

AGENDA OF THE
184th ENGINEERS CANADA BOARD MEETING
September 27, 2017
Fairmont Château Laurier, Ottawa ON
Adam Room

Please refer to the Board Manual and By-law

1	IN-CAMERA SESSION – Directors only (8:30 – 9:30)
	<i>THAT the meeting move in camera and be closed to the public for the purposes of discussing personal matters about an identifiable individual, labour relations or employee negotiations, litigation or potential litigation, and that the permitted participants shall be the Directors of Engineers Canada and the Interim Chief Executive Officer.</i>
2	OPENING (9:30 – 9:45)
	2.1 Call to order and approval of agenda <i>THAT the agenda be approved and the President be authorized to modify the order of discussion.</i>
	2.2 Declaration of conflict of interest
3	EXECUTIVE REPORTS (9:45 – 11:00)
	3.1 President’s Report to the Board – R. Kinghorn
	3.2 CEO’s Report to the Board – S. Price
4	CONSENT AGENDA (11:00 – 11:15) <i>Board members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda for discussion.</i>
	<i>THAT the consent agenda motions listed below (4.1) be approved in one motion.</i>
	4.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES (attachments) a) <i>THAT the minutes of the May 26, 2017 Board meeting be approved as presented.</i> b) <i>THAT the minutes of the June 26, 2017 Board workshop be approved as presented.</i> c) <i>THAT the minutes of the August 30, 2017 Board meeting be approved as presented.</i>
5	REPORTS TO THE BOARD (11:15 – 12:15) QB & AB Updates
	5.1 Qualifications Board Update – D. Peters (attachment)
	5.2 Accreditation Board Update (attachment) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing Accreditation Updates – W. MacQuarrie • AU Taskforce – B. Dony

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation Improvement Program – L. Villeneuve
	LUNCH (12:15 – 13:15)
5	REPORTS TO THE BOARD CONTINUED (13:15 – 14:15)
	<p>5.3 Governance Committee – S. Devereaux (attachments)</p> <p>a) <i>THAT the Board direct the CEO to provide the following progress reports in 2018:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Monthly Activities Email and webinar</i> 2. <i>Progress on Strategic Plan</i> <i>To be provided at every Board meeting (three times per year), including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Direction given by the Board</i> - <i>Goals set by EC as a result</i> - <i>Programs contributing towards achievement of those goals</i> - <i>Progress (% complete, if applicable), status (on track, some disruption, major disruption), and financials</i> 3. <i>Financial Updates</i> <i>To be provided at every Board meeting (three times per year), including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Approved budget</i> - <i>Spend to date</i> - <i>Current forecast</i> - <i>Variance</i> 4. <i>Progress on Projects Funded from Reserves</i> <i>To be provided at every Board meeting (three times per year), including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Project description</i> - <i>Project budget</i> - <i>Progress to date (including financial and status)</i> <p>b) <i>THAT the Board authorize the CEO to use reserve funds for the Governance, Strategic Planning and Consultation project for 2018. This authority shall permit the CEO to draw down up to a maximum of:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>\$179,000 for governance improvements and</i> b) <i>\$292,000 for strategic planning and</i> c) <i>\$36,000 for consultations and</i> d) <i>\$22,000 for capacity building.</i>
	5.4 Executive Committee – R. Kinghorn (attachment)
	5.5 Search Committee – C. Roney
	5.6 Nominations Task Force – C. Roney

6	BOARD BUSINESS/REQUIRED DECISIONS (14:15 – 14:30)
	6.1 Risk Register – S. Price (attachment)
	6.2 Additional business (if any)
7	UPDATES FROM STAKEHOLDERS (14:30 – 15:00)
	7.1 National Council of Deans of Engineering and Applied Science – J. Biedermann
	7.2 Canadian Federation of Engineering Students – Z. Kripki
8	NATIONAL BUSINESS (15:00 – 15:45)
	8.1 Presidents Group Report – K. MacLeod
	8.2 Chief Executive Officers Group Report – A. English
	8.3 Matters impacting the profession (if any)
9	NEXT MEETINGS (15:45 – 16:00)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 26-28, 2018 (Ottawa, ON)
10	CLOSING (16:30) (motion not required if all business has been completed)

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE
181st ENGINEERS CANADA BOARD MEETING
May 26, 2017
DELTA ST. JOHN'S HOTEL AND CONFERENCE CENTRE
ST. JOHN'S NL
Salon A**

The following directors were in attendance		
C. Roney, President	R. Kinghorn, President-Elect	D. Jayas, Past-President
A. Bergeron	K. Baig	T. Brookes
D. Brown	G. Comrie	S. Devereaux
J. Dunn (replace N. Lawen)	D. Ford	D. Gelowitz
Z. Ghavitian	S. Gwozdz	J. Holm
R. Hunt	N. Lawen (regrets)	D. Lynch
C. Parenteau	É. Potvin	R. Shreewastav
L. Staples	R. Trimble	

The following advisors were in attendance		
A. English (CEOG)	W. MacQuarrie (AB)	D. Peters (QB)
I. Puri (NCDEAS)	S. Price (Interim CEO)	

The following observers were in attendance		
E. Barber	C. Borg (Manulife)	J. Boudreau (Incoming Director)
L. Champagne (Incoming Director)	D. Chui (Incoming Director)	J. Collins
L. Doig (Incoming Director)	R. Dony	G. Dunphy
G. Emberley	G. Faulkner	J. Gamble (ACEC)
L. Golding	J. Hack (OSPE)	A. Harvey (Great West Life)
S. Jha	M. Kearney	K. King
G. Koropatnick	Z. Kripki (CFES)	H. Lam (Manulife)
J. Landrigan	J. Lindsay	K. MacLeod
L. Martins (Great West Life)	G. McDonald	R. McDonald
L. Melvin	M. Milligan (ABET)	J. Nagendran
S. Perruzzo (OSPE)	G. Picard (Manulife)	A. Samson (CRÉIQ)
S. Sarnia	N. Serraglio (Great West Life)	R. Stewart
J. Tink	J. Underhill	K. Verhalen (NSPE)
L. White	C. Zinck	

The following staff were in attendance		
C. Brown	B. Gibson	V. Kelly
M. Ouellette	L. Scott	D. Smith
K. Smith	J. Southwood	K. Sutherland
J. Taylor	L. Villeneuve	

1. OPENING

1.1. CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The president called the meeting to order at 08:41 and welcomed members.

5618

On a motion by É. Potvin, seconded by R. Shreewastav, it was resolved THAT the agenda be approved with the following amendments: removal of the following items be removed from the consent agenda:

- **3.1a) (by D. Lynch)**
- **3.2 (by R. Shreewastav)**
- **3.3b) (by D. Ford)**
- **3.4 (by S. Devereaux)**
- **3.5 (by S. Devereaux)**

and the President be authorized to modify the order of discussion.

Carried

K. Sutherland confirmed that guests were invited to address the Board in agenda item six.

1.2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflicts were declared.

2. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

2.1. PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

President Chris Roney discussed key issues facing Engineers Canada, including challenges in the accreditation process, the increasingly active role of technologists, planned improvements to the governance processes, development of two National Position Statements, improvements to volunteer management and the need to examine the nomination process to board committees. Finally, an update was provided on the Chief Executive Officer search.

President Roney's presentation and report are available on the Board [microsite](#).

2.2. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

Interim CEO Stephanie Price updated the Board on the budget and Q1 forecasting including budget allocations to human resources. She committed to providing monthly email updates to the Board. Board members indicated that they were in favour of the monthly email update and liked the update presentation format. A suggestion was made that a short teleconference be scheduled to allow for questions about the monthly email.

The CEO's presentation is available on the Board [microsite](#).

3. CONSENT AGENDA

5619

On a motion by C. Parenteau, seconded by D. Brown, it was resolved THAT the consent agenda items 3.1b and 3.3a be approved in one motion.

Carried

3.1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5620 On a motion by L. Staples, seconded by D. Lynch, it was resolved

a) THAT the minutes of the March 1, 2017 Board meeting be approved as presented.

An amendment to the Minutes of March 1, 2017 was put forward by David Lynch to be amended as follows:

“D. Lynch: innovation is possible within the existing system ~~but not encouraged.~~”

Exclude the last three words stroked above.

3.2. QUALIFICATIONS BOARD DOCUMENT

5621 On a motion by D. Ford, seconded by R. Trimble, it was resolved

THAT the Guideline on Admission to the Practice of Engineering in Canada be approved. Carried

R. Shreewastav raised questions regarding statements that some regulators are considering alternatives to the one year experience requirements. D. Peters confirmed that the guideline will be regularly updated to reflect these types of changes as they occur.

3.3. NATIONAL POSITION STATEMENTS

5622 On a motion by D. Gelowitz, seconded by B. Hunt, it was resolved

THAT the following National Position Statements be approved:

a) Qualified Person vs. Licensed Engineer

Carried

D. Ford raised questions since the term “qualified person” which is also being reviewed by the CEQB and the Practice Officials Group (NPOG) and questioned if approval of the National Position Statement may be premature. The CEQB chair confirmed that the CEQB work is not in conflict with adoption of the position statement at this time.

3.4. APPOINTMENTS TO QUALIFICATIONS BOARD

5623 On a motion by G. Comrie, seconded by R. Trimble, it was resolved

THAT the following appointments to the Qualifications Board be approved.

- a) Dennis Peters, FEC, Ph.D., P.Eng., SMIEEE, Chair, second term, 1-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018**
- b) Ron LeBlanc, FEC, P.Eng., Vice-chair, first term, 1-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018**
- c) Paul Blanchard, FEC, P.Eng., Past chair, second term, 1-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018**
- d) Mahmoud Mahmoud, FEC, PhD, P.Eng., member representing British Columbia/Yukon, second term, 3-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020**
- e) Roydon Fraser, FEC, PhD, P.Eng., member representing Ontario, second term, 3-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020**
- f) Jerry Helfrich, FEC, P.Eng., member-at-large, first term, 1-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018**

- g) Frank George, P.Eng. FEC, FGC (Hon.), member representing Alberta/Northwest Territories/Nunavut, new member, 3-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020

5624

On a motion by D. Jays, seconded by A. Bergeron, it was resolved THAT the motion be amended such that the terms be modified to one year appointments, ending June 30, 2018.

Amended Motion Carried (11 in favour, 7 opposed)

S. Devereaux spoke to the lack of diversity with the current slate of candidates, and suggested that one year terms would allow for time to properly review and consider the issue of diversity on the CEQB. She expressed disappointment, stating that the CEQB does not have or seem to be striving for 30% female membership. She acknowledged that the nomination process was followed, and that regulators support the candidates, but indicated that she could not support the original motion with three-year terms.

D. Peters spoke of the value of corporate memory and stated that experienced volunteers are essential and that a one-year term is too short to be effective on this committee. He strongly encouraged that the Board approve the three year term as put forward.

R. Trimble acknowledged the challenges around the nominations processes, and the lack of diversity, but indicated that he was not in favour of one-year terms.

C. Parenteau spoke in favour of improving the diversity of the board, but stated that treatment of volunteers is crucial. She is supportive of a future improvement to the nomination process, but cautious of changing the terms unilaterally at this time.

S. Gwozdz stated that a change to one-year terms would reflect a lack of process and would be an unacceptable approach. However, the process needs to be reviewed in the future.

J. Holm noted that the amendment would provide the necessary flexibility for the Board to improve the diversity and that still reappoint these individuals for two more years in the future.

3.5. APPOINTMENTS TO ACCREDITATION BOARD

5625

On a motion by G. Comrie, seconded by R. Trimble, it was resolved THAT the following appointments to the Accreditations Board be approved.

