



Minutes

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTEERS (ACV)

Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018

Location: PEO Offices, Room 5A

Time: 5:00pm – 8:00pm

<p>Attendance:</p>	<p>Chris Kan, P.Eng. – Chair Sean McCann, P.Eng. – Vice Chair Michael Chan, P.Eng. Márta Ecsedi, P.Eng. Doug Hatfield, P.Eng. (teleconference) Lisa Lovery, P.Eng.</p> <p>Regrets: Christian Bellini, P.Eng. – Council Liaison Nick Colucci, P.Eng. Vic Pakalnis, P.Eng. Fern Gonçalves – Director, People Development (Committee Advisor)</p> <p>Staff: Viktoria Aleksandrova – Committee Coordinator (Staff Support)</p>
<p>AGENDA ITEMS</p>	<p>ROUTINE BUSINESS</p>
<p>1.1 Welcome and Introduction</p>	<p>The Chair welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 5:45pm.</p>
<p>1.2 Approval of Agenda</p>	<p>Moved by Márta Ecsedi, seconded by Sean McCann:</p> <p>That the Agenda be approved as amended. MOTION CARRIED.</p>
<p>1.3 Approval of Minutes (December 7, 2017)</p>	<p>Moved by Michael Chan, seconded by Sean McCann:</p> <p>That the Minutes of the ACV meeting held on December 7, 2017 be approved as presented. MOTION CARRIED.</p>
<p>2. COMMITTEE AND TASK FORCE TERMS OF REFERENCE</p>	
<p>2.1 Council Composition Task Force (CCTF) – Final Report</p>	<p>The ACV reviewed the <i>CCTF Final Report</i> submitted for peer-review and comment. It was noted that, due to time constraints and because the committee was not part of the discussion, the ACV was unable to provide a detailed feedback to the document, as presented.</p> <p>The ACV's feedback to the 'Matrix' Section of the document is available in <i>Appendix A</i> [marked with yellow highlight].</p>



