



---

# Minutes

## LICENSING COMMITTEE MEETING

May 16, 2019

PEO Offices

### **Members:**

Barna Szabados, P. Eng. (Chair)

Christian Bellini, P. Eng.

George Comrie, P. Eng.

Mohinder Grover, P. Eng.

David Kiguel, P. Eng.

Greg Wowchuk, P. Eng.

### **Staff:**

Bernie Ennis, P. Eng.

### **Guests/Observers:**

Guy Boone, P. Eng.

Leila Notash, P. Eng.

Changiz Sadr, P. Eng.

### **Regrets:**

Roydon Fraser, P. Eng.

Santosh Gupta, P. Eng. (Vice-Chair)

Lola Hidalgo, P. Eng.

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIR’S REMARKS**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m., with six members of the Committee in attendance. Consequently, quorum was attained.

The Chair commenced a discussion regarding the issue of revising the Terms of Reference to add an RCC nominated member. The Committee considered two options:

- (1) Add additional position.
- (2) Change member-at-large position to RCC.

G. Comrie stated that he had discussed with L. Hidalgo when she joined the Committee whether she wanted to continue. If she had a keen interest in licensure, she may want to stay on the Committee. Therefore, the Committee should wait to make decision until affirming her intention.

Originally, the Legislation Committee position was intended as the Council Liaison. G. Wowchuk agreed to be the Council Liaison.

G. Comrie noted that the Licensing Committee has had problems with people not attending meetings.

**Action:** B. Szabados to contact L. Hidalgo regarding staying on the Licensing Committee.

**Action:** B. Ennis to prepare revised Terms of Reference and submit a Briefing Note to Council for the June 2019 meeting.

**Action:** B. Ennis to send Josie D’Aluisio’s e-mail address to the Licensing Committee members.

**2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

A motion was made to approve the agenda as written.

**Moved by: G. Comrie                      Seconded by: M. Grover                      CARRIED**

**3. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 14, 2019 MINUTES**

A motion was made to approve the Minutes of the March 14, 2019 meeting as written.

**Moved by: M. Grover                      Seconded by: G. Wowchuk                      CARRIED**

There was discussion of the policy for eliminating bias by reviewers prepared by Richard Steinecke. L. Notash noted that this policy does not deal with unconscious bias.

**4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

There was nothing to report.

**5. OFC UPDATE**

B. Ennis reported that there had been no new developments regarding PEO noncompliance issues. PEO staff will meet with staff of the Ontario Fairness Commission on July 25, 2019.

**6. GOOD CHARACTER - UPDATE**

**7. REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES**

**Staff**

Staff had nothing to report.

**Experience Requirements Committee (ERC)**

D. Kiguel reported that the last ERC meeting was held in April 2019.

The ERC agreed to implement quality process on a trial basis that will review the applicant interviews. They will be chosen at Random and assessed in order to update training of the members.

Three members of the ERC received Order of Honor award.

**30 x 30 Task Force**

The Task Force held a session presenting to Chapters.

The Task Force presented at the Volunteer Leadership Conference.

The Task Force is providing a session to approximately 30 employers, mostly larger organizations.

C. Bellini indicated that he believes that there is a need for a separate approach for dealing with small firms.

## **Academic Requirements Committee (ARC)**

There was nothing to report.

### **8. COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK PRESENTATION**

#### **Suitability to Practice**

Workplan is intended to define attributes for unsuitability for practice. There is an assumption that these attributes can be re-assessed at any time after licensure. G. Comrie stated that this allowed by the Act. Need criteria for triggering a re-assessment.

Add "8) Whistleblowing" to attributes.

G. Wowchuk is concerned about going down this road. This will add substantially to the bureaucracy of PEO.

G. Comrie: Need a process and standards for dealing when aware of a problem. We could be accused of not regulating the profession. There needs to be clarity around expectations of PEO members. The Law Society recognized that they needed to deal with problems of lawyers who were not suitable to practice.

C. Sadr asked whether there had been any Regulation changes dealing with suspension due to failure to comply with PEAK.

C. Bellini advised that it was PEO's responsibility to plug any loopholes in PEO's ability to regulate. It is counter-productive to impose onerous requirements that are unnecessarily complicated. He does not believe that there is a problem with the public not trusting engineers, but is there a loophole that PEO can close?

M. Grover: Need to consider situation, such as:

- Bribery: Law would deal with this; would we expect PEO take action?
- Sexual Harassment: Employer would take action; would we expect PEO to take action? Person has already been punished by employer.