5626

On a motion by D. Jayas, seconded by B. Hunt, it was resolved THAT the meeting move in-camera and be closed to the public for the purposes of discussing personal matters about an identifiable individual, labour relations or employee negotiations, litigation or potential litigation, and that the permitted participants shall be the Directors of Engineers Canada.
Carried

REPORTS TO THE BOARD

3.6. QUALIFICATIONS BOARD UPDATE

Dennis Peters, Chair of the Qualifications Board, provided highlights of his presentation which included a status update on the Qualifications Board's work and outputs for approval, an update

on the development of the Model guide on the assessment of non-CEAB applicants, and an overview of next steps in the development of the guide.

a) National Discussion on the Assessment of Non-Accredited Degree Applicants

D. Peters updated the board on the CEQB work on the assessment of non-accredited degree applicants. Currently regulators use tools developed by the CEQB to assess graduates from non-CEAB accredited programs. The work at this time is to review the current regulator approaches and consider the need for new processes.

A. English raised a concern about legal defensibility and suggested that the CEQB consider legal reviews as development of the document progresses.

B. Dony expressed appreciation for this work. He requested that stakeholder engagement take place early and be properly incorporated.

J. Landrigan stated that the current scope of work for this item was different from the original one, which was about supporting a specific need in the admissions process.

C. Roney stated that the regulators want Engineers Canada to always ensure that the services provided to them address their needs.

D. Lynch reiterated the urgency of moving forward on this work in response to events such as APEGA's *Mihaly case*.

b) Work plan

5627 **On a motion by D. Ford, seconded by C. Parenteau, it was resolved THAT the 2017-2019 Qualifications Board Work plan be approved. Carried**

The CEQB Presentation is available on the Board [microsite](#).

3.7. ACCREDITATION BOARD UPDATE

a) Report to the Board

Wayne MacQuarrie, Chair of the Accreditation Board, and Lynn Villeneuve, Practice Lead, Accreditation, provided a report to the Board, including: an overview of the Accreditation Board; accomplishments from October 2016 to May 2017; progress by the AU Task Group, and the Accreditation Improvement Program.

The AU Task Group stemmed from the concerns that had been raised regarding curriculum measures, and the direction from the Board to examine alternatives. The Task Group membership includes a representative from the Deans, an admissions official and three members from the CEAB.

5628 **On a motion by D. Brown, seconded by R. Shreewastav, it was resolved THAT the Board approve corrections to criteria 3.5.3 and 3.5.5 Carried (12 in favour; 5 opposed; 1 abstention)**

W. MacQuarrie introduced the motion, indicating that the requirement for licensure in a particular jurisdiction is a regulatory issue and should not be included in accreditation criteria.

D. Lynch indicated that the previous requirement for registration in a jurisdiction was made based on the decision that the CEAB should never create any uncertainty or divergence between the position of the regulators and a body acting for the regulators. The requirement was made to accommodate those regions where teaching engineering is considered the practice of professional engineering.

The AB presentation is available on the Board [microsite](#).

4. BOARD BUSINESS/REQUIRED DECISIONS

4.1. Governance Committee

a) Status report on Review of Governance Model

Digvir Jayas, Past-President, and Chair of the Governance Committee, delivered the recommendations from the committee

5629 **On a motion by R. Kinghorn, seconded by R. Trimble, it was resolved THAT there was a Notice of Waiver of Motion. Carried**

D. Jayas noted that the Governance Committee was recommending a change in the governance model. He also discussed the need to review the CEAB and CEQB nominating procedures and the status of items removed from the previous agenda.

5630 **On a motion by D. Jayas, seconded by S. Devereaux, it was resolved THAT the Board approve the improvement plan laid out in the report from the May 6-7, 2017 Governance Workshop and direct that the Governance Committee maintain oversight of the implementation of the plan. Carried**

D. Jayas stated that the Governance Committee is seeking approval from the Board to implement the three-phase plan laid out in the Report from the May 6-7, 2017, Governance Committee Workshop.

It was suggested that expertise in governance be retained to assist in the transition to a future new governance model, and that key issues were regulator involvement, developing strategic direction and the time required for a governance change.

It was stated that consultations with the regulators will commence immediately and the CEO will provide the necessary resources. The expected timelines are in the Governance Report on page 10.

G. Comrie asked for clarity on what exactly was being approved through this motion and D. Jayas responded that the first phase is the agreement between the regulators and Engineers Canada on the purpose of the organization. With that clarity, the commitment could then begin

the development of long-term direction for Engineers Canada. S. Price added that the June Board workshop would focus on governance so that all board members would have a clear understanding of the work going forward.

D. Gelowitz asked if devoting resources to this project would impact other projects and programs, and questioned if abandoning the current Strategic Plan would disappoint regulators. He stated that development of a new strategic plan in only one year may be too ambitious.

R. Kinghorn agreed that the current Strategic Plan should not be wholly abandoned and stated that a plan would be developed at the June Workshop to address this. He noted that the current plan was flawed due to its lack of focus and the fact that it was silent on accreditation while most regulators would agree that this is the number one item. S. Price added that the current Strategic Plan received very little feedback. She stated that direction from the Board is crucial, and that a better process is required so that future plans reflect the regulators' priorities.

Z. Ghavitian expressed his disappointment that the Board is going around in circles. He also stated that such important work being done by a committee lacks transparency.

On a point of clarification, Chris Roney reread the Motion that was passed at the last meeting which was put forward by Dave Brown and seconded by George Comrie which stated:

THAT the Governance Committee consider alternatives to our current governance model and represent recommendations for consideration to the Board in May 2017.

G. Comrie highlighted that a key issue will be defining what we mean by consultation with regulators. This item is shown as a key activity on the proposed project plan in the report. He further suggested that having approval points defined is important, and that better mechanisms would result in better governance and operations.

A. Bergeron inquired how often the governance committee would meet to deliver on this work plan. Monthly meetings are currently foreseen.

D. Brown highlighted that expert advice was required regarding the change in governance model, and that Engineers Canada must ensure that it gets answers from the regulators so that this same issue is not revisited in five years.

5631

On a motion by D. Jayas, seconded by S. Devereaux, it was resolved
THAT the Board approve the use of reserve funds for all costs associated with the implementation of the governance improvement plan and the Governance Committee be directed to provide updates during each Board meeting until the improvement plan is complete.

Deferred

D. Jayas reiterated that the costs associated with this, depending on how much external support is required, the amount is in the range of \$200,000-\$250,000. Updates will be provided at every meeting and board members will be given the opportunity to approve going forward. S. Price added that the total cost is unknown at this time.

D. Brown expressed his discomfort signing a “blank” cheque and asked that more detail of how much is required and what work will be done be provided.

G. Comrie was surprised that a consultant was already engaged on providing this service.

S. Price informed the Board that the consultant that was hired to perform the work was Christina Comeau who has expertise in engagement which is a very important part of the improvement project – how we consult and engage with the regulators. She also has experience in developing governance models for other organizations. For the immediate short-term, there would not be a need for any reserve funds. This work could be funded by the existing Governance Committee budget.

5632 **On a motion by D. Jayas, seconded by R. Trimble, it was resolved**
THAT a Task Force be struck to undertake a review of Board committee nominating procedures, composition, term limits, and succession planning. The Task Force will be chaired by C. Roney.
Carried

D. Jayas stated that this Task Force would address weaknesses in the current policies which were identified during this year’s nominations to CEAB and CEQB.

The Governance Committee presentation is available on the Board [microsite](#).

4.2. Motion regarding use of reserves

5633 **On a motion by D. Gelowitz, seconded by G. Comrie, it was resolved**
THAT the Board approve the use of reserve funds for all costs associated with the changeover of chief executive officers. These expenses were unforeseen, could not have been budgeted for 2017, and are required due to the Board motion of January 30, 2017.
Carried

4.3. Motion regarding accreditation issues

5634 **On a motion by S. Devereaux, seconded by D. Brown, it was resolved**
That the Engineers Canada Board of Directors create a coordination team to address the accreditation issues around the adoption of graduate attributes, accreditation units and other issues presented by the NCDEAS. This team will have no more than 6 persons plus staff and will have equal and direct representation from the regulators, the NCDEAS, and the CEAB. The team will have the authority to provide a solution directly to the Engineers Canada Board of Directors for consideration and approval. The team will have a reporting deadline of November 30, 2017.

In an effort to expedite the work of the coordination team, the Engineers Canada Board of Directors appoints Engineers Canada Executive Committee to populate the coordination team with suitable candidates so the work can begin without delay.
Defeated

S. Devereaux indicated that the motion was put forward due to a perception that no progress has been made on accreditation matters.

D. Peters stated that, from the point of view of Higher Education Institutions, it is critical that any change be very prudently implemented, so a considered process was appropriate.

W. MacQuarrie and I. Puri indicated that the current composition of the AU Task Force is working well. I. Puri mentioned that one of the lessons learned is that the regulators should be represented.

A. Bergeron applauded S. Devereaux for this motion and suggested that the Board revisit the motion in September to see if progress has been made.

A. English, reported that the CEO Group has very serious concerns about progress on some of the accreditation issues. She was not sure whether a Task Force is the way to solve those issues or whether the Board should act in a more proactive way in demanding accountability.

G. Comrie asked whether the CEAB has the necessary resources to do what Engineers Canada requires them to do, and suggested that a more robust plan is required to allocate resources. W. MacQuarrie responded that the CEAB is certain that whatever resources are needed will be made available to them. He further stated that changes have been seen.

R. Kinghorn requested that the CEO include a report on the progress of this Task Force in her monthly reports.

4.4. Risk Register

The report was presented for information purposes only, and was not discussed.

4.5. Additional business (if any)

No additional business was brought forward.

5. UPDATES FROM STAKEHOLDERS

5.1. National Council of Deans of Engineering and Applied Science (NCDEAS)

I. Puri, newly elected chair of the National Council of Deans of Engineering and Applied Science (NCDEAS) provided his report. THE NCDEAS presentation is available on the Board [microsite](#).

5.2. Canadian Federation of Engineering Students (CFES)

Zenon Kripki, President of the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students (CFES) presented an update to the Board. The CFES presentation is available on the Engineers Canada [microsite](#).

A. Bergeron requested that the CFES be involved in consultation with the CEAB's AU Task Force.

5.3. ABET - M. Milligan

Michael Milligan, Executive Director, and CEO of ABET extended thanks for having been invited. He stated that the ABET Engineers Canada relationship as a very good, strong, and important one. He noted that ABET recently experienced Governance restructuring and reduced their Board size from 55 Board members (two years ago) to 13. He stated that in their experience this could easily take up to 10 years and offered to share in more details.

5.4. National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE) – K. Verhalen

Kodi Jean Verhalen, President of the NSPE, provided a verbal report regarding the highlights of their work. The NSPE presentation is available on the Engineers Canada [microsite](#).

5.5. ACEC, Canada – J. Gamble

John Gamble, President and CEO, provided a verbal report and expressed that ACEC values their ongoing relationship with Engineers Canada.

6. NATIONAL BUSINESS

6.1. Linkages Committee Report

Russ Kinghorn, President-Elect and Committee chair was unable to provide his report due to the meeting extending past its scheduled time.

6.2. Presidents' Group Report

Chris Zinck, Chair of the Presidents' Group, presented an update following the meeting held May 25, 2017. He expressed a desire from the Group to spend more time in their meetings discussing key issues facing the profession as a staging area to the meeting of members. As a result they will be asking staff for more information. A decision was also made that President's Group meetings have a standing in-camera session added to the agenda.

Finally, he noted that Engineers Nova Scotia Vice-President, Katherine McLeod, was elected as the incoming chair. The Presidents' Group presentation is available on the Engineers Canada [microsite](#).

6.3. Chief Executive Officers' Group Report

A. English, Chair of the CEO Group, delivered highlights from their May 24 meeting. The group expressed concern over lack of progress on accreditation; concerns over CEAB and CEQB nomination process; and, challenges with life memberships and Continuing Professional Development (CPD) requirements. They also voiced continued support for the National Membership Database, for the development of an online ethics course and for a national catalog of regulators' continuing professional development offerings.

In addition, the group discussed the Canada-EU Trade Agreement (CETA) and the new Canada Free Trade Agreement (CFTA) implications; Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act issues; the development of National Position Statements; the Pacific Northwest Economic Region and United States comity agreements. The CEO Group presentation is available on the Engineers Canada [microsite](#).

6.4. Competency Project Update

S. Price stated that this update was provided for the Board because this project is one of the major initiatives which the Board authorized and budgeted from reserves. Future updates will be provided as the project progresses.