	<p>Action [1]: Staff will forward ACV's feedback to the CCTF Committee Advisor and Staff Support.</p>
<p>3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES AND ACTION ITEMS</p>	
<p>3.1 2018 Committee Chairs Workshop – Update</p>	<p>The Subcommittee Chair, Sean McCann, provided an update regarding the <i>2018 Committee Chairs Workshop</i>. He noted that the initial teleconference meeting with the potential facilitator was successful. Gregg Brown, facilitator of the 2017 Committee Chairs Workshop, was selected based on the feedback received from the participants who indicated that they would like to have a continuation of the discussion and a 'deeper dive' into the topic. The tentative theme for the 2018 workshop is Volunteer Performance Evaluation using the DISC personality system. The training will also cover such topics as working in collaboration and dealing with difficult people.</p> <p>Action [2]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff will send the DISC personality test to those ACV members who were unable to attend the workshop. • Staff will arrange to sign a contract with Gregg Brown through the National Speakers Bureau (NSB). • Staff will send the Summary Report from 2017 Committee Chairs Workshop, once confirmed by the subcommittee, to all participants.
<p>3.2 Succession Planning Subcommittee Update</p>	<p>The Subcommittee Chair, Sean McCann, provided an update regarding the subcommittee meetings on Dec 7, 12 and Jan 11th. He noted that four initial applications were reviewed, and that the subcommittee was working on developing a list of criteria to be considered while reviewing the applications.</p> <p>The subcommittee discussed the following training needs for new ACV member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training of new volunteers on the <i>Committee and Task Forces Policy and Reference Guide</i>; - Training of existing (or experienced) volunteers on how to run effective meetings; - Training of new ACV members on ACV's specific activities, subcommittee projects, tasks, etc. - 21 Toys Empathy toy to be considered as part of teambuilding exercise for new members. <p>Action [3]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff will set up a date for the next subcommittee meeting after Jan 22nd application deadline. • Subcommittee members to send their lists of criteria for consideration during the selection process. •
<p>3.3 C & TF Policy Reference Guide – Self-Evaluation Form – Subcommittee Update</p>	<p>The ACV members completed a sample <i>Self-Evaluation Form</i>, in accordance with the <i>Committees and Task Forces Policy – Reference Guide</i>. The completed form is available in <i>Appendix B</i> below.</p> <p>Action [4]:</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subcommittee to further discuss changes to the <i>Self-Evaluation Form</i> and provide its recommendation to the ACV.
3.4 ACV Subcommittee Assignments	<p>The ACV reviewed the <i>Subcommittee Assignments Log</i>.</p> <p>Action [5]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff to contact Vic Pakalnis, Denis Dixon and Nick Colucci to confirm their willingness to continue on the ACV's subcommittees.
4. OTHER BUSINESS	
4.1 Election of Chair and Vice Chair	<p>The Committee held an election for the position of Committee Chair and Vice Chair.</p> <p>Moved by Michael Chan, seconded by Márta Ecsedi: That Sean McCann, P.Eng. be elected as the ACV Chair for 2018. MOTION CARRIED</p> <p>Moved by Chris Kan, seconded by Michael Chan: That Lisa Lovery, P.Eng. be elected as the ACV Vice Chair for 2018. MOTION CARRIED</p> <p>Action [6]: Staff to submit this information to Council at their next meeting.</p>
4.2 2017 ACV Annual Report	<p>The committee reviewed the draft 2017 ACV Annual Report.</p> <p>Action [7]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACV members to submit their comments, feedback to Viktoria by January 26, 2018. Viktoria to amend the draft document and send for final review to the committee by Feb 2, 2018.
5. SCHEDULE OF NEXT MEETINGS – AND – ADJOURNMENT	
Future Meetings and Adjournment	<p>The next ACV meeting/event dates are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thursday, March 8, 2018 - Friday, April 20-21, 2018 - Volunteer Leadership Conference - Thursday, May 24, 2018 - Thursday, August 9, 2018 - Thursday, October 4, 2018 - Friday, October 26, 2018 - Committee Chairs Workshop - Thursday, December 6, 2018 <p>The meeting was adjourned at 8:04pm.</p>



APPENDIX A

**Council Composition Task Force – Decision Matrix –
ACV’s Feedback [marked with yellow highlight]**

Topic	Reason / Discussion	CCTF Decisions
EIT’s on Council	<p>Against EIT’s on Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIT’s lack experience and are just developing an understanding of the profession – need to develop that understanding before they can be effective sitting on Council and making decisions regarding the regulation of the profession Going through the rite of passage is an incentive to become engaged and earning the entitlement to become a voting member of Council <p>For EIT’s on Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They bring a link to younger demographic that PEO struggles to capture An EIT offers a younger/different/diverse perspective Council should reflect the broader PEO demographic base Elected or appointed, but would recommend elected 	<p>EIT on Council, 3 for, 2 against (Carried)</p> <p>ACV is not in support of this decision because it will require changing the Professional Engineers Act.</p>
P.Eng LGAs vs Lay LGAs	<p>For elimination of P.Eng. LGA’s</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> P.Eng LGAs were needed when there was a requirement of discipline specific members to sit on discipline panels – no longer a requirement If there are too many LGAs, PEO is no longer a self-regulatory body There is no shortage of a P.Eng. pool that can be elected to Council – PEO does not need the government to select P.Eng.’s on its behalf Ontario is the only province that has P.Eng. LGAs There is no guarantee of getting talented P.Eng. LGAs. Any PEO member can run for election. PEO can and should elect all P.Eng’s from its 80,000 members. Any P.Eng who might have, in future, applied for a LGA position can run for election, thus demonstrating publicly his/her merit. A engineer candidate running for office is required to devise and present a platform for consideration by members. This is demanding in time and effort, proving commitment. P.Eng. LGAs take positions away from elected engineer Councillors, thus diminishing our member-directed Association. Government oversight of PEO is well served by lay LGAs; therefore, there is no need for P.Eng. LGAs. For any specified number of LGAs it is more effective that they be "lay" so as to provide other-than-engineering input to Council from their respected professional backgrounds. There may be political influence at play in the appointment of LGAs; Are P.Eng. LGAs taking advantage of political connections rather than mounting an election campaign? All PEO members on Council should have to run in an election on a platform supported by a majority of members, not be appointed by government. This ensures commitment to the position and 	<p>Eliminate P.Eng. LGAs, 4 for, 0 against, 1 abstention (Rescinded)</p> <p>Keep Lay LGAs (consensus)</p> <p>Keep P.Eng LGAs and ask the AG to consider providing councillors of specific disciplines to address representation issues 3 for, 1 against (Roger) (Carried)</p> <p>No feedback</p>



