

CANADIAN ENGINEERING ACCREDITATION BOARD
Abridged minutes of the 170th virtual meeting

CONFIDENTIAL

3148 DATE AND PLACE

The 170th meeting of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board took place via Zoom on June 5 & 6, 2021.

3149 ATTENDANCE

The following were in attendance:

Chair: R. (Bob) Dony, FEC, P.Eng.
Vice-Chair: P. (Pierre) Lafleur, FIC ing.
Past-Chair: L. (Luigi) Benedicenti, FEC, P.Eng.
Members: S. (Suzelle) Barrington, FIC, ing.
P. (Pierre) Bourque, ing.
E. (Emily) Cheung, FEC, P.Eng.
P. (Pemberton) Cyrus, FEC, P.Eng.
W. (Waguïh) ElMaraghy, FEC, P.Eng.
R. (Ray) Gosine, FEC, P.Eng.
P. (Paula) Klink, P.Eng.
S. (Suzanne) Kresta, FEC, P.Eng.
A.M. (Anne-Marie) Laroche, ing.
M. (Mrinal) Mandal, P.Eng.
J. (Julius) Pataky, P.Eng.
J. (Jeff) Pieper, FEC, P.Eng.
A. (Allen) Stewart, P.Eng.
R. (Ramesh) Subramanian, FEC, P.Eng.
T. (Tara) Zrymiak, FEC, P.Eng.

Secretariat: E. (Elise) Guest
J. (Johanne) Lamarche
A. (Alexander) Olivas, FEC (Hon.)
A. (Adam) Rodrigues
M. (Mya) Warken

Engineers Canada Board Director:

T. (Tim) Joseph, P.Eng.

Observers: (the following were in attendance for all, or part, of the meeting)

J. (Jeff) Card, FEC, P.Eng. (GJ Cahill)
D. (Danny) Chui, FEC, P.Eng. (President, Engineers Canada)
C. (Chris) Donaldson (York University)

M. (Marie-Isabelle) Farinas, ing. (Université du Québec à Chicoutimi)
M. (Manu) Gill (British Columbia Institute of Technology)
B. (Benjamin) Gobeil-Jobin, ing. (Université du Québec à Chicoutimi)
R. (Ryan) Huckle (Conestoga College)
C. (Christine) Lee (Engineers and Geoscientists British Columbia)
M. (Mahmoud) Mahmoud, P.Eng. (Chair, Qualifications Board)
R. (Ryan) Melsom (Secretary, Qualifications Board)
A. (Aparna) Mohan (Canadian Federation of Engineering Students)
C. (Christine) Moresoli, ing. (University of Waterloo)
J. (Jim) Nicell, P.Eng. (McGill University)
J. (James) Olson, P.Eng. (University of British Columbia)
J. (Jason) Ong, (Engineers and Geoscientists British Columbia)
W. (Wayne) Peters, P.Eng. (University of Prince Edward Island)
G. (Gillian) Pichler, P.Eng. (Engineers and Geoscientists British Columbia)
S. (Stephanie) Price, P.Eng. (Engineers Canada Executive vice-president)
K. (Kate) Sisk, FEC (Engineers Geoscientists New Brunswick)
C. (Caroline) St-Denis (École de technologie supérieure)
T. (Tony) Thoma, P.Eng. (Conestoga College)
C. (Christopher) Yip (University of Toronto)

3150 OPENING OF THE MEETING

3150.1 CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Chair called the meeting to order and presented a list of meeting attendees. The confidentiality of the Accreditation Board proceedings was shared with all present.

The following motion was carried unanimously:

MOTION:

“That the agenda be approved as distributed and that the Chair be authorized to revise the order of business as necessary to accommodate the needs of the meeting.”

Moved by A. Stewart, seconded by T. Zrymiak

Carried

3150.2 DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Board members and members of Board committees have an ongoing obligation to identify and disclose actual, reasonably perceived, and potential conflicts of interest.

B. Dony directed meeting attendees to declare any conflicts of interests they may have.

ACTION ITEM:

- Policies and Procedures Committee to consider creating a CEAB addendum to the Engineers Canada’s Declaration of Conflicts of Interest policy to cover the CEAB’s specific situation.