6.5. Matters impacting the profession (if any)

No additional matters were brought forward.

7. ELECTIONS TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

5635 On a motion by D. Jayas, seconded by L. Staples, it was resolved
a) THAT C. Roney be confirmed to the position of Past-President for the 2017-2018 term.
Carried

5636 On a motion by D. Jayas, seconded by C. Parenteau, it was resolved
b) THAT R. Kinghorn be confirmed to the position of President for the 2017-2018 term.
Carried

5637 On a motion by D. Jayas, seconded by R. Trimble, it was resolved
c) THAT the following directors be confirmed to the 2017-2018 Executive Committee:
i. President-elect and Member at Large – Annette Bergeron (per GP-9.1.3.1f)
ii. OIQ – Z. Ghavitian (per GP-9.1.3.1b)
iii. APEGA – C. Parenteau (per GP-9.1.3.1b)
iv. PEO –C. Roney, Past-president (per GP-9.1.3.1b)
v. PEGNL, Engineers NS, Engineers PEI or APEGNB – S. Devereaux (per GP-9.1.3.1c)
vi. APEGM or APEGS – D. Gelowitz (per GP-9.1.3.1d)
vii. APEGBC, Engineers Yukon or NAPEG –R. Kinghorn, President (per GP-9.1.3.1e)

Carried

Annette Bergeron was elected President-elect. Because she is from a region that is already represented on the executive committee, she also fills the Director at-large position, and no additional director was elected to this position.

5638 On a Motion by D. Jayas, seconded by D. Gelowitz, it was resolved
THAT all ballots be destroyed.
Carried

8. NEXT MEETINGS

- June 26-27, 2017 Board Workshop (Cranbrook, BC)
- September 25-27, 2017 (Ottawa, ON)
- February 26-28, 2017 (Ottawa, ON)

9. IN-CAMERA SESSION – CURRENT DIRECTORS AS WELL AS: CEQB CHAIR, CEAB CHAIR, CEO GROUP ADVISOR AND INTERIM CEO ONLY

On a Motion by S. Devereaux, seconded by B. Hunt, it was resolved
THAT agenda items 3.5a, b, d, e, f, g, and h be tabled until the Board resumed open session.
Carried

5639 On a motion by D. Brown, seconded by R. Kinghorn, it was resolved
THAT 3.5c be moved in-camera to discuss issues more fulsomely.
Carried

The in-camera session took place with all directors present as well as four advisors: CEAB Chair, CEQB Chair, CEO Group Chair and interim CEO.

5640 On a motion by R. Kinghorn, seconded by G. Comrie, it was resolved
THAT the meeting be moved to open session.
Carried

5641 On a motion by G. Comrie, seconded by R. Shreewastav, it was resolved
THAT the following appointments to the Accreditation Board be approved:

- b) Wayne MacQuarrie, FEC, P.Eng., Chair, second term, 1-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018*
- d) Julius Pataky, member representing British Columbia/Yukon, new member, 3-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020*
- e) Danilo Candido, FEC, P.Eng., member representing Alberta/Northwest Territories/Nunavut, third term, 3-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020*
- f) Pemberton Cyrus, FEC, P.Eng., member representing Atlantic, second term, 3-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020*
- g) Robert Dony, FEC, P.Eng., member representing Ontario, third term, 3-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020*
- h) Jeff Pieper, FEC, P.Eng., member-at-large, second term, 3-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020*

Carried

5642 On a motion by J. Holms, seconded by S. Devereaux, it was resolved
THAT the motion be amended such that the terms be modified to one year appointments, ending June 30, 2018.
Motion Defeated

C. Roney stated that the Board did not have the information necessary to consider agenda item 3.5c but would be seeking that information so that a decision can be made soonest.

D. Lynch stated that reducing the terms to one year will be interpreted as a vote of no-confidence with many of the members of the AB and will be devastating to volunteers, especially since four of the five appointments are re-appointments. A much preferable course

would be to request nominations for five additional members at large. This would address the issue of gender diversity and as well as other diversity considerations such as discipline of practices, internationally trained engineers, and bilingualism.

S. Devereaux disagreed saying that the minutes would reflect why the Board is making this decision. It is not about the abilities of any individual, it is about the Board's commitment to diversity.

D. Lynch suggested a motion to reconsider the prior motion on QB appointments.

5643 **On a motion by D. Lynch, seconded by Z. Ghavitian, it was resolved THAT motion 3.4 regarding Qualifications Board appointments be re-considered. Carried (with the required 2/3 majority)**

5644 **On a motion by Z. Ghavitian, seconded by C. Parenteau, it was resolved THAT the following appointments to the Qualifications Board be approved.**

- a) Dennis Peters, FEC, Ph.D., P.Eng., SMIEEE, Chair, second term, 1-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018**
- b) Ron LeBlanc, FEC, P.Eng., Vice-chair, first term, 1-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018**
- c) Paul Blanchard, FEC, P.Eng., Past chair, second term, 1-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018**
- d) Mahmoud Mahmoud, FEC, PhD, P.Eng., member representing British Columbia/Yukon, second term, 3-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020**
- e) Roydon Fraser, FEC, PhD, P.Eng., member representing Ontario, second term, 3-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020**
- f) Jerry Helfrich, FEC, P.Eng., member-at-large, first term, 1-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018**
- g) Frank George, P.Eng. FEC, FGC (Hon.), member representing Alberta/Northwest Territories/Nunavut, new member, 3-year appointment for the term July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020**

Carried

10. CLOSING (motion not required if all business has been completed)

5645 **On a motion by D. Ford, seconded by G. Comrie, it was resolved THAT the board move to close.**

Minutes prepared by D. Smith for:

Chris D. Roney, FEC, P.Eng.
President

Stephanie Price, CAE, P.Eng.
Interim Chief Executive Officer

UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE
182nd ENGINEERS CANADA BOARD WORKSHOP MEETING

June 26, 2017

St. Eugene Golf Resort & Casino, Cranbrook, BC

The following directors were in attendance		
R. Kinghorn (President, Engineers Canada)	C. Roney (Past-President, Engineers Canada)	A. Bergeron (President-Elect, Engineers Canada)
K. Baig (OIQ)	J. Boudreau (Engineers & Geoscientists New Brunswick)	T. Brookes (NAPEG)
D. Brown (PEO)	L. Champagne (OIQ)	D. Chui (PEO)
S. Devereaux (Engineers Nova Scotia)	L. Doig (APEGA)	J. Dunn (Engineers PEI)
G. Faulkner (APEGA)	D. Gelowitz (APEGGS)	S. Gwozdz (OIQ)
J. Holm (APEGBC)	B. Hunt (PEGNL)	D. Jayas (Engineers Geoscientists Manitoba)
D. Lynch (APEGA)	C. Parenteau (APEGA)	R. Shreewastav (PEO)
The following advisors were in attendance		
Ann. English (CEOG) (via teleconference)	W. MacQuarrie (AB)	D. Peters (QB)
S. Price (Interim CEO)		
The following staff were in attendance		
C. Brown	C. Comeau (CT Labs - via teleconference)	P. Culhane (CT Labs)
D. Smith	J. Southwood	K. Sutherland
The following Directors/Advisors were absent		
R. Trimble (APEY)	Z. Ghavitian (OIQ)	I. Puri (NCDEAS)

1. OPENING

1.1. CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The president called the meeting to order at 08:50 and welcomed members.

A motion to approve the agenda of the Board meeting (workshop) being held on June 26, 2017 was made, seconded and resolved

THAT the agenda be approved and the President be authorized to modify the order of discussion.

Carried

The president called the meeting to order at 08:50a.m. It was also moved that Items 3.1 and 3.2 be added to the agenda.

2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were identified.

3. APPROVAL OF DIRECTORS TO BOARD COMMITTEES

- 3.1 ***On a motion by D. Gelowitz, seconded by J. Holm, it was resolved THAT the following suggested motion be approved***

Suggested Motion:

THAT the Accreditation Board be requested to obtain a list of candidates from the regulators, the National Council of Deans of Engineering and Applied Science, and the Accreditation Board to fill three at-large positions and one regional representative (SK/MB) position, and that the Nominations Committee use this list to propose a total of four new appointments for review by the regulators and approval by the Board by August 31, 2017.

Carried

S. Devereaux questioned the diversity issue.

S. Price confirmed the urgent requirement for women and bilingual individuals.

A. Bergeron highlighted the timing of the Regulator Council meetings may potentially coincide with Regulator Executive meetings.

W. MacQuarrie confirmed the benefit of appointing an active Dean and stated that the National Council of Deans of Engineering and Applied Science was to provide a suggestion to the AB on this matter.

Carried

R. Kinghorn confirmed that the Nominating Committee will make a recommendation and the Board will approve by teleconference before the end of August 2017.

On a motion by D. Jayas, seconded by C. Parenteau it was resolved THAT the individuals listed be recommended and appointed to the Board Committees for the 2017-2018 term (requires simple majority).

Carried

3.2 **Incorporating Meeting Rules (circulated) proposed to conduct a meeting under reasonable time and fairness:**

1. Speak for two minutes.
2. Opportunity to speak a second time only if everyone has had a chance to speak. Efficiency is key.
3. Limited to two chances to speak, i.e. effectiveness including all views.
4. Restating or reiterating the same point is not permitted. New information is suggested if and when you speak again. A safe environment is encouraged.

A. Bergeron highlighted that members should feel free to disagree with staff from time to time.

Going forward at Board meetings, R. Kinghorn will work with the President-Elect to maintain a list of speakers. A timer will be present on the screen.

4. IN-CAMERA SESSION

Move to reconvene at 4:00p.m. as a committee

On a motion was put forward, seconded, and it was resolved

THAT the meeting move in-camera and be closed to the public for the purposes of discussing personal matters about an identifiable individual, labour relations or employee negotiations, litigation or potential litigation, and that the permitted participants shall be the Directors of Engineers Canada. (requires simple majority)

Carried

5. CLOSING (motion not required if all business has been completed)

A MOTION to adjourn the meeting was made, seconded and unanimously approved.

A motion to close the meeting was made, seconded, and it was resolved THAT the board move to close.

Minutes prepared by D. Smith for:

Russ Kinghorn, FEC, P.Eng.
President

Stephanie Price, CAE, P.Eng.
Interim Chief Executive Officer

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE
183rd ENGINEERS CANADA BOARD MEETING
August 30, 2017
TELECONFERENCE**

The following directors were in attendance		
R. Kinghorn, President	A. Bergeron, President-Elect	C. Roney, Past-President
K. Baig	J. Boudreau	T. Brookes
S. Devereaux	L. Champagne	J. Dunn
G. Faulkner	L. Doig	Z. Ghavitian
S. Gwozdz	D. Gelowitz	W. Hunt
D. Jayas	J. Holm	C. Parenteau
R. Shreewastav	D. Lynch	R. Trimble
The following directors sent regrets		
D. Chui	D. Brown	
The following advisors were in attendance		
A. English (CEOG)	W. MacQuarrie (AB)	D. Peters (QB)
I. Puri (NCDEAS)	S. Price (Interim CEO)	

The following observers were in attendance (due to the nature of the teleconference it was not possible to track all observers)		
J. Tink	J. Landrigan	J. Collins
L. Golding	M. Fewer	K. MacLeod
L. White	G. McDonald	C. Zinck

The following staff were in attendance		
W. Guy	L. Villeneuve	

1. OPENING

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The President called the meeting to order at 12:04 on Wednesday, August 30, 2017.

