



Minutes

ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE

Meeting of Friday, November 24, 2017

PRESENT:

Members:

Leila Notash, Chair
R. Subramanian, Vice Chair
Sanjeev Bhole
Judith Dimitriu
Waguhi ElMaraghy
Amir Fam
Roydon Fraser
Michael Hulley
Ross Judd
Joe Lostracco
Ian Marsland

Magdi Mohareb
George Nakhla
Juri Silmberg
Remon Pop-Iliev
Allen Stewart
Barna Szabados
Seimer Tsang
Gosha Zywno

Staff:

Michael Price, Deputy Registrar
Anna Carinci-Lio
Moody Farag
Esther Kim
Pauline Lebel
Marsha Serrette
Irene Zdan

Regrets:

Bob Dony
Stelian George-Cosh
Meilan Liu
Amin Rizkalla
Medhat Shehata
Shamim Sheikh
John Yeow

Guests:

Santosh Gupta, ERC Chair
David Kiguel, ERC Vice Chair
Amit Banerjee, APEGA

1. Call to Order and Chair's Remarks

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Leila Notash at approximately 10:35 AM. The Chair introduced Amit Banerjee, P.Eng to the committee. He is the Deputy Director of Registration at APEGA.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The Chair, requested to add an additional item to the agenda under 8.8, Referral to ERC.

MOTION:

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

CARRIED

3. Approval of the Minutes of the October 27, 2017 Meeting

MOTION:

It was **moved** by Barna Szabados and **seconded** by Ramesh Subramanian that the minutes of the October 27, 2017 meeting be approved.

CARRIED

4. Matter(s) Arising from the Minutes

Item 8.9 Ross Judd spoke on the issue of the W Booth School of Engineering program, Masters of Engineering Design. Students enrolled in this 12 months post-graduate degree program are required to take six courses and produce a final industry related project. Ross Judd is currently supervising four students in this program. This is a technology program not an engineering program. Seimer Tsang also stated that when you look at the transcript from McMaster you will notice that the designation given is a master of engineering design (MENGD). This is different from the conventional acronyms of M.Eng and M.A.Sc. The committee should be cautious when assessing applicants of this program for licensure. He further suggested that the Redbook should be updated to reflect this program. The ARC Redbook subcommittee will meet to address this addition to the manual.

There was a concern raised in regard to the Term Limits of the Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs. Once the Chair or Vice Chair serves for a maximum term they are no longer eligible for reappointment to those positions. The question was asked what will happen if there is no one willing to perform the Chair/Vice Chair duties? The Council resolution does allow for extenuating circumstances.

5. Chair's Report

Leila Notash reported on the following items:

- She attended the Committee Chairs workshop on November 3, 2017. Bob Dony, Barna Szabados, Ramesh Subramanian, Santosh Gupta and David Kiguel were also in attendance. The moderator presentation focused on team building, personality styles, the various ways that people work and

how you manage the different styles. The workshop was well received by those in attendance. She also stated that what was missing in the presentation was, how to develop the skills required to manage the mixture of styles. The problems were identified but no solutions were given. Ideally there should be a follow up to the workshop in the future. Another drawback was the workshop identified scenarios that were all work related. The presentation was not adjusted to the audience of Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs who work with volunteers.

- Jacqueline Stagner has notified the committee that she resigned from the ARC effective October 27, 2017.
- The Chair attended the Chapters Leadership Conference on November 17, 2018.
- She has decided to run as Councillor-at-large.

6. Deputy Registrar's Report

Michael Price reported on the following:

- He welcomed Amit Banerjee from APEGA. He has been visiting Regulators across Canada and surveying the various licensing practices and procedures. In addition to joining the ARC meeting today he will also attend ERC interviews.
- Allison Brownlee was PEO's policy analyst at the Ontario Fairness Commission (OFC). She has resigned from the OFC and has joined the Treasury Board. PEO's new policy analyst is Ricardo Fisher.
- PEO has received correspondence from the OFC. They are currently working on completing cycle 3 assessments for all regulators by June 2018.
- HRTO Chirkov case, the closing arguments were to be submitted by the applicant. The applicant has not submitted closing arguments by the initial date specified. Mr. Chirkov has requested two deferrals to date.
- He thanked those members who sent in their comments on the draft general direction for the draft guideline on assessments of non CEAB applicants. Comments have been sent to Engineers Canada

7. Endorsements

7.1 Reading Assignment of Technical Reports/Synopses

There is one technical report in manufacturing. Optimizing Production Process Using Manufacturing Engineering Principles. This report will be examined by Waguih ElMaraghy.

7.2 Issues Arising from ARC/Deputy Registrar Recommendations

No items to report

7.3 Issues Arising from Recommendations for applicants Referred by ARC

No items to report

7.4 PPE Results

Anna Carinci Lio reported on the results of the last PPE sitting that took place on October 18, 2017. There was a 73% passing rate slightly lower than in previous sittings, with no third-time failures.