3151.3 Memberships

B. Dony expressed the Board's appreciation to the departing members, L. Benedicenti and J. Card, for their contributions. P. Lafleur expressed his appreciation to B. Dony for his contributions as Chair of the CEAB.

3152 REPORTS TO THE BOARD

3152.1 ENGINEERING DEANS CANADA (EDC)

J. Olson, Chair, Deans Liaison Committee (DLC) provided a summary of EDC activities including:

- Current status of undergraduate engineering education in Canada:
 - Completed a year of on-line remote courses
 - Courses were delivered asynchronously and synchronously, respecting international locations.
 - Laboratories were offered using simulation, video, virtualizations, lab-in-a-box, etc.
 - Design projects continued.
 - Assessments and exams were delivered using on-line proctoring and academic integrity monitored.
- As of September 7, 2021, UBC plans to be in person and face-to-face (with accommodation for students who cannot attend in-person). The learning environment will be full classrooms, no social distancing, and likely no mask or vaccine requirement. Future considerations:
 - A new capacity for remote instruction and online learning (both students and faculty) has been developed and implemented. The future of undergraduate engineering education is blended learning:
 - Student expect courses to be available on-line
 - Student expect to have shorter, more engaged in-person experience
 - Faculty expect to continue to deliver remote and online, leveraging investments in new technology and new pedagogy to develop online content, experiences, design projects, laboratories, and assessments.
 - The EDC wonders: What is the role of AU in this system?
- EDC is looking forward to the Definition of Design working group's response to consultation and to discussions at the Deans Liaison Committee.
- EDC expressed concern about the scope of the CEAB's 30 by 30 Task Force and their report recommendations. Though they support the 30 by 30 initiative, the EDC notes that they feel it is inappropriate for Engineers Canada to advance their strategic goals through accreditation.
- In subsequent discussion, it was noted:
 - That the EDC has requested to have an active role in Engineers Canada's upcoming Washington Accord review.
 - The 30 by 30 Task Force's mandate is to look at the entire accreditation process and not solely accreditation criteria. This includes an examination of the Accreditation Board's own operational policies and procedures. The Task Force has been conscious to only make reasonable criteria changes that are achievable by HEIs and within their control.

- While there is a desire expressed by Engineering Deans Canada for the accreditation system to move to an entirely outcomes-based accreditation system, the readiness of all HEIs to do so is varied and context-specific.
- Some questioned whether it would be entirely appropriate to abandon input measures altogether as inputs can be a predictor of the outcomes of a program.

3152.2 UPDATE ON ACTIVITIES FROM THE CANADIAN FEDERATION OF ENGINEERING STUDENTS (CFES)

A. Mohan, Vice-President Advocacy provided a presentation on national student advocacy by engaging CEAB members through:

- A mindfulness check-in
- Stories
- Strategic plan & vision for the CFES

In subsequent discussion, it was noted:

- The students' vision after COVID includes:
 - a return to a new normal where radical compassion still underlies interaction.
 - technological stewardship is a value that the students care a lot about.
 - to stop being uncomfortable around politics.
- It was very much appreciated by the CEAB that the subject of mental health was brought forward by the CFES.

3152.3 UPDATE ON THE QUALIFICATION BOARD'S ACTIVITIES

M. Mahmoud provided an update on the work of the Canadian Engineering Qualifications Board (CEQB). As part of the 2021 work plan, CEQB is currently:

- Conducting a feasibility study on alternative methods of academic assessment for non-CEAB applicants
- Creating a new public guideline for engineers and engineering firms on the topic of Indigenous consultation and engagement on engineering projects
- Revising the Engineers Canada Paper on software engineering
- Consulting with regulators and 30 by 30 champions on guidelines on workplace gender equity

In 2022, CEQB is expected to start:

- Conducting regulator consultation on the following three priorities:
 - New public guidelines on fitness to practice
 - New public guideline on whistle blowing
 - Research paper on Canadian engineers working internationally
- Updating existing CEQB documents and syllabi

3152.5 ACCREDITATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE

M. Warlen provided an update on the Accreditation Improvement Program (AIP) including:

- *Accreditation Matters*, *Engineers Canada's* monthly accreditation newsletter, continues to provide broad updates about the work of accreditation as well as AIP activities.

