfirmed that the ARC provided feedback to the CEQB regarding its request when the ARC was sent the draft, however, the CEQB had not responded yet to the ARC's request.
- The Chair suggested that the ARC define its own two Board Sheets [Biomedical and Biochemical Engineering] and then share them with the CEQB. Roydon Fraser noted that due to the changes in the process of QB's work plan development, it would be best that PEO provide an example as to what the two Board Sheets would look like. It would be preferable in terms of expediency as the syllabi may not go into QB's work plan for at least a year.
- The Chair asked Bob Dony to confirm that he would take the initiative to organize a subcommittee made up of people he knows in the Biomedical Engineering field to create a Board Sheet and he agreed to the Chair's request. Vice Chair Ramesh Subramanian volunteered to organize a subcommittee to compile a Board Sheet for Biochemical Engineering.
- The Chair asked whether a Motion should be proposed as to the organization of the Biomedical and Biochemical subcommittees; the consensus was that a Motion was not required.
- Stelian George-Cosh commented that Engineers Canada (EC) still did not have Manufacturing Engineering on its discipline list. Moody Farag confirmed that the Manufacturing syllabus created by PEO was shared with CEQB.
- The Chair requested that Moody Farag remind the CEQB that PEO has already developed a Manufacturing Engineering syllabus that EC does not have on its list and, as well, to inform them that PEO will also develop Board Sheets for Biomedical and Biochemical Engineering.

The ARC had an extensive and lengthy discussion and the following comments were made:

- Waguih EIMaraghy commented that the OFC requests were not unreasonable. He asked about the other associations position on the Canadian experience requirement.
- Bob Dony informed members that there is a project in British Columbia that is looking at a competency-based model and that the OFC was aware of the BC initiative, noting that the ARC was not an active participant. The project has been ongoing for a couple of years because it's not an easy issue to address. Bob Dony also remarked that PEO is not the only regulator to have some pressure with regard to this matter; most provinces have their equivalent of a Fairness Commissioner.
- Bob Dony further commented that the PEO Council is in consultation with the top legal mind in the country on how to respond to the OFC demands.
- Roydon Fraser offered to summarize points in terms of the Canadian experience: BC is basically a quantity approach. There hasn't been any problem with the risk-assessment approach. And with a quality approach, some sort of challenge approach would be required, as with an oral exam. The ARC is not looking for only codes and the ability to follow codes but looking for the ability to practice engineering in a Canadian environment with an engineer's ethics applied properly.
- David Kiguel, the Experience Requirements Committee (ERC) Chair, noted that the ERC will soon look into alternative ways of meeting the Canadian experience. As a first step, at the next ERC Business Meeting (Aug-17-2018), there will be a presentation by the BC association [Engineers and Geoscientists British Columbia (EGBC)] on what their experience has been on their pilot project. The ERC was informed about this EGBC project a couple of years ago. EGBC does not refer to it as Canadian experience but, rather, Canadian Environment.
- The Chair asked David Kiguel to report on what the EGBC presents at the ERC Aug-17-2018 Business Meeting at the next ARC meeting, Aug-24-2018. The Chair requested that this report be included with the next ARC meeting materials. David Kiguel agreed to the Chair's request.
- Roydon Fraser commented on the PPE psychometric is not feasible with essay-type questions unless they have been around for several years. Further, he explained that the idea of multiple choice is that it's done for several years and people have so many questions, they don't know what question they're going to get. So basically, an exam goes out, everyone will copy down the question.
- Judith Dimitriu stated concern that if PEO went with multiple choice for the PPE, people would pass, but not understand the concept. PEO wants people to understand the law and ethics, therefore, the PPE cannot be multiple choice.
- The Chair asked if there was a reason the OFC was only asking for the PPE psychometrics and not technical exams. Anna Carinci Lio replied that the OFC

is only concentrating on entrance exams that all other Regulators have to provide, which is the PPE.

- The Chair noted that, regarding the psychometrics aspect, the ARC may need to look at Bar Exams. Are they multiple choice exams? If not, how are they going to assess those?
- David Kiguel pointed out that the Licensing Committee (LIC) worked on an appeal process that was presented to the ARC and this process for academic assessments was approved by the ARC. Further, he noted that the ERC is actively working on formalizing an appeal process for interview results.
- Human Rights Commission Hearing: Seimer Tsang asked Moody Farag whether there was a decision as to the Human Rights Commission hearing of the applicant who filed a complaint against the PEO saying that the PEO discriminated against him because of where he was educated. Moody Farag reported that the case was heard in Nov-2017; the decision ruling was in March 2018. The Human Rights Commission ruled that there was no evidence that the PEO discriminated against the applicant; therefore, the case had no merit and it was dismissed.