5646 On a motion by W. Hunt, seconded by C. Roney, it was resolved

THAT the agenda be approved

Motion carried

2. APPROVAL OF ACCREDITATION BOARD NOMINATIONS

5647 On a motion by C. Parenteau, seconded by S. Gwozdz, it was resolved

THAT the following appointments to the Accreditation Board be approved.

a) Luigi Benedicenti, FEC, P.Eng., Vice-chair, new member, 1-year appointment for the term September 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018

b) Tara Zrymiak, FEC, P.Eng., member representing Manitoba/Saskatchewan, new member, 3-year appointment for the term September 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020

c) Suzanne Kresta, FEC, P.Eng., member-at-large, new member, 3-year appointment for the

term September 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020
d) *Anne-Marie Laroche, ing., member-at-large, new member, 3-year appointment for the term September 1, 2017 to June 30, 2020*
Motion carried

3. DISTRIBUTION OF AFFINITY PRODUCTS MEMO

5648 On a motion by C. Roney, seconded by T. Brookes, it was resolved THAT the Affinity Products memo be approved for distribution.
Motion carried

The purpose of the memo was discussed, as some Board members thought the memo should include a more detailed breakdown indicating which regulator brings what percentage of business for each program. It is unknown at this time if this information is confidential. It was clarified that the memo is to support transparency and accountability, indicating where the revenue comes from and where it is spent.

S. Price summarized that she will:

- look into the confidentiality of the information, and what further information could be provided
- distribute the memo to the CEO Group and the Presidents Group, and add it to the Presidents Group agenda at their upcoming meeting to solicit feedback
- ensure that future budgets are broken down in alignment with the memo

4. GOVERNANCE WORK BUDGET

5649 On a motion by S. Devereaux, seconded by D. Jayas, it was resolved with the amendment that follows
THAT the Board authorize the CEO to use reserve funds for the Governance, Strategic Planning and Consultation project for 2017 and 2018. This authority shall permit up the CEO to draw down up to a maximum of \$448,000 for 2017 and up to a maximum of \$625,000 for 2018.

Amendment:

On a motion by D. Gelowitz, seconded by C. Roney, it was amended and resolved THAT the Board authorize the CEO to use reserve funds for the Governance, Strategic Planning and Consultation project for 2017.
Motion carried

A discussion occurred with concerns regarding the amount of money to be approved, the selection process of the vendor, and the impending hiring of a new CEO. It was clarified that the Governance Committee was mandated with a large scope of work, and that this work is the responsibility of the Board on how they want to be governed as opposed to work of the current interim CEO or incoming CEO. The selection of the vendor is an operational matter, as it is the interim CEO's responsibility to support and execute the directions mandated by the Board.

S. Price highlighted that since the distribution of the Agenda Book she had received a level of effort quote in the amount of \$1.291 million for a similar scope of work. C. Comeau is already

familiar with Engineers Canada, which is background that another firm would be required to learn in order to execute the project.

S. Price commented that if the use of reserves was not approved then the funds would need to be covered by the operating budget because the Board gave direction in May when the Board approved the project, and asked that the Governance Committee maintain oversight of the implementation of the plan.

The wording of the motion on the table was discussed resulting in the need to clarify what was to be approved. It was determined that the current need was to approve a motion agreeing that this was a special project and reserve funds could be used for 2017 with more information to be provided and specific amounts going forward to be discussed and approved at the September 27, 2017 Board meeting. The contract would be staged and further reports would be provided and approvals sought as the project progresses.

5. CEO SEARCH UPDATE

C. Roney provided a status report on the CEO Search.

Boyden has been contracted as the executive recruitment firm, and has completed stakeholder consultations. Active recruiting will begin next week with the goal of having a recommendation of one candidate, who has been interviewed by the CEO Search Committee to put forward to the board in early December. It was noted that being a P.Eng. is not a mandatory requirement of this role, although it is preferred as the Committee decided that it was in the best interest of Engineers Canada to keep options open as opposed to screening out otherwise qualified candidates based on this one criteria.

6. CLOSING

Business being concluded, the meeting closed at 13:09.

Minutes prepared by W. Guy for:

Russ Kinghorn, FEC, P.Eng.
President

Stephanie Price, CAE, P.Eng.
Interim Chief Executive Officer



Note on the Qualifications Board's Documents for the Engineers Canada Board

The Qualifications Board would like to put forward two documents for the Engineers Canada Board's consideration: an update on the status of items being undertaken under QB's 2017-2019 work plan and a document on Proposed Changes to QB's Terms of Reference. The QB Chair will be pleased to elaborate on and further discuss these documents at the Board meeting.

Proposed Changes to the Qualifications Board Terms of Reference

At its April 2017 meeting, the Qualifications Board (QB) unanimously approved the following motion: “that the position statement, as circulated to QB members on March 30, 2017, with the addition of “until such time as there is further clarification on the problem” be brought to the Engineers Canada Board”. This motion was shared with the President of Engineers Canada on June 20th.

QB recognizes that its terms of reference could be more detailed and is open to providing further clarifications on meeting diversity targets and providing the opportunity to regulators to remove a member, in exceptional circumstances. The purpose of this document is to propose several changes to the QB terms of reference with respect to diversity and nominations for consideration by the Nominating Committee of the Engineers Canada Board.

1. Background Information - History, Purpose and Mandate

QB was created in 1987 to provide services to regulators in assessing non-CEAB applicants. While its mandate has broadened over the years, it is still successfully operates under similar principles: promoting regional harmony; adoption of a national perspective for the benefit of the profession; support regulators; and reporting to the Engineers Canada Board. This model has been successful for the last 30 years.

As stated in the Engineers Canada Governance Manual ([GP 9.6 - Qualifications Board Terms of Reference](#)), QB functions both in the area of policy and operational matters to address, on behalf of all the regulators and the engineering profession, many aspects related to the qualifications of engineers. It considers issues relevant to the ongoing qualification of engineers throughout their careers.

The scope, through various committees and task forces extends effectively to all areas that consider the qualifications of engineers. It includes, naming only a few, admission, continuing professional development, practice in areas such as environment and sustainability, software engineering and engineers in training. Because of the variety of the issues at hand, members are expected to possess a certain level of experience prior to joining the QB and we’ve found that a few years is required (typically at least one full three-year mandate) before a certain level of understanding of the complexity of the issues is reached. This length of time is also required to fully understand the different perspectives of each jurisdiction in a particular area and to understand how they can be balanced and amalgamated in national documents, including guidelines.

2. Diversity in QB’s terms of reference

The members of the Qualifications Board are drawn from a national pool of experienced engineers. There are no paid QB members. All are volunteers who give their time and their talent generously for

As the Nominating Committee knows, it can be challenging to define which diversity categories to include and set targets. Diversity is a complex issue, particularly in a small group such as QB, and as a result, an absolute target might be difficult to achieve. QB would like to recommend that the definition of diversity categories be done transparently and openly, stating which factors the Nominating Committee and the Engineers Canada Board must (will) consider which ones will not be considered and then establishing the relative importance of those that will be considered. Given the size of QB, striking the right balance will remain a challenge, especially those that require the self-identification of individuals. QB also recognizes that diversity goes beyond the physical attributes represented below and that members should also seek to represent and welcome a diversity of perspectives. As a result, it would like to recommend to the Nominating Committee and the Engineers Canada Board that resources be allocated to support and perhaps train members in understanding expectations associated with a diversity of perspectives.

3. Attributes and competencies of a good candidate for QB or a committee

In addition to not providing specific details on diversity, the QB terms of reference do not specify attributes and competencies for nominating individuals. QB would like to propose the following for the Nominating Committee's consideration:

3.1 Experience in the profession: As stated in the terms of reference, preference has traditionally been given to engineers who have experience with the admission process of a regulator: "In the selection of members for the QB, consideration is given to appointing individuals who are serving or have served on a Board of examiners (or its equivalent) and to maintaining representation from various engineering disciplines. Every effort will be made to reflect the diversity of the membership of the engineering profession." Having chaired either a Registration Committee or Board of Examiners has been seen as very valuable experience for a QB Board position.

Very often the nominated individuals also have quite extensive experience in other professional service such as on the council of a regulator, on a discipline committee or at a Branch or Division level or on one or more of the profession's volunteer committees, all of which enhances the breadth and depth of expertise on the QB.

3.2 Capability: Both the interest and willingness to serve in the position, and the time and capacity to carry out the tasks that go with the position. This includes a commitment of time to reading advance materials for meetings and coming to the meeting prepared to be a contributing part of discussions. Given that QB members are expected to sit on at least two committees, and that they generally meet at least once (sometimes twice) a month, the time commitment represents approximately five to ten hours a month, excluding attending QB meetings. It also includes willingness and capability to share in advancing the work of QB and its committee(s), although this commitment of time and effort is not extensive or onerous.

Since appointments are for a three-year term (with two re-appointments possible), a candidate should, as far as can reasonably be predicted, be confident of their ability to serve for at least three years. Note

that the nature of the work of QB is that projects and initiatives frequently span more than one year, and new appointees to the QB or to a committee typically experience a learning curve that is steep for the first year while a new person learns the job and works toward being a full contributing member. As mentioned earlier, it is generally recognized that it takes at least three years for a QB member to gain a certain level of knowledge of issues.

3.3 Capacity to work collaboratively with others: The success of the QB itself, and of its committees depends on all participants working with each other in a respectful, cooperative context, where all participants contribute their subject matter expertise, their judgment, and their willingness to listen to and to consider the thoughts of others to the work being done. QB works and has traditionally worked with a spirit of cooperation and without conflict and confrontation, allowing of course for healthy debate where there are differences of opinion.

3.4 Leadership potential: Because of the small size of QB, and the fact that there are six committees (excluding ad hoc task forces), more than half of QB members are charged with chairing a committee. Chairs are also expected to attend officials groups meetings and present on behalf of QB.

3.5 Other competencies and skills: Often a good candidate will have additional experience, skills or attributes that make them potentially a better QB member. Involvement in a professional technical or learned society, international work experience and/or education experience, status in another profession as examples of other qualities that can be considered as applicable to candidate selection.

4. The Nomination Process

While the QB terms of reference do not specify the nominations process, QB would like to propose the following nomination process for the Nominating Committee's consideration:

4.1 Process for new members: Historically and very successfully, when a QB position becomes open, if it is related to a specific region, then the Regulator or Regulators are contacted and asked to suggest or recommend suitable candidates. All regulators are invited to recommend candidates for members-at-large positions. This has often resulted in more than one candidate being suggested, allowing the QB Nominating Committee and ultimately the Board of Engineers Canada to select a candidate that helps to create or maintain diversity, add specific desired attributes to the QB and to consider a balanced approach to Board composition. For the reasons stated above, Regulators are not asked "who they would like to be their representative."

Additionally, by its nature, the QB has a broad network of contacts in the profession and through that network may be aware and may bring to the Nominating Committee a good candidate. While the existing process does not include specific criteria for diversity, QB would like to recommend that, once the Nominating Committee has established criteria, it explicitly ask regulators to identify individuals meeting the established targets.

While regulators staff are welcomed to sit on QB committees, where they are extremely important and valued members, having a staff member as a Board member of QB creates a conflict of interest which should be avoided. When issues are voted on at the Board meetings, a regulator staff member might feel compelled to vote in a way that supports one regulator's position on an issue, disregarding the positions of other regulators and other leaders in the profession. Given that QB members are expected to represent regions, this might make them at odds with the other jurisdictions they are supposed to represent. Also, then they might be subjected to censure by their regulator. For these reasons it is felt that it is not appropriate to have a regulator staff member appointed as QB members. As a result, QB would like to recommend that the Nominating Committee also states in QB's terms of reference that a member cannot be a regulator staff.

4.2 Re-appointment of existing members (second or third term): As continuity and QB experience are both valued assets, if a member continues to meet all of the attributes and competencies listed above, as confirmed through consultation with the relevant regulator(s), the QB Committee would ordinarily recommend re-appointment.

The entire process of selection and continuance of volunteers is and should be an open and transparent one, devoid of political interest or interference. If an engineer has the attributes and competencies described above, he or she should be eligible to serve, provided they are in good standing as a member with one or more of the regulators.

If, exceptionally, a QB member is not meeting performance expectations, the Nominating Committee may choose not to re-appoint this individual. In the rare circumstance that a board or committee member is required to step down before the end of his or her term, it should be only for one of the following reasons:

- Performance: the member misses a specified number of meetings, or is unwilling or unable to meaningfully participate in Board or committee activities.
- Member not in good standing: for whatever reason, the individual is suspended or removed from the professional register, they are no longer eligible to continue as a Board or committee member
- Breach of Code of Ethics or Code of Conduct: these are requirements of service on QB and a member who is found to have breached either of these can be removed for cause.

