



Minutes

ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE (ARC)

Friday, October 19, 2018

PRESENT

Members

Leila Notash, Chair
R. Subramanian, Vice-Chair
Seimer Tsang
Remon Pop-Iliev
Amin Rizkalla
Gosha Zywno
Sanjeev Bhole

Jüri Silmberg
Ian Marsland
Waguhi ElMaraghy
Barna Szabados
Medhat Shehata
Michael Hulley

Staff

Michael Price
Moody Farag
Pauline Lebel
Faris Georgis
Anna Carinci Lio
Esther Kim
Irene Zdan
Claire Riley

Regrets

Bob Dony
Stelian George-Cosh
Shamim Sheikh
Meilan Liu
Roydon Fraser
Allen Stewart

Judith Dimitriu
George Nakhla
Joe Lostracco
John Yeow
Magdi Mohareb
Ross Judd
Amir Fam

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 10:35 AM. She welcomed everyone to the meeting and acknowledged the return of PEO Deputy Registrar Michael Price.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The Chair noted that there would be no discussions under Item 8.2 – Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) Update and Item 8.3 – Canadian Engineering Qualifications Board (CEQB) Update as representatives Bob Dony and Roydon Fraser were not in attendance.

MOTION

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

CARRIED

3. Approval of the Minutes of September 28, 2018

The following corrections were noted:

- Under Item 8.6 – Experience Requirements Committee (ERC) Report: ...requiring monitors to spend a *30-hour per month* minimum of physical presence at an EIT's workplace, as opposed to *30-hour per week* minimum.
- The correct spelling of the name of Professional Standards Committee (PSC) Chair *Fanny Wong*.

MOTION

It was **moved by** Waguih ElMaraghy and **seconded by** Jüri Silmberg that the minutes of the September 28, 2018 meeting be approved as amended by unanimous consent.

CARRIED

4. Matters Arising from the Minutes

- Under Item 6.5 – Meeting with Ordre des ingénieurs du Québec (OIQ), Moody Farag clarified that le gouvernement du Québec's perception of the OIQ's Junior Engineer Program being a barrier to licensure was indeed an opinion and not a fact.

5. Chair's Report

Based on the September 28, 2018 ARC meeting, the Chair reported on the following two items:

- For the Annual PEO Committee Chairs Workshop on October 26, 2018, she registered as the ARC Chair; however, the ARC Vice-Chair registered as Councillor. The Vice-Chair suggested that, like the PEO Annual General Meeting, the Chair could propose to the Volunteer Management Department that the ARC Vice-Chair-elect attend the workshop. The initial response from the department explained that both the ARC Chair and Vice-Chair were registered and that it was the only option to select – even though the Vice-Chair registered for the workshop as Councillor. Further, the department communicated that if the ARC wanted the Vice-Chair-elect to attend the workshop, the Chair would have to withdraw. However, a week later, the Chair was informed by the department that the Vice-Chair-elect could attend the workshop after all. Citing this example, the Chair suggested that an improvement in communications would be beneficial to all.

- The Chair further commented on transparency in the process and criteria for the selection of committee chairs, membership and task forces. After the September 28, 2018 ARC meeting, she sent an email to Interim Registrar Johnny Zucco enquiring about the selection process of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) PEO representative. She noted that the final criteria for the position had changed from the public posting after applications had already been submitted and questioned whether this was a matter of concern. She opined that it should be made clear from the beginning, before a position is posted, that all criteria for selection are well-defined, or flexible enough that there are no contradictions regarding the candidate criteria at any stage of the selection process.

6. **Deputy Registrar's Report**

Michael Price reported that he returned to the office on October 3, 2018.

He informed the Committee that David Judd, the son of Ross Judd, passed away suddenly at the beginning of October. Ross Judd has been an ARC member for over 30 years and is a former ARC Chair. PEO sent a card and he visited the funeral home on behalf of PEO to express condolences.

7. **Endorsements**

7.1 **Reading Assignment of Technical Reports/Synopses**

There was one synopsis in Manufacturing Engineering titled: *Manufacturing: Design Optimization of a High Containment Roll Compactor*: submitted by applicant with File Number: 100222646. It was reviewed by Waguih ElMaraghy and accepted.

There were two synopses in Mechanical Engineering:

- Title: *Temperature and Humidity Analysis in Gallery and Non-Gallery Museum Spaces Under Summer and Winter Design Day Conditions*: submitted by applicant with File Number: 100507828. It was reviewed by Remon Pop-Iliev. Topic was accepted with specific notes to the applicant.
- Title: *Redesign of Sector Gate Drive Machinery*: submitted by applicant with File Number 100205198. It was reviewed by Waguih ElMaraghy. Topic was accepted; however, the reviewer requested that the applicant resubmit synopsis following PEO Guidelines.