7. Endorsements

7.1 Reading Assignment of Technical Reports/Synopses

There was one synopsis in Manufacturing presented to the ARC for consideration: The title of the synopsis is Manufacturing: Design of Energy Harvester: Submitted by applicant with File Number: 100216357. Remon Pop-Iliev approved the synopsis and agreed to mark the report.

7.2 Issues Arising from ARC/Deputy Registrar Recommendations

The Chair reported that after discussions with Moody Farag, they decided to bring one or two applications from each program – if available – for applicants who graduated from the Philippines to the ARC. For the past year, these files were assessed by the staff. Now, one or two of these applications will be assessed by ARC members monthly. A year from now, the ARC will look at whether the applicants were assigned any exams or whether they were Confirmatory. Currently, they are all Confirmatory and there is no directed Confirmatory.

7.3 Issues Arising from ERC Recommendations for Applicants Referred by ARC

There were no issues to report.

8. Procedural and Related Matters

There were no issues to report.

8.1 Licensing Committee (LIC) Update

There was no update to report.

8.2 Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) Update

Bob Dony reported that the last meeting was in June and the next meeting is scheduled for September 2018.

Regarding the CEAB AU Task Force, a preliminary report on the feedback from Stakeholders is now available and the Task Force will be meeting over the summer to discuss it to determine the next steps.

8.3 Canadian Engineering Qualifications Board (CEQB) Update

Roydon Fraser reported that, four to six months ago, he was excited about an effort to put some principles into their admissions processes. The Chair of the Subcommittee who was overlooking this aspect is no longer there. The National Officials said they do not like what CEQB is doing. There are considerable changes at EC as to how processes are done. They have taken on the approach that the Regulators dictate what EC does; that is the Board's decision. But this is translated down to the QB, meaning that National Officials must agree to anything that is done, followed by the CEOs of the organizations. Then EC gets the feedback. Based on this, he believes this EC process will create a situation that could be problematic for doing anything that is useful, visionary and evolutionary.

8.4 Distance Education (DE) Sub-Committee

Waguhi ElMaraghy reported that the Sub-Committee members met prior to the ARC meeting and discussed definitions and background work. They also agreed to share some of the work that is going to be done during the next few weeks, starting with: definitions; the ability to collect data from applicants and what format it will take; what would be the implications in terms of changes in PEO regulations. The subcommittee will present a written draft report to the ARC within a couple of months.

8.5 Revised Report of the ARC McMaster B.Tech. Sub-Committee

The Chair noted that the report was approved by the ARC, however, there were four minor corrections to be made before presenting it to Council for approval:

- The year "2016" was added to the second paragraph of page one in order to be more precise as to when McMaster University contacted PEO to request the evaluation of three more B.Tech. programs.
- Under Recommendations – Page 2: Item 1: "For a graduate of 2018 and forward..." was added
- Under Recommendations – Page 2: Item 3: "Poor performance" was discussed but was not originally included in the document. Since "good performance" was noted in the document, there was a need to include "poor performance."
- Under Recommendations – Page 2: Item 3: "s/he" was replaced by "the applicant."

MOTION

It was **moved** by Jüri Silmberg and **seconded** by Waguih ElMaraghy that the revisions to The ARC McMaster B.Tech. Subcommittee Report be approved as amended.

CARRIED

Waguih ElMaraghy commented that when the revised version of the ARC McMaster B.Tech. Report gets to the stage of entry into the Red Book entry, there should be an elaboration of “poor performance.” To add “It’s the same as...

There was no Motion. The consensus of the Committee was “All in Favour.”

8.6 Experience Requirements Committee (ERC) Report

David Kiguel reported that:

There were no activities of the ERC since they last reported in June 2018. The next ERC Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for August 1, 2018. The next ERC Business Meeting is scheduled for August 17, 2018. At this meeting there will be a teleconference with Engineers and Geoscientists British Columbia (EGBC) regarding experience requirement.

An invitation was extended to ARC members to join the teleconference. Roydon Fraser stated that he would like to participate. The Chair asked him to share his questions with the ERC Chair David Kiguel and Vice Chair Changiz Sadr in case he could not attend.

9. New Procedural Matters

Waguih ElMaraghy brought to the attention of the committee that McMaster Bachelor of Manufacturing Technology should also be reviewed, the Red Book indicates that the program should be reviewed in January 2017.” He asked when the assessment would be initiated. Moody Farag commented that after the recently reviewed McMaster B.Tech. programs are approved by Council, a new ARC sub-committee would have to be formed to review the Bachelor of Manufacturing Technology program and other new programs.

MOTION

It was **moved** by Waguih ElMaraghy and **seconded** by Stelian George-Cosh that the ARC will continue to assign the McMaster Bachelor of Manufacturing Technology graduates as indicated in the Red Book, until a review is done this year.

CARRIED

10. Other Business

Professional Practice Examination (PPE)

11. Adjournment Meeting adjourned at 11:39 AM Next Meeting: **August 24, 2018**