If, exceptionally, a QB member is at odds with one or more jurisdictions, the jurisdiction is invited to voice concerns at all times with the QB Executive Committee, who will seek to resolve the matter. In the rare circumstance that removal of a member is required, the Executive of the Qualifications Board would advise the Executive of Engineers Canada and the final decision would be made by the Board of Engineers Canada. No other circumstances should be considered as cause for removal of a QB member. QB would like to recommend that this process be specified in the updated terms of reference.

5. Recommendations

QB respectfully recommends that the Nominating Committee:

- Recommend to the Engineers Canada Board that it allocates resources to support current members in understanding diversity expectations.
- Define diversity in the terms of reference and communicate diversity targets to QB so that it can specify desirable diversity targets when requesting nominations to regulators.
- Revise the terms of reference to include the proposed nominations process of new and existing members.

[]

2017-19 Qualifications Board Work Plan Status Update (As of August 2017)

Activities and Deliverables	Planned Date for completion	Forecasted Date for Completion	Actual Date of Completion	Status
Admissions Issues Committee				
Develop Guideline on limited license	Sept 2018	Sept 2018		On track
Revise Guideline on admission to the practice of engineering	April 2017	April 2017	April 2017	Completed
Revise Guideline on work experience assessment	April 2019	April 2019		Pending
Monitor the update of the International Institution Degree Database (IIDD)	Sept 2017	Sept 2017		Ongoing
Monitor APEGBC's Canadian Environment Experience Project	Ongoing	Ongoing		Ongoing
Collaborate with the Admission Officials Group on common goals	Ongoing	Ongoing		Ongoing
Continuing Competence Committee				
Review Guideline on continuing professional development	April 2018	April 2018		On track
Review Step-by-step guide for the preparation and implementation of an individual professional development plan	April 2019	April 2019		Pending
Monitor existing continuing professional development agreements throughout the country, examine barriers and consolidate results	Ongoing	Ongoing		Ongoing
Monitor the use of continuing professional development software across the country	Ongoing	Ongoing		Ongoing
Organize bi-annual cross-country calls on continuing professional development for officials	Ongoing	Ongoing		Ongoing
Engineer-In-Training Committee				
Develop Guideline on enabling entrepreneurship	April 2019	April 2019		On track
Review Model guide: direct supervision	April 2018	April 2018		Ongoing
Review Model guide: implementing mentoring programs	Sept 2018	Sept 2018		Pending
Review Guideline for the engineer-in-training program	April 2019	April 2019		Pending
Review the Engineers-in-Training Frequently Asked Questions webpage	Sept 2017	April 2018		Behind schedule
Environment and Sustainability Committee				
Develop Guideline on climate change mitigation	April 2018	April 2018		On track
Develop White paper on environmental engineering	April 2019	April 2019		Pending
Review Guideline on site remediation	Jan 2018	Jan 2018		On track
Monitor climate change issues	Ongoing	Ongoing		Ongoing
Organize bi-annual cross-country calls on environment issues for officials	Ongoing	Ongoing		Ongoing
Practice Committee				
Develop Guideline on qualified persons	Sept 2018	Sept 2018		On track
Revise Model guide: concepts of professionalism for engineers	April 2018	April 2018		Pending
Guideline on authentication of documents	April 2017	Jan 2018		Behind schedule
Collaborate with the Discipline & Enforcement and Practice Officials Groups on common goals	Ongoing	Ongoing		Ongoing
Syllabus Committee				
Develop Guideline on the assessment of non-CEAB degree applicants	April 2018	April 2018		On track
Develop a Model guide on the use of syllabi	April 2018	April 2018		On track
Review Computer engineering syllabus	April 2017	April 2017	April 2017	Completed
Review Engineering physics syllabus	April 2017	April 2017	April 2017	Completed
Review Industrial engineering syllabus	April 2017	April 2017	April 2017	Completed
Review Petroleum engineering syllabus	April 2017	Sept 2017		Behind schedule
Review Basic studies syllabus	Jan 2018	April 2018		Behind schedule
Review Environmental engineering syllabus	Jan 2018	Jan 2018		On track
Review Geological engineering syllabus	Jan 2018	Jan 2018		On track
Review Marine engineering syllabus	Jan 2018	April 2018		Behind schedule
Review Software engineering syllabus	Jan 2018	Jan 2018		On track
Review Complementary studies syllabus	Sept 2018	Sept 2018		Pending
Review Biomedical/biochemical engineering syllabus	Sept 2018	Sept 2018		Pending
Review Geomatics engineering syllabus	Sept 2018	Sept 2018		Pending
Review Mining and mineral processing engineering syllabus	Sept 2018	Sept 2018		Pending
Review Chemical engineering syllabus	April 2019	April 2019		Pending
Review Civil engineering syllabus	April 2019	April 2019		Pending
Review Electrical engineering syllabus	April 2019	April 2019		Pending
Review Mechanical engineering syllabus	April 2019	April 2019		Pending
Review Mechatronics engineering syllabus	April 2019	April 2019		Pending
Review Naval architectural engineering syllabus	April 2019	April 2019		Pending
Review Agricultural/biosystems/bioresource/food engineering syllabus	Sept 2019	Sept 2019		Pending
Review Building engineering syllabus	Sept 2019	Sept 2019		Pending
Review Forest engineering syllabus	Sept 2019	Sept 2019		Pending
Review Metallurgical engineering syllabus	Sept 2019	Sept 2019		Pending
Review Structural engineering syllabus	Sept 2019	Sept 2019		Pending

ACCREDITATION BOARD REPORT MAY 2017 TO SEPTEMBER 2017

The Accreditation Board was established in October 1965. Its main mandate is to grant accreditation, on behalf of the regulator members of Engineers Canada, to Canadian undergraduate engineering programs that meet or exceed educational standards acceptable for professional engineering registration in Canada. The Accreditation Board also provides valuable information to help the Engineers Canada Board make decisions on matters relating to engineering education and accreditation both in Canada and in other countries.

The work of the Accreditation Board contributes to the continual improvement of the quality and to the relevance of engineering education in Canada.

Accreditation Board members

Accreditation Board members are engineers licensed to practice in Canada. There are academic and non-academic representatives on the Accreditation Board. There is representation from various disciplines.

Wayne MacQuarrie, FEC, P.Eng. Chair	Ray Gosine, FEC, P.Eng.
** Luigi Benedicenti, FEC, P.Eng. Vice-Chair	Denis Isabel, FIC, ing.
G�rard Lachiver, FIC, ing. Past-Chair	Paula Klink, P.Eng.
Suzelle Barrington, FIC, ing.	**Suzanne Kresta, FEC, P.Eng.
Pemberton Cyrus, FEC, P.Eng.	Pierre Lafleur, FIC., ing.
Danilo Candido, FEC, P.Eng.	**Anne-Marie Laroche, P.Eng.
Emily Cheung, FEC., P.Eng.	Julius Pataki
Robert Dony, FEC, P.Eng.	Jeff Pieper, FEC, P.Eng.
	**Tara Zrymiak FEC, P.Eng.

Engineers Canada Board Representatives on the Accreditation Board:
Dave Brown, P.Eng. and Gary Faulkner**

As of September 1, 2017, 35% of the Accreditation Board members are women. 40% of members are bilingual.

Accreditation Board accomplishments in this reporting period include:

June

- ✓ Made accreditation decisions on 25 programs at 13 higher education institutions. Four new programs were granted accreditation.
- ✓ Members reviewed documentation and provided advice to the Engineers Canada delegation attending the International Engineering Alliance meetings of June 18-23, 2017. During that meeting signatories to the Washington Accord admitted a new member signatory, Pakistan, represented by the Pakistan Engineering Council. Recognition applies to graduates from 2017 onwards.
- ✓ The Accreditation Improvement Program held a face-to-face stakeholder consultation on June 5 in conjunction with the Canadian Engineering Education Association conference in Toronto.
- ✓ Membership in the AU Task Force was expanded to broaden the scope of the group. There was a change of leadership: Bob Dony accepted to lead the group. Members include Tom Tiedje (NCDEAS),

Andrew Hrymak (NCDEAS), Danilo Candido (CEAB), Luigi Benedicenti (CEAB), Ray Gosine (CEAB) and Matthew Oliver (APEGA, Regulator Rep).

July

- ✓ The AU Task Force held a face-to-face meeting in Toronto on July 18. Prior to that meeting much research was done to examine the current curriculum content methodology in Canada, and to examine systems used by other engineering accreditation organizations in the world. For the face-to-face meeting, the first goal of the task force was to identify and define a process to refine AUs to cope with the changes in engineering education. The group has identified possible short-term and longer term changes to existing criteria and to accreditation procedures that could address NCDEAS and Regulator issues. The group has developed a short-term action plan with deliverables and timelines.
- ✓ A call for nominations for membership on the Accreditation Board was issued. The call was sent to the regulators, the National Council of Deans of Engineering and Applied Science and the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board. The Engineers Canada website home page announced the call for nominees.
- ✓ An email campaign was launched for stakeholders to provide feedback and sign up for updates on progress of the Accreditation Improvement Program. Individual messages to just under 200 people went out in mid-July. The first program update was sent to subscribers on July 27.

August

- ✓ The closing date for receipt of nominations for membership on the Accreditation Board was August 4, 2017. The outcome was that 20 excellent candidates were put forth for consideration by the Accreditation Board Nominations Committee. The Nominations Committee agreed on an assessment methodology. Members then reviewed the list of nominees using a scoring approach for the different qualifications (details are available on request). After due consideration the Committee agreed to make recommendations as outlined in the nominations memo. The Engineers Canada Board met by teleconference on August 30* to review the recommendations and make the appointments to the Accreditation Board.
- ✓ The AU Task Force met by teleconference on August 22 to follow up with outcomes of the July 18 meeting.
- ✓ An Advisory Committee for the Systems (Technology) element of the Accreditation Improvement Program was established

September

- ✓ September 8, the Accreditation Board held a workshop on *Developing a Training Program for Accreditation*. Information gathered at the workshop will inform future training initiatives included in the Training element of the Accreditation Improvement Program
- ✓ September 9, the Accreditation Board held a meeting to discuss policy, review reports on accreditation compliance and to make substantial equivalency decisions for three programs at one institution
- ✓ The Advisory Committee for the Systems (Technology) element of the Accreditation Improvement Program met by teleconference to orient members of the Committee.

The Accreditation Board accomplishes its mandate by doing the following:

- On-site review teams provide information for the Accreditation Board to make accreditation decisions. These teams of highly experienced engineers also provide valuable feedback to programs. In addition, the accreditation decisions provided directly to the deans come with specific and detailed feedback for future program improvements. This contributes to the continual improvement of engineering education.
- The Accreditation Board has a feedback process to identify changes to simplify accreditation documentation and the visit process. Staff and volunteers provide support to programs preparing for visits.
- The Accreditation Board secretariat provides access to the Program Development Advisory Procedure. This is a way for new engineering programs under development can obtain advice, either through a curriculum assessment or an informal visit. The Accreditation Board has recently approved a guidance document for any program that needs feedback prior to making changes.

Contribution to the profession

- Graduates of accredited engineering programs meet the academic requirements for licensure. No confirmatory examinations are required of these graduates, facilitating their application for licensure in Canada. Accreditation alleviates the workload of the provincial Academic Review Committees (or equivalent). The criteria for accreditation are intended to support the continual improvement of the quality of engineering education. The “minimum path” criterion certifies the individual student. The graduate attributes criterion validates the program and provides the data necessary to develop a process for continual improvement.
- The accreditation process enhances consistency in regulatory standards and practices. It supports mobility.
- Engineers Canada has entered into mutual recognition agreements with select engineering organizations around the world. The Accreditation Board regularly monitors the accreditation systems of those organizations to ensure the continued value of these agreements.
- The Engineers Canada Board provides two representatives to the Accreditation Board. Both the current representatives have experience on accreditation visits. **There are opportunities for any Engineers Canada Board Director to observe visits.**
- Each regulator member of Engineers Canada is regularly invited to send representative(s) to observe Accreditation Board meetings. Such invitations are routinely accepted by regulators. Valuable information is exchanged by all parties.
- The Washington Accord is a multi-lateral agreement between bodies responsible for accreditation or recognition of tertiary-level engineering qualifications within their jurisdictions that have chosen to work collectively to assist the mobility of professional engineers. It comprises of 19 member countries that perform the accreditation of over 7,000 engineering programs worldwide. Canada is a leading jurisdiction in terms of mentoring other jurisdictions aspiring to become part of the Washington Accord.
- The Accreditation Board represents Engineers Canada at the Washington Accord, providing advice and regular reports to the Engineers Canada Board on these activities. Obligations of Washington Accord signatories are to participate in regular monitoring activities and information exchange between signatories and provisional members. The admission of new signatories requires the unanimous approval of the existing signatories, and existing signatories are subject to monitoring visits every six years.