The Chair suggested that applicants define the acronyms used in their reports.

7.2 **Issues Arising from ARC/Deputy Registrar Recommendations**

There were no issues to report.

7.3 Issues Arising from ERC Recommendations for Applicants Referred by ARC

There were no issues to report.

8. Procedural and Related Matters

8.1 Licensing Committee (LIC) Update

The LIC Chair Barna Szabados provided an in-depth report on the status of the *Internal Independent Review of Academic Assessments* briefing note to be presented to Council:

- In response to the briefing note, the Legislation Committee (LEC) provided its peer review feedback in an August 3, 2018 memorandum and recommends that the LIC seek an external legal opinion to determine if and how this proposed review process can be implemented, and if it in any way would infringe on, or be limited by the Act or Regulation 941.
- The LEC does not want the LIC to employ the word “appeal.” Instead, the LIC is now referring to the process as an “internal independent review.”
- As the LIC proposal included having an independent expert as a member of the review panel, the LEC stated that this may contravene Section 40(1) of Regulation 941, unless the external experts/reviewers were appointed by Council to the ARC Committee. ARC decisions have to be made by ARC members. If a non-member makes a binding decision, it could be problematic.
- The ARC Review Panel should really be endorsed by Council which would rule out any potential problem of infringing upon the Act or Regulation 941.
- Presenting a panel to Council on a case-by-case basis could possibly result in delays for appointments considering its full agendas. Instead, the LIC proposes to present a roster of panel members to be approved (e.g., a roster of individuals who grade the PEO Professional Practice Examinations). Upon approval by Council, the roster of individuals would then be eligible to sit on the ARC Review Panel.
- The ARC was asked by the LIC Chair whether there were any objections to him asking Council to approve a roster of panel members as opposed to members on a case-by-case basis and, by consensus, there were no objections.
- He read the addition to Stage 3 (when a panel is introduced in the review process) as was agreed upon by the LIC at its October 18, 2018 meeting: The composition of the panel, its terms of reference, the credentials of the expert proposed, and the statement of the applicant’s claim shall be submitted to Council for approval. Upon Council’s appointment of the panel, the expert shall be asked to conduct an independent assessment based on the applicant’s submission of all relevant documents and conduct the assessment within the process described in the ARC Procedure Manual.
- At the October 18, 2018 LIC meeting, there was ample discussion on the definition of a “frivolous” case brought forward by an applicant. Who determines when a case is “frivolous” or valid? Some mechanism, specification has to be put in place regarding the determination of deeming a case as frivolous. PEO Staff is the best source regarding the history and issues associated with the applicant’s file but, ultimately, the ARC should decide whether the case should proceed or not.

- When asked to define the “independent expert” on the panel (Stage 3 of the proposed review process), the LIC Chair explained that this would be a person who is familiar with licensure and who was not involved in the previous 2 stages of the process; who did not take part in the decisions made within the history of the case. He further commented that the Experience Requirements Committee (ERC) has many members who are recognized experts in their respective fields.
- The ARC will recommend the independent expert and this individual will have to be approved by Council. The expert must: not be a member of the ARC; be an expert in the discipline or close to the discipline in the case review; should be familiar with academics and curricula; be familiar with the review process described in the ARC Procedure Manual; and be familiar with the process of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB).
- It is up to the ARC Chair or Vice-Chair to make sure that the expert is briefed and updated on the new aspects of the review process – whether a newcomer or previous ARC member.
- He was asked by the ARC Chair to clarify Stages 1 and 2. He summarized Stage 1 as the current review process outlined in the ARC Procedures Manual: an assessment is made by an original reviewer and if there is an issue, a second reviewer is assigned. Stage 2 is not in the ARC Procedure Manual: a “Blind Review” whereby there are two different reviewers and, if they cannot agree, then the ARC Chair or Vice-Chair will be added to the case discussions to seek a resolution. In the case of not reaching a decision at this stage, the case will be presented to the ARC and each Stage 2 reviewer will present their views.
- If an applicant is not satisfied with their Notice of Assessment (NOA), Stage 2 will accommodate the review and/or briefing to the applicant to clarify the reasons for the original assessment.
- A panel will intervene only if there is no decision reached by the ARC itself and no additional case information provided by the applicant. The panel is comprised of 4 members, with 3 voting members: 1 expert in the field or licensure; the ARC Chair or Vice-Chair; 1 Councillor (not an ARC member); and 1 non-voting PEO staff member, preferably the Deputy Registrar or Admissions Manager.
- Further, the LIC understands that the ARC issues the NOA and can make a decision, theoretically, contrary to that of the panel. However, the LIC believes that the philosophy behind the proposed review process is that the ARC would endorse the panel’s decision. If the ARC does not agree, or the case is highly complicated, then the case would be presented to the Registration Committee. But if new information is provided by the applicant at any time during the process, the applicant will be informed that their case will go back to the ARC.
- Moody Farag suggested that the LIC add a timeframe in the briefing notes as to how long each stage of the review process will normally take in order to manage an applicant’s expectations. The consensus was 8 weeks for each stage.
- The final version of the briefing note will be circulated to the ARC for review and endorsement before it is submitted to Council at its February 2019 meeting.