- The training needs to support the transition to 2022/2023 virtual visits will benefit from the training methodology established under the AIP.
- The AIP team will continue to work with our vendor (Armature) and the AIP System Advisory Committee to configure Tandem, Engineers Canada's new data management system to support accreditation.
- The continual improvement process continues to intake, analyze, prioritize, and follow-up on suggestions for improvement to accreditation and to the Enrolment and Degrees Awarded Survey (EDAS).

3153 ACCREDITATION ACTIVITIES

3153.1 ACCREDITATION BOARD FALL 2021 AND WINTER 2022 VISITS

M. Warken reported that the CEAB secretariat has received requests for accreditation visits from 17 institutions for 79 programs including 13 new programs.

3153.2 PROGRAMS UNDER DEVELOPMENT

M. Warken presented the list of programs under development. Meeting participants were encouraged to report anything of interest related to this issue. It was noted that two of the programs identified for Humber College do not have the word engineering in its title.

ACTION ITEM:

- Secretariat to contact Humber College to advise them of criterion 3.6.2 which states: An accredited program must have the word "engineering" in its title.

3153.3 MEMBER ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE SEPTEMBER 2021 ACCREDITATION BOARD MEETING

B. Dony presented the members' assignments for the September 2021 meeting for information. No concerns or comments were noted.

3153.4 ANTICIPATED ACCREDITATION VISITS 2022-2026

M. Warken presented the 2022-2026 anticipated accreditation visits forecast for information and workload planning purposes.

ACTION ITEM:

- The Policies and Procedures Committee to discuss the possibility of virtual visits when conducting single program visits.

3154 ACCREDITATION DECISIONS (ABRIDGED)

3155 POLICY ITEMS

3155.1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

B. Dony provided the following status update:

- In the first 12 months of the pandemic, the CEAB Executive Committee met at least bi-weekly to monitor the rapidly evolving situation and to develop a

response plan (including the proposal to defer visits, communications with stakeholders of the accreditation system, meetings with Engineering Deans Canada Leadership, establishing ad hoc working groups and task forces, and aiding the Secretariat advise institutions on the CEAB accreditation criteria and procedures).

- Since February, the Committee has met less frequently, normally every 3-4 weeks. In those meetings, agenda topics related the products expected through the Terms of Reference:
 - CEAB meeting agenda development
 - Input on the structure and focus of the CEAB workshop on the 2022-2024 Engineers Canada Strategic Plan
 - Determining the CEAB's representation at meetings and conferences of other organizations:
 - CFES' Canadian Engineering Leadership Conference (January 16, attended by Tara Zrymiak)
 - ICACIT 2021 Program Evaluators Update (March 13, attended by Bob Dony)
 - Engineering Deans Canada meeting (April 15-16, attended by Pierre Lafleur)
 - CEQB meeting (April 10, attended by Bob Dony)
 - National Admissions Officials Meeting (April 14, attended by Bob Dony)
 - Engineers and Geoscientists British Columbia Council Forum (April 22, attended by Bob Dony)
 - Input on feedback to Engineers Canada's Governance Committee's review of Board Policy 6.9 CEAB Terms of Reference.
 - Input on Engineers Canada's/CEAB's workshop submission to the 2021 Conference of the Canadian Engineering Education Association.
 - Engineering Deans Canada's concerns about the accreditation system
 - Washington Accord monitoring visit 2021 details
 - Management of real and perceived conflicts of interest for visits

In between meetings, the Executive Committee is very active on email, frequently advising the Secretariat on the interpretation of accreditation criteria to advise programs and others seeking clarity.

Next steps:

- The Executive Committee will turn over on July 1, 2021 with the following committee composition:
 - Bob Dony
 - Paula Klink
 - Pierre Lafleur (Chair)
- The Executive Committee will continue to report on its activities to the CEAB at each meeting.
- Copies of presentations made at meetings and conferences of other organizations will be uploaded to the new 'Presentation Bank' folder in the CEAB collaboration space for all members to access at their leisure.