AU Task Force meeting

Notes from the July 18, 2017 meeting held at the ALT hotel in Toronto, Ontario

Participants

Bob Dony (Task Force leader)
Dan Candido (CEAB member)
Matthew Oliver (Regulator/Admissions official representative)
Tom Tiedje (NCDEAS member)
Luigi Benedicenti (CEAB member)
Ray Gosine (CEAB member)
Regrets: Andy Hrymak (NCDEAS member)

Guests

Wayne MacQuarrie, Chair, CEAB
Ishwar Puri, Chair, NCDEAS
Russ Kinghorn, President, Engineers Canada
Stephanie Price, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Engineers Canada

Accreditation Board Secretariat

Kathryn Sutherland, Vice President, Governance and International Affairs
Lynn Villeneuve
Johanne Lamarche

1. Opening remarks and introductions

- Welcome and introductions: B. Dony called the meeting to order and all attendees introduced themselves.
- Approval of agenda: The agenda was accepted as distributed and the leader was authorized to revise the order of business as necessary to accommodate the needs of the meeting.
- Purpose of the meeting
 - The purpose of the meeting was to reflect on the past work of the AU Task Force and to identify an action plan that demonstrates progress in addressing NCDEAS concerns while respecting various stakeholder positions.
 - To consider the definition of an AU in its present form (criteria 3.4.1.1) and to identify, the advantages, disadvantages and ramifications of any definition change on existing criteria.
 - To investigate how curriculum content requirements could be linked to student outcomes/graduate attributes whatever system of AU counts is used

2. Initial discussion

- AU Task Force changes: B. Dony gave a brief explanation as to Task Force member changes due to members whose terms on the CEAB had expired and that the membership has been increased to broaden the representation on the Task Force.

Participants discussed and agreed on the urgency in developing an action plan (short and longer term) to address NCDEAS concerns

3. Perceived stakeholder positions

Discussion objective – to come to an understanding / recognition of current stakeholder realities

- Stakeholders were described as: HEIs Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board, EC Board Regulators Industry Students

It was noted that the EC Board expects the AB to work with the NCDEAS and Regulators to address their issues. There was discussion and confirmation about the purpose of accreditation being to prepare the graduates for entry into the profession in terms academic formation. There was also discussion about the lack of homogeneity of “industry” and the stated needs from employers. Some of the skills required by “industry” may be attained after graduation.

4. NCDEAS concerns

Discussion objective-affirm and prioritize concerns as short and longer term issues

I. Puri confirmed accuracy of issues identified in the January 3, 2017 document submitted by NCDEAS. He would like the workload to be tangibly beneficial. Once learning outcome criteria were adopted in addition to the knowledge base (“inputs”) the workload increased substantially. Membership in the Washington Accord is one reason for supporting the adoption of learning outcomes. However there is a disconnect because regulators have indicated they are generally “agnostic” to the Washington Accord.

There was also discussion about the lack of clarity about AU categories. No one uses the “other” category.

5. Preliminary AU Task Force status report and relevance of the current terms of reference

Discussion objective – to share and discuss G. Reader’s Task Force status report

In developing the “AU” (accreditation unit) the Accreditation Board has defined its own credit system, in the absence of a homogeneous credit system. The work performed prior to this meeting involved reviewing different methodologies used across the world. The research revealed that in Canada, engineering programs have a larger proportion of laboratory work as part of the curriculum than the majority of other jurisdictions. The group discussed this and there was consensus that labs are seen as key elements of curriculum in terms of student learning.

Terms of Reference: participants reviewed the terms of reference drafted by Graham Reader. Overall these were accepted by the group as being valid, but with the following refinements:

- a. The first goal of the Task Force is *To identify and define a process to evolve AUs to cope with the changes in Engineering Education.*
- b. As a “legacy” item, the second goal would be to envisage how curriculum content requirements could be linked to student outcomes/graduate attributes whatever the system of curriculum content measurements

It was also noted that there was a need to:

- c. Ensure there is sufficient flexibility in teaching of engineering education
- d. Reduce the “fear factor” as it is not captured in current ToR, and,

e. Continuous Improvement needs to be captured as well

6. Possible criteria and procedures change considerations. Action plan development.

Discussion objectives :

Identify other potential short term and longer term changes to existing criteria and accreditation procedures that could address the NCDEAS issues

Prepare a short-term action plan including deliverables and timelines

Action	Action created on	Person responsible	Status	Notes/additional info (lighter font for completed items)
1. Gap analysis: Survey/list of questions through NCDEAS – what are some non-classroom program delivery methods currently in use or contemplated	July 18, 2017	T. Tiedje A. Hrymak AB Secretariat	In progress	AU Task Force members to approve questions/survey Questions/survey to be forwarded to NCDEAS Chair for next steps, which could be to forward to the NCDEAS Education Committee, or to all members
2. Develop a “learning unit” definition or a refined AU definition	July 18, 2017	R. Dony T. Tiedje A. Hrymak	In progress	
3. Seek exemplars for a series of different learning methodologies	July 18, 2017	T. Tiedje A. Hrymak AB Secretariat		NCDEAS representatives to work with HEIs to obtain exemplars that currently exist. Recommend I. Puri be involved Obtain examples of non-traditional delivery styles and work with the AB to develop a “guide” as to how to proceed within existing AU-based criteria or modifications to accommodate.
4. Assess AU ranges of accredited programs.	July 18, 2017	Secretariat	In progress	Provide data reports (including AU counts and margins), first to Task Force for initial review, then to NCDEAS for their fall meeting (fall 2017) Suggestions as to how “other” AU category can be used, using the 405 AU to differentiate/add value to degrees
5. Accreditation Visit Training	July 18, 2017	D. Candido / L. Benedicenti / Secretariat	In progress	Dealt with as part of the Accreditation Improvement Program. Workshop on September 8

Action	Action created on	Person responsible	Status	Notes/additional info (lighter font for completed items)
6 Provide more detailed AU data from visits re: declared AU vs revised median as well as histogram	July 18, 2017	Secretariat R. Dony	In progress	Goal of this and action 4 is to provide more fulsome data reporting to ensure all parties have a better understanding of actual program AU numbers and ranges ie. education campaign - declared AUs vs revised AUs Secretariat to provide to Task Force prior to disseminating to NCDEAS
Provide an information bulletin on a regular basis re: accreditation changes	July 18, 2017	Secretariat	In progress	Consider bimonthly update Bi-yearly updates (at NCDEAS meetings) is likely sufficient Secretariat to discuss with EC communications staff CEEA is another good venue to provide information
Linking AU and learning outcomes	July 18, 2017	L. Benedicenti W. MacQuarrie	In progress	Consider asking P. Klink to assess potential workload reduction
Provide an interim report to the Engineers Canada Board at the September meeting	July 18, 2017	Secretariat/ AB Secretary	In progress	Deadline to include in meeting agenda materials is August 23
Provide a final report to the Engineers Canada Board for the February 2018 meeting for approval (including consultation with HEIs, regulators and AB)	July 18, 2017	Secretariat/ AB Secretary		

8. Next steps

AU Task group members to meet by teleconference on a date the week of August 14 to review interim report for Engineers Canada Board meeting

9. Other Business

None raised

10. Next meeting

August 14, by teleconference. Next face-to-face meeting expected to be in October 2017

11. Closing

The AU Task Force meeting adjourned at 16:00 on Tuesday, July 18, 2017.

Use of Reserves for Expenses Related to the Governance, Strategic Planning and Consultation Project
Prepared by Sarah Devereaux, Governance Committee Chair and Stephanie Price, CEO
September 2017

MOTION:

THAT the Board authorize the CEO to use reserve funds for the Governance, Strategic Planning and Consultation project for 2018. This authority shall permit the CEO to draw down up to a maximum of:

- a) \$179,000 for governance improvements and*
- b) \$292,000 for strategic planning and*
- c) \$36,000 for consultations and*
- d) \$22,000 for capacity building.*

Introduction

Through our ongoing governance review we have already achieved progress in moving to a more effective Board. On the request from our owners, we have developed recommendations to reduce the Board size. And, through our collaboration at our June Board workshop we agreed that our strategic planning needed to be reassessed. Achieving these outcomes will result in significant improvements for Engineers Canada. It will also require additional resources and work outside of the normal operations of Engineers Canada.

Background

The Engineers Canada Board decided that the Carver governance model was not serving the organization well, and directed the Governance Committee to “...consider alternatives to our current governance model and present recommendations for consideration by the Board...” [Motion #5606, March 1 2017].

The Governance Committee conducted a survey, contacted key stakeholders and held their own workshop in May 2017 to discuss the issue. They decided that the Carver model should be abandoned, and a new model developed that would be specific to Engineers Canada. Their conclusions were presented in a report which included a list of 10 recommendations of items that needed to be fixed or improved, and a complete action plan for doing so which extended to September 2019. The 10 recommendations were in regards to:

- i. Guiding principles
- ii. Performance assessment and board obligation to committees
- iii. Joint planning and direction setting process
- iv. Structure and effectiveness of the board
- v. Templated briefing notes to support proposed motions
- vi. Oversight of the governance update
- vii. Complete edit of the board manual

- viii. Assessment of CEO
- ix. Frequency and granularity of reporting by ceo
- x. Board Interaction with Staff

The recommendations were accepted by the Board on May 26, 2017 via Motion #5630:

THAT the Board approve the improvement plan laid out in the report from the May 6-7, 2017 Governance Workshop and direct that the Governance Committee maintain oversight of the implementation of the plan.

At the June Board workshop, the entire Board, including advisors, convened to discuss the issue of governance and the related issues of board size and strategic planning. The outcome of the workshop, reported in the synopsis PowerPoint and the Workshop Report was agreement to work on:

- governance updates,
- strategic planning and decision making,
- an integrated approach to engagement with regulators, and
- the development of an implementation plan for all of the above.

This governance improvement work was identified by the Board, at that workshop, as one of the three strategic directions for Engineers Canada for the period from July 2017 to December 2018.

Current Activities

Engineers Canada has developed a Governance, Strategic Planning and Consultation (GSPC) project to support achievement of all aspects discussed and agreed to at the June Board workshop. The current project consists of four work packages, to be supported by board committees and the CEO:

- 1) **Governance improvements** so that a new governance model and associated policies will provide clarity and alignment for the regulators and directors on the board governance process. **Led by the Governance Committee**
- 2) **Strategic planning** process that provides relevant and timely mid- to long-term direction to Engineers Canada with year-over-year consistency and an effective process for measuring progress towards achieving the strategic direction set by the board. **By the Executive Committee**
- 3) **Consultation processes** that ensure that regulator views and requirements are heard and responded to. **Led by the Linkages Committee**
- 4) **Improved capabilities** and processes at Engineers Canada to conduct consultations and support ongoing consultations so that all of the above are operationalized and can be maintained on an ongoing basis. **Led by the CEO**

In addition to the committees identified above, the team actively working on this project includes four Engineers Canada staff and two consultants.

Cost Estimate

Detailed planning for the project is still underway, and the cost estimate includes a 15% contingency. The cost estimate will continue to be refined as the project progresses and the schedule and planning are better defined. These numbers have been refined since August 2017 to correct the inclusion of HST

(this is a pass through for us, as we get all HST paid reimbursed to us), and to acknowledge the fact that our current operating budget already covers face-to-face meetings for the Executive, Governance and Linkages committees (i.e. should not be considered project costs).