	<p>process. It also aids maintaining our member-directed Association.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lay LGAs better represent the public voice on Council than P.Eng LGAs., i.e. public oversight and professional participation on Council. • Lay LGAs might be presumed to be a better guard against a self-serving regulator than P.Eng. LGAs. • Lay LGA's provide all the vital input/knowledge/expertise PEO needs from other professions. <p>Against elimination of P.Eng LGA's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LGAs are part of the contract with the government that allows self-regulation – public oversight / participation on Council in turn for self-regulation • The election process does not necessarily provide talented Councillors • If you open up the Act for a change, others will have an opportunity to bring forward other changes that may have unintended consequences. • There is no demonstrated problem with P.Eng., LGAs. • Eliminating P.Eng., LGAs is just the first step to eliminating all LGAs. after which PEO would cease to exist • P.Eng., LGAs could be used to improve diversity (ethnicity, discipline) on Council • Diversity doesn't necessarily come through elections. • According to the McRuer Report, the absence of LGAs means the loss of self-governance 	
Executive Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive committees were created when travel and communication was difficult and BoD's could not be brought together quickly and easily for urgent matters – technology and improvements to infrastructure have been greatly improved allowing BoD's to be brought together for urgent matters much more easily • Executive committees can become shadow boards and usurp the authority of a BoD. i.e. a small cadre of people making decisions 	<p>Eliminate the Executive Committee (Consensus)</p> <p>ACV noted that no Pros and Cons were provided for this item, therefore the committee does not have sufficient information to make a recommendation.</p>
Term Length of President	<p>For maintaining the status quo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue – finding someone willing to serve for more than 1 year • Other constituent associations – president's term is 1 year • Having a president-elect or VP that becomes President provides for a learning curve <p>For extending the term for President</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need a term long enough so that management can't say, "we'll just outlast the President and deal with the next one" • Extended term is necessary because of the learning curve for job and institutional memory 	<p>ACV noted that there was no recommendation from the CCTF on this item, therefore no feedback is provided.</p>
Past President Standing Committee	<p>For creation of a PP Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit membership to a certain date (since creation of OSPE) • Should not lose experience and speaks to institutional memory • Inspiration for younger people <p>Against creation of a PP Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces innovation, same old thinking • Past presidents can participate on other committees • Should only be a group available to provide advice when asked 	<p>Past President's standing committee since the creation of OSPE 1 for, 2 against, 1 abstention (Defeated)</p>