8.2 Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) Update

There were no items to report as CEAB representative Bob Dony was not in attendance.

8.3 Canadian Engineering Qualifications Board (CEQB) Update

CEQB representative Roydon Fraser was not in attendance. However, Moody Farag reported the following:

- On October 16, 2018, PEO received notification from Engineers Canada regarding the approval of syllabi for the Mining and Mineral Engineering Process, as well as Geomatics. These syllabi will be presented at the November 2018 ARC meeting.

8.4 ARC Distance Education (DE) Subcommittee

DE Subcommittee Chair Waguih ElMaraghy reported the following:

- Both he and the DE Subcommittee Vice-Chair Remon Pop-Iliev have strongly expressed the need for PEO to have a software program to support online applications for licensure.
- On October 16, 2018, Engineers Canada (EC) announced its partnership with ARMATURE Corporation in the delivery of a new data management system to support engineering education program accreditation. The delivery of this system is a coordinated effort to improve stakeholder consultation, communication, training, improvement processes, and the technical platforms involved with reporting for accreditation.
- ARMATURE provides accreditation, industry certification, and survey data collection programs the ability to leverage pre-built software components to collect information, analyze data, evaluate performance, measure quality, and predict outcomes. The company serves a variety of industries including Higher Education, Healthcare, Laboratory Science, and Public Service. Founded in 2000 and headquartered in Dulles, VA, ARMATURE has received numerous accolades for delivering high-quality software solutions.
- The DE Chair commented that, based on this announcement, perhaps it is a good time for PEO to follow up with EC to find out more about the software program and whether it would be possible to partner with EC, or contact ARMACHURE directly to consider costs, features of the software and how PEO could use it for its own applications. The objective is for PEO not to be technically behind other organizations and associations that have already initiated online applications. PEO could eventually have all applications and assessments online.

8.5 Election of the ARC Chair and Vice-Chair – 2019

Traditionally, the Committee Vice-Chair becomes the Chair if the Vice-Chair has an interest in filling the role. ARC Vice-Chair Ramesh Subramanian had already expressed interest in becoming the new ARC Chair.

Motion

It was **moved by** Sanjeev Bhole and **seconded by** Medhat Shehata that Ramesh Subramanian be nominated as the new ARC Chair, by unanimous consent, effective January 2019.

CARRIED

The ARC Chair called for nominations from Committee members for the role of ARC Vice-Chair. ARC Chair-elect Ramesh Subramanian nominated Waguih EIMaraghy. The Chair commented that both she and the ARC Chair-elect supported the nomination. As ARC Chair, she was very happy with the nominee's support and his contributions to the ARC in preparing the *Bias* document for the Committee. And as a member of the subcommittee to improve the technical report requirements, the nominee was very active in developing the related Excel document. In addition, the nominee also chairs the ARC Distance Education Subcommittee. Waguih EIMaraghy accepted the nomination.

The Chair asked the nominee to leave the room to allow for closed discussion. After the discussion, the nominee was invited back to the meeting and the Chair congratulated him on the unanimous decision by the Committee to confirm his nomination as ARC Vice-Chair-elect.

Motion

It was **moved by** Ramesh Subramanian and **seconded by** Barna Szabados that Waguih EIMaraghy be nominated as the new ARC Vice-Chair, by unanimous consent, effective January 2019.