The total project costs are currently estimated at:

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS	2017	2018	2019	TOTAL
Governance improvements	\$323,133	\$179,369	\$73,950	\$576,650
Strategic planning	\$33,859	\$291,941	\$139,200	\$465,000
Consultations	\$20,065	\$36,485	\$42,050	\$98,600
Capacity building	\$13,795	\$22,455	\$20,300	\$56,550
TOTAL	\$391,050	\$530,250	\$275,500	\$1,196,800

This estimate includes the costs for the consultants, and the costs of the face-to-face consultations in 2017 and early 2018 with regulators and the CEO Group (2 rounds of 13 consultations each) including travel and accommodations. Consultations in late 2018 and in 2019 will be covered by the operating budget, when the consultations are operationalized and start to be run by staff.

The costs for the consultants *only* are:

PROPOSED CONSULTANT COSTS	2017	2018	2019	TOTAL
Governance improvements	\$204,881	\$179,369	\$73,950	\$458,200
Strategic planning	\$38,261	\$173,491	\$139,200	\$345,500
Consultations	\$22,673	\$36,485	\$42,050	\$98,600
Capacity building	\$15,588	\$22,455	\$20,300	\$56,550
TOTAL	\$272,600	\$411,800	\$275,500	\$959,900

Cost Comparison

Engineers Canada has requested additional “level of effort” bids to ensure that we were getting value for money from our consultants. Two requests were issued, and only one response was received. The total estimate for *consultant time only* was \$1,291,250 with a projected timeline of 2½ years.

Current Status of Reserves

Engineers Canada reserves are in good shape. We currently have over \$7M in reserves, allocated as follows:

Four-year rolling operational reserve	\$4.0M	(target is \$4.0M per GP-14.1)
Legal and liability contingency reserve	\$1.325M	(target is \$1.325M per GP-14.3)
Capital reserve for purchase of assets	\$ 250K	
Other	\$ 211K	
Unrestricted	\$1.793M	
TOTAL	\$7.6M	

The Board has passed two motions regarding use of reserves: one directing the CEO to draw down \$500,000/year to fund projects and ensure that our reserves reduced such that they remain at a level

that is acceptable to the Canada Revenue Agency, and a second authorizing use of reserve funds for costs associated with the 2017/2018 change-over of CEO.

Recommendations

The Governance Committee recommends that the GSPC Project be funded from reserves. Periodically drawing down reserves is a good practice as it is an indicator of their necessity in the eyes of the Canada Revenue Agency. This particular project will make a substantial change in the operations of Engineers Canada. Such a significant change is exactly the type of thing that reserves are established to support.

Further, the CEO should be requested to confirm the exact amount to be drawn down in 2017 and in 2018 when the 2018 budget is approved (December 2017), and to report on the project via the monthly emails and at every Board meeting.

The Board has identified governance improvements as one of its three strategic directions to the CEO. This project is designed to allow us to achieve that direction. If use of reserves is not authorized, there will be an impact on ongoing programs and initiatives as financial resources will need to be re-directed to support this project.

FOOTNOTE

Current Status for 2017 Spending (as of August 31, 2017)

The original 2017 budget includes \$18,750 for the governance consulting services (based on the ongoing need for governance training and support under Carver) and \$82,000 for a late fall board meeting. These funds (\$100,750 total) have been 100% allocated to this project.

The forecast for the year 2017 for this project is \$391,050.

The maximum that would be drawn down from reserves in 2017 is \$290,300 (= 391,050 – 100,750).

If there are any unspent funds in other related budgets at year's end, they will also be re-allocated to this project to reduce the amount that will be drawn from reserves. This will include the committee budgets for Governance, Executive and Linkages as well as the Board workshop budget.

Spend to date on the project (starting from the May 2017 Governance Committee workshop up to the end of August) is approximately \$130,000.

Scope of Work extracted from Collaboration Transformations Proposal



Governance, Strategic Planning and Engagement

Project Phases and Deliverables

The Project will be conducted in four phases.

A Work Breakdown Structure appears later in this proposal.

Phase 1 – Jul to Sep 2017

- Project planning, development of project charter and project plan, governance committee workshop and development of a Board workshop at the September 2017 Board meeting.

Phase 2 – Sep 2017 to Feb 2018

- Workshops with Governance Committee and Executive Committee (Strategic Planning and Performance Assessment). Liaison with Engagement committee as required.
- Conduct Board workshops: Sep 2017 – Governance and Feb 2018 – Strategic Planning
- Regulator Engagement. One complete engagement cycle Two webinars and 12 face-to-face engagements with Regulators
- Initiate training for Engineers Canada staff in engagement and change management
- Engagement of CEO Group Feb 2018
- Phase 2 report and Phase 3 recommendations

Phase 3 – Mar 2018 to Feb 2019

- Workshops with Governance Committee, Executive Committee (Strategic Planning and Performance Assessment) and Engagement committee as required.
- Facilitate end-to-end Strategic Planning process
- Conduct three Board workshops:
 - May 2018 – Review of the 2019-2021 Strategic Plan,
 - Sep 2018 – Governance updates, fundamental issues
 - Feb 2019 – Strategic Plan review and update. Evaluate 2018 operations. Review alignment of CEO's 2019 Operations plan with the Board Strategic Plan.
- Design and facilitate June 2018 Board retreat: Publish the 2019-2021 Strategic Plan
- Regulator Engagement. Two complete engagement cycles.
 - Spring 2018 Strategic Plan development.
 - Autumn 2018 Governance and other Board committee requirements (as required)
- Coach Engineers Canada staff in engagement and change management
- Engagement of CEO Group: Feb 2018, July 2018, Sep 2018 and Feb 2019
- Phase 3 report and Phase 4 recommendations

Phase 4 – Mar 2019 to Jul 2019

- Workshops with Governance Committee, Executive Committee (Strategic Planning and Performance Assessment) and Engagement committee as required.
- Facilitate Strategic Plan review and update process
- Conduct one Board workshop:
 - May 2019 – Update of the Strategic Plan – next steps for direction setting and engagement

- Design and facilitate June 2019 Board retreat: Update the 2019-2021 Strategic Plan
- Regulator Engagement. One complete engagement cycles.
 - Spring 2019 Strategic Plan review and update, other key issues as required.
- Coach Engineers Canada staff in engagement and change management. Engineers Canada staff take on active roles
- Engagement of CEO Group: May 2019, July 2019
- Close-out report and recommendations for next steps

WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE

Phase 2 - Sep 2017 - Feb 2018

	Governance	Strategic Planning	Engagement	Capacity	
Project Management / Admin	3	3	3	3	
Project Team Meetings	10	3	4	3	
Change Management and Communications	5	5	3	1	
Board Meetings and 1 day workshop (Feb 18)	12	2	0	4	
Regulator Engagement (Autumn 2017)	40	0	0	0	
Activities by Work Package					
Workshops (with relevant governing body)	6	6	4	0	
Working Group Meetings	10	8	2	4	
Evaluation and Phase 2 Report	6	0	0	0	
Debriefings - Confirmation of Phase 2 approach	2	0	0	0	
<i>Days by Work Package</i>	94	27	16	11	
				Total	148

Phase 3 - Mar 2018 - Dec 2018

	Governance	Strategic Planning	Engagement	Capacity	
Project Management / Admin	6	6	2	1	
Project Team Meetings	16	12	3	6	
Change Management and Communications	5	5	3	1	
Board Meetings and 1 day workshop (May 18, Sep 18)	12	12	0	0	
Regulator Engagement (Spring 2018, Autumn 2018)	40	40	0	0	
Board June Workshop	0	10	0	0	
Activities by Work Package		0			
Workshops (with relevant governing body)	12	12	8	0	
Working Group Meetings	14	16	4	6	
Evaluation and Phase 3 Report	4	3	3	0	
Debriefings - Confirmation of Phase 3 approach	2	0	0	0	
<i>Days by Work Package</i>	111	116	23	14	
				Total	264

Phase 4 - Jan 2019 to Jul 2019

	Governance	Strategic Planning	Engagement	Capacity
Project Management / Admin	4	6	3	3
Project Team Meetings	14	6	5	3
Change Management and Communications	4	4	4	2
Board Meetings and 1 day workshop (Feb 19, May 19)	12	12	4	0

Attachment 5.3

Board June Workshop	0	10	0	0	
Regulator Engagement (Spring 2019)	0	40	0	0	
Activities by Work Package					
Workshops (with relevant governing body)	6	6	6	0	
Working Group Meetings	6	8	4	4	
Phase 4 Evaluation and Close-out Report	3	4	3	2	
Debriefings - Confirmation of Phase 2 approach	2	0	0	0	
<i>Days by Work Package</i>	51	96	29	14	
				Total	190

Executive Committee Report
Prepared by Russ Kinghorn, President
September 2017

The Executive Committee met on Wednesday August 23 to review the agenda for this meeting, and begin their work on aspects of the *Governance, Strategic Planning and Consultation (GSPC)* Project.

The Executive Committee is responsible for one of the four work packages within the GSPC Project. As described in the Project Charter, that package is:

II. Board Strategic Planning and Performance Assessment.

Facilitating and enabling the work of the *Executive Committee* to adopt an effective, consultative approach to **Strategic Planning**. Four parts are foreseen to this work package:

- Process for outreach, consultation, and decision-making during the planning process
- Development of the Board 2019-2021 Strategic Plan. Target date for release is June 2018.
- Formalize a process for Board committees and Tasks forces to develop annual workplans in response to the direction given in the Strategic Plan. These workplans will be approved by the Board and their effectiveness evaluated, at least annually, by the Board.
- Formalize a process for the Board to evaluate itself.

The Executive Committee therefore plans to meet regularly throughout the fall in order to be able to present recommendations to the Board on these items at the February 2018 workshop.

Risk Register

Prepared by Stephanie Price, CEO

September 2017

Engineers Canada maintains a risk register so that we can manage our risks, make sure that we are taking appropriate action and are adequately prepared.

The risk register was updated with the input of all staff in Q1 of 2017, and was reviewed by staff with responsibility for managing specific risks in Q3 of 2017.

Overall view

All risks are scored in terms of likelihood and impact, and mapped to a chart with the following scores:

		IMPACT				
		Insignificant/ <i>Insignifiant</i> 1	Minor/ <i>Mineure</i> 2	Moderate/ <i>Modérée</i> 3	Major/ <i>Majeure</i> 4	Catastrophic/ <i>Catastrophique</i> 5
LIKELIHOOD / PROBABILITÉ	Extremely Likely/ <i>Extrêmement probable</i> 5	5	10	15	20	25
	Likely/ <i>Probablement</i> 4	4	8	12	16	20
	Moderate/ <i>Modéré</i> 3	3	6	9	12	15
	Unlikely/ <i>Improbable</i> 2	2	4	6	8	10
	Low/ <i>Faible</i> 1	1	2	3	4	5

Engineers Canada BOARD Risks

During our review we identified some risks that are the responsibility of the Board. None of these risks have changed since the May 2017 report.

		IMPACT				
		Insignificant/ <i>Insignifiant</i> 1	Minor/ <i>Mineure</i> 2	Moderate/ <i>Modérée</i> 3	Major/ <i>Majeure</i> 4	Catastrophic/ <i>Catastrophique</i> 5
LIKELIHOOD / PROBABILITÉ	Extremely Likely/ <i>Extrêmement probable</i> 5					
	Likely/ <i>Probablement</i> 4				1 3	
	Moderate/ <i>Modéré</i> 3			28	34	26
	Unlikely/ <i>Improbable</i> 2					
	Low/ <i>Faible</i> 1				5	

We have described these risks and suggested a response plan and monitoring methods in the following table. Engineers Canada staff will support the Board in managing these risks, as requested.