3155.2 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE REPORT

P. Lafleur provided an update on the following items:

- **Engineering Deans Canada concerns**
Updates were provided on the EDC's nine main concerns, which were discussed by J. Olson earlier in the meeting.

The following points were raised in the subsequent discussions:

- It was suggested that the CEAB should review the EDC's concerns in detail. Also, it was suggested that a 'close date' be added to concerns that have been addressed to keep track of the progress on the EDC's concerns.
- Board members voiced concern with the Chair's decision to not allow observers to comment due to time restraints. Several members felt that it is important that these issues be discussed in open forums.

3155.2.1 INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT ON LICENSURE CONSULTATION

In response to the Engineering Deans' concerns regarding the current wording of clauses 9 and 10 (now 8 & 9) of the *Interpretive Statement on Licensure Expectations and Requirements*, the P&P proposed the following recommendations to the CEAB:

1. That clause 8 be updated to reflect the following language:
Engineering science, engineering design, natural science, mathematics, and complementary studies curriculum content should be readily and easily identifiable through learning outcomes, learning activities and assessments attributable to each category in each course where they appear.

Rationale: Respondents suggested that the two proposed clauses be combined into a single statement. This new statement suggests that any distribution of AU's be supported by appropriate evidence.

2. That clause 9 be removed.

Rationale: In order to simplify the Interpretive Statement, and as the intent of the proposed wording for clause 9 has been incorporated in the final recommended wording of clause 8, it is felt that clause 9 is redundant and no longer required.

3. That the P&P explore the advisability of moving the content/intent of Appendix 3 (the *Interpretive Statement on Licensure Expectations and Requirements*), which refers to criteria 3.5.3 and 3.5.5, into the criteria (possibly in the introduction for criteria section 3.4).

Rationale: This appendix, though an interpretive statement, provides elements of requirements for the criteria in question. For transparency and equity, these elements should be included in the criteria themselves rather than considered an 'interpretation.'

- a. That if/when recommendation 3 is implemented, the term 'identifiable' in the proposed new wording for clause 8 as presented above (in 1) be updated to 'justifiable.'

Rationale: 'Identifiable' suggests to programs that they should seek to document AU counts; 'justifiable' makes this activity a requirement. As this is language in an interpretive statement, requirements cannot be stated if they are not explicit in the criteria. Should the content of this appendix be incorporated into the criteria proper, then the language can be updated to make it a requirement rather than a suggestion.

The following points were raised in the subsequent discussions:

- It was suggested that all interpretive statements be removed from the *CEAB Criteria and Procedures* to reduce confusion about the force of interpretive statements. Some stakeholders currently view interpretive statements as criteria. Separating the interpretive statements and the criteria may address this issue.
- It was noted that the P&P worked collaboratively with the Deans Liaison Committee on the proposed amendment and that several HEIs engaged in the consultation process.

MOTION:

"THAT, the CEAB accepts the recommendations of the Interpretive Statement on Licensure Expectations and Requirements Consultation Report."

Moved by P. Lafleur, seconded by P. Cyrus

Carried

Next steps:

- The 2021 CEAB Accreditation Criteria and Procedures book will be updated to reflect changes to the *Interpretive Statement on Licensure Expectations and Requirements*.

3155.3 ACCOUNTABILITY IN ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE UPDATE

R. Gosine, chair, provided a status update on the work of the Accountability in Accreditation committee:

- All members of the Committee (with the exception of the new members) were asked to extend their membership by a term of one year to oversee the preparation of the first report; a transition plan will be developed later in 2021 to limit the impact of committee member turnover in future years.
- The first data collection cycle was launched in June 2020 where the following groups were invited to complete their feedback forms:
 - Institutions who received a decision in June 2020
 - Regulators
 - Programs who received visits in 2020/2021
 - 2020/2021 visiting team members
 - Student leadership at institutions who received visits in 2020/2021
- Feedback has been slow to return to the Secretariat. This is assumed to be pandemic related. The Secretariat has sent several reminders to stakeholders to submit their feedback.
- Due to the deferral of the 2020/2021 accreditation cycle, the data collected this year will be limited. The report on the first cycle will still be published with contextual information explaining why it does not reflect a full data set.
 - The report will be compiled over the summer and will be presented to the CEAB at the September meeting.
- A workplan has been developed to guide report development and committee operations.