CARRIED

8.6 Update to the Licensing and Registration Policies and Guidelines: S. 7.2.3 Specific Examination Program

Member Seimer Tsang presented the following:

- There is a need to update Section 7.2.3 – Specific Examination Program – of the *Licensing and Registration Policies and Guidelines* (a.k.a. the Red Book) to accommodate the Ontario Association of Certified Engineering Technicians and Technologists (OACETT), Certified Engineering Technologists (C.E.T.'s) applicants with academic technician credentials.
- Based on his recent experience of assessing the academics of an OACETT applicant who was issued a C.E.T. designation, but without any technology-level courses in mathematics, science, technology and engineering, he proposes a revision to Section 7.2.3.
- He noted that according to Section 8.2.2 – *Canadian Community College Engineering Technology Diploma Holders (3-year program) or OACETT Certified Engineering Technologists (C.E.T.'s) (with ten or more years of experience) or Equivalent* – a C.E.T. designation satisfies the minimum academic requirements to enter a full Specific Examination Program that includes Basic Studies and technical examinations to address specific academic deficiencies assigned by the ARC. However, in assigning exams to the applicant he referenced, he assigned 16 exams and not 15 as outlined in Section 7.2.3.
- The revision to Section 7.2.3 he proposed is to add “**or more**” with regard to the number of examinations that may be assigned by the ARC. “...Assigned examinations may be from the Basic Studies Group, Professionals Group A and/or Group B, and Complementary studies. The number of examinations may be up to fifteen (15) **or more** for engineering technology applicants...”

- Michael Price commented that, grammatically, it would be incorrect to add “or more” to a sentence that states “up to” a certain number. There should be a decision taken as to a specific number. And if this number is related to technicians, then it may be better to have a separate sentence added. Leave the original sentence as is since 15 is the limit for an engineering technologist applicant’s examination program. Simply add a second sentence: Except in the case of an engineering technologist who may be assigned up to (insert number) examinations.
- S. Tsang acknowledged the suggested changes and said he would revise his proposal to reflect the Committee feedback received. He also proposed to add an additional paragraph to Section 8.2.1 – *Canadian Community College Engineering Technology Diploma Holders (3-year program) or OACETT Certified Engineering Technologists (C.E.T.’s) (with ten or more years of experience) or Equivalent* – instructing assessors to pay attention to OACETT C.E.T. applicants with technician credentials.
- It was agreed to discuss the Red Book revisions further and to add them as an item on the ARC November 2018 agenda.

Matters arising from the Red Book discussions:

- Barna Szabados recommended that an electronic copy of the Red Book be made available to members as opposed to only hard copies with spiral binding. The Chair agreed and requested that the default copy be electronic with the option of requesting a hard copy, in a binder, to facilitate replacement pages whenever there are changes.
- Waguih ElMaraghy requested that examiners receive an electronic copy of the engineering reports in addition to the customary hard copies. The Chair would like PEO Admissions to look into this and give examiners the choice. If examiners choose to review electronic copies of the report, the applicant may be asked to provide their report in the examiner’s preferable format.

8.7 Experience Requirements Committee (ERC) Report

The ERC Chair, David Kiguel, reported the following:

- The ERC held its last meeting on October 12, 2018 and several objectives were achieved.
- The interview appeals process that was developed to address cases of applicants who are not satisfied with the results of their interview was approved by the ERC.
- Based on discussions at the LIC October 17, 2018 meeting, the ERC is going to change the title of the process to omit the use of the word “appeal” and rename it to: Independent Review of ERC Interview Results.
- The ERC has also introduced an independent panel review, which is a new concept to reassess contested interviews. The review panel members are also ERC members so, therefore, there is no need to request the pool of panel members’ approval by Council.

- The only condition for panel members who review a request for reconsideration is that the member should not be related to or acquainted with the applicant, nor have participated in the applicant's interview.
- The ERC passed a motion to request that the time an ERC panel member spends on conducting an ERC interview be considered as allotted time towards their Practice Evaluation Knowledge (PEAK) Program for professional development hours. An interviewer must prepare for the interview by researching relevant codes, standards and the projects to be presented. The motion was passed, and he was tasked by ERC to write a note to the PEO administrator of the PEAK program asking for consideration of the motion.
- The ERC will be holding elections for the positions of Chair, Vice-Chair and an ERC representative on the LIC. PEO staff were asked to send an email communication to ERC members calling for nominations.
- The ERC and the LIC approved a proposal to change the guidelines regarding the mandatory 30 hours per month of physical presence by monitors at an engineer-in-training's (EIT) workplace. A briefing note was prepared for Council to present at its September 2018 meeting, however, it was removed from the agenda with a request that the ERC seek peer review from the Professional Standards Committee (PSC). As requested, the ERC Chair wrote a letter to the PSC Chair asking for the committee's review. As of his report to the ARC, he had not received a response from the PSC.

9. **New Procedural Matter(s) for Discussion**

There were no items to discuss.

10. **Other Business**

No other business to report.

11. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 PM

The next meeting is schedule for **November 23, 2018**