G. Comrie noted that, in Quebec, the Order was put under supervision because a number of OIQ licensees were convicted of fraud. Leadership of OIQ advised that the order was not responsible for ensuring that engineers do not break the law. We need to look at this from public perspective, not professional. This inquiry is an attempt to reduce subjective regarding suitability to practice by clarifying what standard of behavior is.

G. Wowchuk: OIQ problem was systematic, but this matter is regarding individuals. If this does not lead to sanctions, then this is merely window dressing. The public does not know much about engineering.

G. Boone: PEO needs to be recognized as a good steward of the profession

C. Sadr: Is it better to have this than not have it? I believe it is better to have it.

B. Szabados: Question is what do we do with this? Not looking at this sanction perspective, warning. How much work are we prepared to do on this? We keep on talking about “good character”, but everybody has a different definition.

### **Competency Models**

G. Comrie provided a presentation so that the Committee could decide whether to spend time on this topic.

“Acceptable experience” is not clear.

B. Szabados: Acceptable experience is defined as experience under a P. Eng., but this is not always possible.

G. Comrie: it is not clear to the applicant what is needed to meet this requirement.

The measurement instruments lack precision and clarity; no guideline for referees.

C. Bellini: This information is what needs to be given to the applicant before they get their experience.

G. Comrie: Proposing that discussion with the applicant and employer early on about the requirements needed for licensure to ensure that the applicant can get this particular experience.

D. Kiguel: Staff review the applicants’ experience records and refer to the Experience Requirements Committee only if there are questions about the experience.

B. Szabados: Referee does not see the applicant’s experience record and does not know what it includes. The referee does not know what definition of the criteria is expected by PEO, i.e. what does “design” mean; everyone will have a different definition.

G. Comrie: Applicants are experiencing difficulty understanding what is required.

G. Boone: It would be useful for the Licensing Committee to communicate to Council that the issues noted in the AGM submission on licensing are being dealt with by the Licensing Committee.

**Action:** Staff to put the action list on the website.

G. Comrie: The five attributes of required experience are a form of competency model.

**Action:** Staff to Circulate Engineers Canada Assessment Guide to the Licensing Committee members.

G. Comrie: Problem with attributes in either PEO or Engineers and Geoscientists British Columbia required experience is that they are generic; hence, difficulty in interpreting in particular areas of practice.

Fairness Commissioner assumes that a competency model will mean that Canadian experience regulation can be eliminated. G. Comrie does not agree.

Competency model used in other jurisdictions:

- U.K. - Regulatory Qualifications Standards
- U.S. - Competency Framework - "Connecting Credentials"
- Siemens North America has created their own competency framework.

These look at the migration process from technologist to engineer.

Ron Kurtz, P. Eng. has assembled information on these models and how PEO could adopt them. G. Comrie suggested that the Licensing Committee should invite Mr. Kurtz to a future meeting.

Basic idea that there would be discipline-specific experience requirements for certain areas of practice, as well as generic requirements.

### **Next Steps**

B. Szabados: Before we do anything, we need to know the current process. We should bring in R. Kurtz only after we have this information as we would not know how to implement the competency model.

C. Bellini: There are some issues with EGBC (pan-Canadian) model, but we don't want to go down a separate path to get something different. We should work with the national model as there is value in consistency across the country.

B. Szabados: It does not matter which model we use; it depends on how it is implemented. How do we implement our current model? We need to get this information. Barna asked P. Lebel to provide information on how other committees operate.

G. Comrie: We need more meetings as we are not converging on a solution. Council approved a resolution (LPTF), but nothing has been done about it. Someone will come along and say that the licensing system is too complicated, which will force PEO to employ a simple system of writing an entrance exam.

B. Szabados has asked P. Lebel to provide all documents on the website; those sent to applicants and referees, and those used by the Experience Requirements Committee and Academic Experience Committee. Questions such as what complaints have been received from applicants and referees, and how is our model received by applicants and referees.

L. Notash: Competency model should be applied to academics as well focus on board sheets, it forces applicants to conform to very rigid ideas of particular disciplines. The Queen's University is advising junior faculty members who are not CEAB graduates to apply for licenses in B.C.

The Committee members agreed to hold a meeting next month that will be on a single aspect of the licensing process. They decided to deal with documentation to applicants and referees dealing with experience information on how staff processes experience. June 14, 2019 is Academic Experience Committee meeting, so possibly June 13, 2019.

**Action:** B. Ennis to gather documentation and forward to B. Szabados as soon as possible. Send documentation to M. Grover and changing to review and see if it is complete.

**9. REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS LOG**

**10. OTHER BUSINESS**

**11. ADJOURNMENT**