In subsequent discussions it was noted that approximately half the programs that received a decision in June 2020 and almost all visit team members from 2020-2021 visits have responded to their respective surveys.

Next steps:

- Updates on data collection will be presented at each CEAB meeting
- Regular updates on the initiative will be reported at each meeting of the Engineers Canada Board
- CEAB Secretariat to collect feedback and suggestions for improvement on the process throughout the data collection period (June 2020 – April 2021)
- The first report of the Accountability in Accreditation Committee will be presented to the CEAB in September 2021

3155.4 NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT

J. Card provided a status update on CEAB memberships:

Re-appointments

- All current CEAB members eligible for re-appointment were approved by the Engineers Canada Board at their May 28, 2021 meeting. These members include:
 - Suzelle Barrington, representative for Quebec (third term)
 - Emily Cheung, member-at-large (third term)
 - Ramesh Subramanian, representative for Ontario (second term)

New members

- The Engineers Canada approved the appointment of Dr. James K.W. Lee as member-at-large on the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board effective July 1, 2021.

ACTION ITEM:

- The secretariat to distribute the CEAB appointment letters during the week of June 7, 2021.

3155.5 DEFINITION OF ENGINEERING DESIGN TASK FORCE

J. Pieper, chair of the task force reported that the Definition of Engineering Design Task Force was recommending the adoption of a new, single definition of engineering design, and an interpretive statement (including examples) to provide further clarification on the intent of engineering design within the CEAB accreditation system. The language for both the proposed definition and interpretive statement were included in the meeting materials as Appendix 6.5a, section 4.

The following points were raised in the subsequent discussions:

- The proposed wording in the interpretive statement could contribute to the ongoing issue of interpretive statements being considered 'shadow criteria'. It was suggested that only the examples presented at the end of the report be included in the interpretive statement and that the rest of the content should be included in the criteria.
- It was noted that there is a need for a fulsome review of the criteria in order to reduce reliance on the interpretive statements.

MOTION:

"THAT, the CEAB accepts the recommendations of the report on the 2020 consultation of the Engineering Design Task Force and refers the matter to the Engineers Canada Board for final decision."

Moved by J. Pieper, seconded by E. Cheung

Carried with 1 abstention and 1 opposed

Next steps:

- The criteria change will be presented to the Engineers Canada Board at their October 1, 2021 meeting.
- Assuming the Engineers Canada Board approves the criteria change, the change will be implemented according to the timeframe recommended by the CEAB.

3155.6 CEAB TASK FORCE ON VIRTUAL VISITS

L. Benedicenti, chair of the task force, presented the group's final report to the CEAB to provide members with an overview of:

- COVID-19's impact on CEAB accreditation and the Task Force's mandate,
- The process of planning and executing the visits of the 2020/2021 accreditation cycle,
- The 2021/2022 [Guide for the Virtual Evaluation of an Engineering Program](#), and
- Recommendations for current and future considerations around virtual and in-person visits.

The following points were raised in the subsequent discussions:

- On recommendation number 8 (conducting exit interviews virtually even in an in-person visit) alternative wording was suggested: "That, following resumption of in-person visits, the exit interview **may** be conducted virtually **based on discussion between the visit chair and the dean/designated official.**"
- Members expressed concern about the scope of recommendation 3. Alternative wording was suggested: "That the CEAB consider asking HEIs ~~undergoing visits in the 2021/2022 accreditation cycle~~ to provide an accounting of planned and actual AU delivery counts."
- In the preamble to the recommendations, a member suggested that the "with regards to virtual visits" wording in the statement "The members of the Task Force make the following recommendations to the CEAB with regards to virtual visits" be removed. This change is reflective of the scope of the recommendations being made.
- A member expressed concern about the recommendations becoming official procedures. It was confirmed that the recommendations are meant to be used as a guide and that there is always an opportunity to modify guidelines. It was suggested that the motion be changed to "accepts the report" instead of the "accepts the recommendations".
- A member suggested that the *Guide for Virtual Evaluation of an Engineering Program* be reviewed following the 2021-2022 accreditation cycle for further improvements.
- It was suggested that the questions in the addendum of the Questionnaire section of the Guide be framed in the past tense. They are currently in the future tense.