8. Procedural and Related Matters

8.1 Licensing Committee Update

Barna Szabados reported to the committee that the LIC met on Thursday, November 23, 2017. There was an extensive discussion on the issue of monitors. A monitor supervises the work of an EIT where a professional engineer is not present at the EIT's location. The ERC is currently reviewing the role of the monitor and will make a recommendation to the LIC. Also discussed was the appeals process. The problem that the LIC is trying to solve is related to applicants who do not meet the academic requirements. The only process for these applicants is to appeal to the Registration Committee (REC). However, the REC is not an appeal process it is a Denovo hearing. There is a process for internal review at PEO however, it is not properly documented in the Redbook. Barna Szabados suggested that he discuss with Leila Notash, Seimer Tsang, and Roydon Fraser to work on a draft that will be circulated to the ARC for review. Michael Price further suggested that the OFC stated, that their needs to be a policy to ensure that internal review of applicant's files cannot be completed by the same assessor who completed the initial review. This recommendation was focused on the ARC and the fact that in some disciplines there is only one assessor. This update should address this issue and the subcommittee can decide what they would like to recommend and bring it back to the ARC.

8.2 CEAB Update

No items to report

8.3 CEQB Update

Roydon Fraser reported that the CEQB has been working on several guidelines the most important being the Non-CEAB guideline. There are two issues that need ARC input, definition of depth and design academics. In the CEAB definition of depth the integration of mathematics, basic science, engineering science and complimentary studies are included. The original

definition that the ARC approved states, mathematics, basic science, engineering science and design and complimentary studies.

The Redbook definition reflects the CEQB syllabus, in terms of principle and states engineering design. Why is the ARC not measuring design in the academics? So where does design fit in, given that the CEAB has it as their AU count? Why don't we have it explicitly on the PEO syllabi?

Roydon shared his view points that he believes that design has two parts an academic part and design experience. CEAB has two purposes, academics and then risk reduction. Furthermore, he believes a capstone is not necessary for academics. Significant design experience should not be part of the academics, it is part of the experience. The committee discussed the matter at length.

8.4 Discussion on Depth and Breadth

Seimer Tsang, Barna Szabados and Waguih ElMaraghy were asked to review the definition of Depth and Breadth in the Redbook. The subcommittee met and has the opinion that there should be no changes made to the 2008 definition at this time. Future definition agreed by the CEQB and CEAB will be considered in future updates of the Red Book.

8.5 Review of ERC Bias Policy

Michael Price reported on this item that relates to the Ontario Fairness Commission and the update that David Kiguel provided on behalf of the ERC. The issue is the Fairness Commission report of 2017 stated that the PEO should implement guidelines for decision makers that include clear direction on what to do if they find themselves in a situation of potential bias. The feedback from the OFC was that they did like the level of details and examples that the ERC was using for their definition of bias. However, the ERC had not got to the point of implementing bias guidelines. Now that the ERC has completed their definition of bias, the understanding of the OFC is that the ARC should review the policy and see if there are any changes or modification that they would make to their current policy. Michael Price suggested that the policy should be reviewed by the Redbook subcommittee. At the next meeting with the OFC, PEO will provide ARC recommendations for OFC feedback.

8.6 CEQB Draft Syllabi Feedback

The updated Petroleum syllabi was voted through an online process and approved by the ARC. Members of the Environmental, Geological and Software Engineering disciplines are requested to provide their feedback on the draft syllabi for the next ARC meeting.

8.7 ERC Report

David Kiguel reported that the ERC has not met since he last reported in October. The next ERC Business meeting is scheduled for December 18, 2017.

The ERC Subcommittee met on November 21, 2017. The committee's main discussion was on the recommendation of the LIC to review the experience guideline on monitors. The conclusion was that the entire concept of monitor and its obligations must be thoroughly reviewed.

The election of Chair of the ERC is completed. The new Chair for 2018 is David Kiguel. The election of Vice Chair is underway and there are four candidates running for the position.

8.8. Referral to ERC

This relates to the experience requirement before applicants are referred to ERC interviews. Applicants with a PhD do not need five years engineering experience when they are referred to ERC for interview according to the Redbook. However, M.Eng, MSc. and B.Eng and BSc. candidates need five years engineering experience before they are referred to ERC for Interview. Roydon Fraser stated that when someone is referred to the ERC who has had five years experience after graduation and has a Masters, he expects them to go to an ERC Interview. However, staff does an assessment on the experience and if they see the applicant does not have relevant engineering experience they do not get referred to the ERC for an interview. He was not aware of a process that staff would override one of his recommendations and it would not go to the ERC. Furthermore, that staff would not advise him of the override. The committee discussed this item at length, and agreed that this topic has two issues.

- Staff Overriding an ERC interview referral
- What is considered relevant engineering experience.

This item will be a topic of discussion at the next meeting.

9. New Procedural Matter(s) for discussion

10. Other Business

Waguhi EIMaraghy had a question regarding the PEAK program. The question derived from one of his colleagues. Are faculty members practicing Engineering? Leila Notash stated that according to the Professional Engineers Act, teaching is not the practice of Engineering. The definition of practicing was reviewed by Council last year when introducing the PEAK program. There will be no changes made to the Act in this area.

11. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned: 1:01PM

Next Meeting: December 8, 2017