Risk #	Risk Category	Title	Description	Symptoms	Risk Response Strategy	Response Plan	Monitoring Method
1	Strategic	Vision or Strategy	A lack of vision, direction or strategy for Engineers Canada would result in owners' needs not being met.	Diminished confidence by the owners Diminished engagement of owners Decreased staff morale and productivity	Prevention	Board defines vision Governance committee defines direction	
3	Operations	Succession planning for CEO	Without effective succession planning, loss of the CEO would compromise Engineers Canada's ability to deliver due to lost knowledge	CEO leaves with no clarity in how this role will be filled Key duties are neglected	Prevention	Succession plan in place for CEO Job description kept up-to-date	
5	Strategic	Duty of Care - Board	Inability to meet the required duty of care would lead to ineffective decision making and legal liability for directors	Lack of preparation to inform decisions Length of time to make decisions is unnecessarily long Lack of preparation or knowledge	Prevention	Training for all new directors	Self-evaluation and performance monitoring of directors, by directors.
26	Strategic	Accreditation Process	An ineffective accreditation process would cause loss of confidence by key stakeholders and withdrawal of higher education institutions from the accreditation process.	HEI or regulator withdraws from accreditation Dissatisfaction of regulator with accreditation	Mitigate	Focus on system improvement Additional resources for Accreditation Team Ongoing stakeholder engagement Coordination of activities to ensure alignment of all efforts.	Stakeholder feedback
28	Operations	AB and QB oversight	Lack of oversight of AB and QB could lead to disengagement with vision and strategic direction of Engineers Canada	Board observers do not contribute to AB and QB Board does not engage with AB and QB reports AB and QB not in alignment with Engineers Canada strategic direction	Prevention	Board actively engages with AB & QB. Protocol for approval of work plans Operational Policy sets out support for Board, Board Committees and Officers Terms of Reference for Board reps on AB & QB to be developed.	
34	Operations	Qualifications Board	QB work that is not aligned or is in conflict with the work of the AB would undermine the value of accreditation	Disagreement between QB and AB	Prevention	Observers of QB at AB and vice versa Oversight by Board information sharing between support staff	AB and QB reports to the Board

Engineers Canada – Organizational Risks

The risks which are under Engineers Canada’s control are categorized as follows:

		IMPACT				
		Insignificant/ <i>Insignifiant</i> 1	Minor/ <i>Mineure</i> 2	Moderate/ <i>Modérée</i> 3	Major/ <i>Majeure</i> 4	Catastrophic/ <i>Catastrophique</i> 5
LIKELIHOOD / PROBABILITÉ	Extremely Likely/ <i>Extrêmement probable</i> 5					
	Likely/ <i>Probablement</i> 4		24			
	Moderate/ <i>Modéré</i> 3			25	2, 4, 10, 34	7
	Unlikely/ <i>Improbable</i> 2	13	17	8, 12, 21, 27	14, 16, 29, 33	
	Low/ <i>Faible</i> 1	9, 18, 20		11, 15, 23, 30, 31	6, 19, 32	22

Risk #24 and #25, shown in blue, are the only ones that have changed since the May 2017 report.

Full details of these risks are on the following pages.

Risk #	Risk Category	Title	Description	Symptoms	Risk Response Strategy	Response Plan	Monitoring Method
7	Strategic	Delivering Value to Regulators	Inability to deliver value to the regulators would lead to lack of support and potential withdrawal from Engineers Canada	Lack of alignment with regulator imperatives Lack of support or participation by regulators Regulator disengagement Lack of demonstrated accountability Lack of reporting to regulators / information sharing	Prevention	Engagement of regulators in strategy and plan development Consultation with members on projects. Ongoing relationships and consultations with officials groups including CEOs	Stakeholder feedback
2	Operations	Resource Utilization	Loss of a key operational resource who is the single expert or point person for a program would lead to delays or decrease in services from Engineers Canada.	Loss of staff or reduction in ability to perform work	Prevention	Staff engagement Health, Safety & Wellness Program Business Continuity planning	employee engagement survey
4	Operations	Succession planning for executive team	Without effective succession planning, loss of an executive team member would compromise Engineers Canada's ability to deliver due to lost knowledge	Executive team member leaves with no clarity in how this role will be filled Key duties are neglected	Prevention	Succession plan in place for COO and VPs Job descriptions kept up to date for all staff	
10	Operations	Staff Retention	High levels of overall staff turnover would lead to low productivity and morale.	Projects / Initiatives delayed Morale declines	Mitigate	Human resources function led by HR Professional Implementation of People Excellence Practices via Journey to Excellence	Employee engagement survey results used to improve practices.

Risk #	Risk Category	Title	Description	Symptoms	Risk Response Strategy	Response Plan	Monitoring Method
14	Operations	Breach of privacy	Breach of private data would lead to legal action and/or reputational, physical, financial, etc. harm to Engineers Canada and to individuals whose personal information is accessed.	Data breach	Prevention	Internal privacy assessment conducted every year in Q4. Privacy training is provided to staff annually Third party contracts are reviewed to ensure that Engineers Canada and partners follow and respect applicable privacy legislation.	
16	Reporting	Financial Planning and Monitoring Processes	Ineffective financial planning and monitoring processes would lead to fiscal jeopardy	Overspending Underspending Budget items do not match priorities	Mitigate	Financial and operational controls documented External auditor reviews financial controls annually New Planning and Monitoring process ties planning (and AOP) to budget cycle. Board review and approval of budget.	Approval of budget and annual operating expense
24	Strategic	Accuracy of website	Inaccurate information on the public website would lead to negative public perceptions of Engineers Canada, confusion and/or reputational damage.	Complaints from stakeholders, including members, Board, volunteers, staff and others is reported	Prevention	Comms team/web team follow web content process Periodic review of content by content owner User feedback mechanisms made available	Web Content Process, ticketing system, page contacts listed, ongoing communication with key stakeholders
25	Strategic	Poor adoption of change	Lack of change management in Engineers Canada projects or change initiatives would compromise their success and implementation.	Lack of engagement with projects/programs Failure of projects / programs Inadequate understanding of projects / programs	Mitigate	A full-time change practitioner has been hired and actively participates in all major projects. Incorporate change management into all initiatives Train staff on fundamentals of change management	Success rate of projects After action reviews / lessons learned for projects Results of communications plans

Risk #	Risk Category	Title	Description	Symptoms	Risk Response Strategy	Response Plan	Monitoring Method
29	Operations	Business Continuity	Unclear processes, protocols and communications in the event of an emergency would lead to Engineers Canada not being able to operate and /or injuries to staff or volunteers.	Missing policies Lack of training for new staff	Mitigate	Creation of a plan that includes processes and protocols to deal with emergencies. Communication and training plans in place.	Operational policy review
33	Operations	Cyber attack	A cyber attack (hacking) would damage data integrity	Loss of data Threats or extortion regarding data	Mitigate	Development and implementation of a Cyber Risk Response Plan; Scheduled to be completed in Q2, 2017	
8	Operations	Contracting	Ineffective processes to select and manage partnerships and suppliers would lead to unanticipated contract costs and complications, and failure to deliver on initiatives.	Onerous terms and conditions Liabilities for non-performance	Prevention	Improve Partner and Supplier Processes Contract guidelines and procedures. Establishment and ongoing communication of procurement process and policies. Contracts reviewed financial services and, where necessary, Legal Counsel. Strategy to ensure partnerships and collaborations match EC strategies.	
12	Operations	Travel policy	ineffective travel policy would fail to protect individuals (where they travel, healthy and safety) and EC financially, and in terms of risk of joint travel.	Lack of travel policy Increasing travel costs	Prevention	Volunteer Expense Process in place Insurance for volunteers in place Travel policy to be developed in 2017.	
21	Strategic	Adverse publicity	Adverse publicity about Engineers Canada would lead to lack of confidence in the organization.	Negative press coverage	Prevention	Relationship established with PR experts. Communications input on key image decisions. Communications approval of public materials and media relationship management.	

Risk #	Risk Category	Title	Description	Symptoms	Risk Response Strategy	Response Plan	Monitoring Method
27	Operations	Internal support to staff	insufficient levels of common resource support (communications, IT, etc.) would lead to ineffective use of the primary resources assigned to programs or projects.	Staff doing non-core work (minutes, communications, legal, etc.)	Mitigate	Prioritization of initiatives Active supervision of staff and initiatives	
22	Compliance	Not-for-profit status	Failure to comply with to the Canadian Not for Profit Corporations Act would lead to a compromise or loss of the not for profit status	Filings not made, or improperly made Reserve levels too high	Monitor	Expenditures to exceed reserves by \$500K of each of the next three years to reduce reserves	Monthly financial statements
6	Strategic	Duty of Care - executive level staff	Inability to meet the required duty of care would lead to poor performance and inability for Engineers Canada to deliver	Lack of ability to perform on the job	Prevention	Regular performance reviews and conversations	Performance reviews
17	Operations	Investment market risk	Excessive risk in Engineers Canada investments would impact the fair value of future cash flows of reserve or investment funds.	Low market value of investments. Low rate of return of investments	Transfer	Investment management firm in place Disclosure annually provided in Note 5 of Financial Statements	Monthly investment statements Annual audit
19	Operations	Financial	Loss of a key income source would disrupt financial plans	Withdrawal of regulator Insolvency of affinity provider	Prevention	Active affinity relationship management, including regulators.	
32	Operations	IT Strategy	Failure of IT infrastructure would cause service disruption.	Unavailability of IT infrastructure Lack of reliability of IT infrastructure	Prevention	Backup strategies to data sets where possible Selection of reputable cloud vendors that offer a suitable degree of redundancy.	Backup sets send email notifications on failure. Cloud vendor found to backup)365 content
11	Operations	Staff recruitment	Ineffective recruitment process would lead to low morale and a loss of productivity.	Poor job performance of new hires	Mitigate	Procedures established for hiring and onboarding new staff.	
15	Operations	Inadequate internal controls - Fraud	Poor internal financial controls would lead to undetected misappropriation of assets	Management override of internal controls Inability to get a clean audit opinion	Prevention	Financial and operational controls documented and followed External auditor reviews	Results of regular internal audit reports.

Risk #	Risk Category	Title	Description	Symptoms	Risk Response Strategy	Response Plan	Monitoring Method
			and or other illegal activities			financial controls annually	
23	Reporting	Financial Reporting and Remittances - HST	Failure to make government remittances would lead to unexpected financial penalties and or additional audit scrutiny from the federal government.	Indications that HST will not be remitted Indications that payroll taxes will not be remitted	Prevention	Control systems in place 3rd party ADP payroll service remits source deductions	Monthly financial statements
30	Compliance	Legislative compliance	Failure to comply with legislation would lead to fines and or legal proceedings against Engineers Canada	Filings not made, or improperly made HR policies lacking Operational policies lacking	Prevention	Avoid risk through compliance: Legal to diarize key filing dates, keep abreast of corporate, regulatory, employment and other legislative updates.	
31	Strategic	Trade-mark risks	Failure to police use of trade-marks leads to loss of rights	Trade-marks used improperly by others Trade-marks not used by EC	Mitigate	In-house and external counsel monitors TM use and defends against marks that are misleading or confusing with Engineers Canada marks.	
13	Operations	Liability	Legal claims against Engineers Canada would cause financial hardship and reputational damage.	Lawsuits filed or threatened	Transfer	D&O and E&O insurance in place Property insurance in place	
9	Operations	Asset Management	Improper asset management and depreciation leads to inaccurate financial reporting	Improper accounting	Prevention	On-site assets are protected through secure building site Annual review of the capital asset list IT assets are tracked by IT staff. Assets capitalized, written off or depreciated as per GAAP	Annual audit
20	Operations	Borrowing strategy	A poor borrowing strategy would lead to excess interest payments and /or destabilization of cash flow	Interest payments Variations in cash flow	Monitor	Prudent borrowing strategy as advised by PL, Finance	Monthly financial statements and annual audit

Risk #	Risk Category	Title	Description	Symptoms	Risk Response Strategy	Response Plan	Monitoring Method
18	Operations	Foreign currency risk	Exposure to foreign currency risk with respect to United States currency holdings and investments in United States or other foreign equity mutual funds would impact the fair value of future cash flows of reserve or investment funds.	Market value of US currency investments	Transfer	Managed as part of the investment portfolio.	Monthly financial statements and annual audit