		ACV is in agreement with this decision.
Past President	<p>For elimination of PP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No role for Past President Institutional memory; however, memories can be faulty, good record keeping is the key APEGNB eliminated the position of Past President Reduce the 3 P's – a triumvirate <p>Against elimination of PP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminating the PP indicates that the President after serving as President has no value to the organization 	<p>Eliminate the position of Past President 3 for, 0 against, 1 abstention (Carried)</p> <p>ACV is not in support of this decision. The committee agreed that the role of Past President should be kept for the sake of continuity.</p>
Vice President	<p>For elimination of VP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No role for Vice Presidents 	<p>Eliminate both VP positions (Consensus)</p> <p>ACV agreed that more information is required regarding the Role of Vice Presidents (elected and appointed).</p>
President-elect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training for being President (apprenticeship) Not ex officio on any committees – only observers President-elect invited to committee meetings for training purposes, would have no vote and would be required to leave during any in-camera sessions 	<p>Maintain PE position (Consensus)</p> <p>PE not ex officio on any committees – only observer 4 for, 0 against (Carried)</p> <p>No feedback</p>
Role of the President	<p>For separation of President and Chair roles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> President, in the role of chair, is used as an advocate of management, a quasi CEO Gives President ability to focus on the business of PEO and become the “chief excitement officer” or “chief inspiration officer” for the profession Gives the President the opportunity to speak to issues at Council The appointed Chair should not be taking a position, their role is to make sure the meeting runs properly The Chair (if a separate position), would have no power. A job description would need to be written for that position LGAs are completely excluded from the running of Council in any meaningful respect, separating the roles would give a meaningful role to LGAs particularly Lay LGAs 	<p>Separate the roles of Chair and President 4 for, 0 against (Carried)</p> <p>ACV noted that since the current practice is to elect the Council Chair, no feedback was required to this decision.</p>
Diversity on Council	<p>For greater diversity on Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversity could be enhanced through LGA appointment process. Council should reflect the diversity of PEO's licence holders. 	<p>Council would benefit from greater diversity (Consensus)</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you make it work? 81,000 members, approx. 200,000 engineering graduates – by enhancing membership in PEO, there would be a membership more reflective of society and therefore, Council would be more reflective of society. • Leveraging diversity to achieve innovation can make PEO a high-performance organization. • Diversity provides for diverse thought, thus could result in more creative decisions. <p>Issues to consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With an elected Council, it is difficult to ensure diversity – a policy on recruitment of candidates could support diversity. • If you want a more diverse Council, the catchment areas have to be examined, that is, divide the constituencies. • Reserve 2 seats that are Council appointed (balancing /equalization seats) – issue, how to define the 2 seats? The seats could be appointed after the election in order to bring diversity based on gaps as an outcome of the election; however, this introduces another class of Councillor. • There are many classes of diversity – difficult to represent all classes of diversity. • To remove barriers and give everyone an equal chance - “blind” recruitment of candidates for Council, candidates are not identified – rejected by TF • Make Council a more welcoming place in order to encourage more women and immigrants to run • How do you measure diversity? <p>Barriers to entry - Have a methodology to flow through the profession rather than quotas, therefore, reduce barriers to entry and you will get the diversity that is needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Examining the need for 48 months of experience ○ Reach out to students and engineering graduates to join the profession ○ Engineers in the early stages of their career have challenges to get time off work or away from family ○ reduce time commitment and workload for Council ○ examine ways to compensate Councillors and employers - employers see it more as a loss of time / productivity than of loss of money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progressive membership, graduated membership • Asking the AG to consider providing LGAs of specific disciplines to address representation issues 	<p>Remove barriers to entry 3 for, 0 against, 1 abstention (Carried)</p> <p>ACV is in agreement with this decision.</p>
<p>Regional Councillor/RCC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides regional representation • Could be block voting of 10 RC’s at Council • 2 RC’s are needed for continuity 	<p>Maintain 2 regional councillors per region 4 for, 0 against (Carried)</p> <p>ACV is in agreement with this decision.</p>
<p>Councillor-at-large</p>	<p>For elimination of CALs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don’t need 29 Councillors to manage an organization with a budget of \$24 million <p>For status quo or increasing CALs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CALs look at the profession as a whole • CALs bring broader issues to the Council table, not just regional or chapter issues • No demonstrated problem with the current number 	<p>Maintain 3 CALs 2 for, 3 against (Defeated)</p> <p>Increase the number of CALs to 4 plus an ex officio member from CODE 3 for, 0 against,</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing money is not the main job of Council 3 is too small for a critical mass - all Councillors have an overriding duty to the profession, province, public, therefore, there needs to be a critical mass – more than 3 - by increasing the number to 5, it would bring a broader perspective, richer dialogue. <p>Issue 1 – chapter experience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require CALs to have at least one two-year term as a RC to give experience before being eligible to be CAL - supports succession planning. <p>Issue 2 – Adding CODE rep to Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having a CODE member on Council could assist with resolving issues between PEO and engineering schools. 	<p>1 abstention (Carried)</p> <p>Require CALs to serve as RC (1, 2-year term) to gain experience before being eligible to be a CAL 0 for, 4 against (Defeated)</p> <p>ACV agreed that the CCTF's recommendation required more clarity. The decision to increase the number of CALs would go against recent concerns regarding the size of current PEO Council. PEO would benefit from having two representatives on CODE (Registrar and Vice President-appointed) rather than CODE's ex-officio representative on PEO Council.</p>
<p>General feedback:</p>	<p>ACV commented that whatever decisions were made, their implementation and sustainability would be the main challenge.</p>	



APPENDIX B

Committee Self-Evaluation Form			
Committee: Advisory Committee on Volunteers		Date: Jan 11, 2018	
Please respond to each question with one of the following: Always, Sometimes or Never			
Committee and Task Force Operations		Rating	
		Always	Sometimes
		Never	
1. Did the committee/task force operate within the specific Terms of Reference, annual Work Plan, Human Resources Plan and PEO core values?		Yes	
2. Did the committee/task force adequately meet the training needs of committee/task force members where required?		Yes	
3. Did the committee/task force work effectively with the Council-appointed liaison?		Yes	
4. Did the committee/task force suggest improvements to PEO processes?		Yes*	
5. Did the committee/task force consult with other committees/task forces to identify and address policy issues?		Yes*	
Additional comments to the above: Item 4 and 5 always when requested.			
Role of the Committee / Task Force Chair		Rating	
		Always	Sometimes
		Never	
6. Did the chair effectively lead the committee/task force in completing its duties and responsibilities?		Yes	
7. Did the chair make effective use of committee/task force members' knowledge and time?		Yes	
8. Did the chair arrange for the preparation and distribution of a formal agenda in advance of each meeting, including any required supporting material?		Yes*	
9. Did the chair provide committee/task force members with a meeting schedule?		Yes*	
10. Did the chair work effectively with the committee advisor?		Yes	
Additional comments to the above: Item 8 and 9 accomplished through excellent support of Committee Advisor and Staff Support.			
Role of Committee/Task Force Members		Rating	
		Always	Sometimes
			Never
			[Identify average percentage]
11. Were committee/task force members respectful of the roles of the chair, their colleagues, the liaison and the committee advisor?			Yes* [75%]



Committee Self-Evaluation Form			
Committee: Advisory Committee on Volunteers		Date: Jan 11, 2018	
12. Did committee/task force members participate actively?		Yes* [63%]	
13. Did committee/task force members come to meetings prepared?		Yes* [68%]	
14. Were committee/task force members given the opportunity to agree to the expectations of effort and intention of committee/task force membership prior to accepting a role on the committee/task force?	Yes		
15. Did committee/task force members dedicate the required time to the work of the committee/task force?		Yes* [61%]	
Additional comments to the above: Item 11, 12, 13 and 15 – Yes to read ‘most times’. Individual scores were provided by committee members anonymously, and an average percentage was calculated and identified above.			
Committee Performance Metrics (from the annual Work Plan)			
Metric #1 <insert> Metric #2 <insert> Cont'd		<i>Assessment of results:</i> a. Efficient - yes b. Too high level c. Further changes to the form are required d. Scale or percentage	