MOTIONS:

"THAT, the CEAB accept the report of the Virtual Visit Task Force and directs the Policies and Procedures Committee to consider implementation plans where necessary."

Moved by L. Benedicenti, seconded by A. Stewart

Carried

"THAT, the CEAB approve the Guide for Virtual Evaluation of an Engineering Program for the 2021/2022 visit cycle."

Moved by L. Benedicenti, seconded by R. Subramanian

Carried

"THAT, the CEAB Task Force on Virtual Visits be stood down, with thanks."

Moved by L. Benedicenti, seconded by A. Stewart

Carried

Next steps:

- The 2021/2022 *Guide for Virtual Evaluation of an Engineering Program* will be:
 - Published on the Engineers Canada website
 - Circulated to all programs receiving visits in the 2021/2022 visit cycle
 - Circulated to all 2021/2022 visiting team chairs, for distribution to their teams
- The CEAB Secretariat will capture any feedback or suggestions for improvement to the *Guide* throughout the 2021/2022 visit cycle for future consideration.

3155.7 CEAB WORKING GROUP ON REQUIRED VISIT MATERIALS

P. Klink, chair of the working group, provided an update on the progress of the Required Visit Materials Working Group's consultation process. A consultation on the Group's report was executed.

Next steps:

- The Working Group will meet over the summer to review feedback, refine its recommendations, and prepare a final report for the CEAB's September meeting.

3155.8 CEAB TASK FORCE TO RESPOND TO THE ENGINEERS CANADA "30 BY 30" INITIATIVE

J. Pieper, chair of the working group, provided the group's final recommendations to the CEAB for consideration and requested direction on next steps, specifically if the CEAB would like the group to lead a consultation on the recommendations.

The following points were raised in the subsequent discussions:

- A member felt that the third question under recommendation 10 ("What is the level of availability [of counselling services] (i.e, first come first served, or are special considerations made to allow certain demographic groups (like women, LGBTQ+) to access the services first?") is inappropriate and ill-advised since institutions triage student's needs for counselling in order of need and level of distress. The member suggested asking if counsellors are adequately trained regarding equity, diversity, and inclusion issues. That recommendation number 16 (Composition of visiting teams) be listed under "Changes to CEAB procedures, policy and operations".

- Some members advocated for the CEAB to consult on all of the report's recommendations to ensure credibility. Some expressed concern that consulting on all recommendations is excessive, noting that internal processes and business of the CEAB does not require external consultation.
- It was noted that the EDC has expressed concerns regarding the report in the past. J. Pieper noted that there were two members on the working group that were nominated as representative of the EDC by that group.
- All institutions and all members of Engineering Deans Canada will be invited to participate in the consultation.
- Several members expressed discomfort on consulting on all recommendations as they are currently written. It was suggested that they be reviewed and further refined. Others felt this step was unnecessary.
- Members decided to defer the motion directing the P&P to develop an implementation plan for the recommendations that do not require consultation as it was decided that all recommendations would be within scope of the consultation.

MOTIONS:

"THAT, the CEAB accepts the CEAB 30 by 30 Working Group Report."

Moved by J. Pieper, seconded by E. Cheung

Carried

Motion number two was amended as follows:

"THAT, the CEAB directs the members of the Working Group to consult nationally on all recommendations in the report"

Moved by J. Pieper, seconded by E. Cheung

Carried with 7 opposed and 1 abstention

Next steps:

- The CEAB Secretariat will assist the Working Group in developing a consultation plan.
- An appropriate window for a consultation period will be identified, taking into consideration other Engineers Canada consultations.
- The Working Group will oversee the consultation.
- Updates on progress will be provided by the Working Group to the CEAB at its upcoming meetings.

3155.9 CEAB TASK FORCE TO REVIEW THE P&P COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE REPORT

P. Lafleur, chair of the working group, provided a brief update on the group's work.

The working group is exploring a distributed leadership model. This model is a departure from the current structure of the P&P but would allow more CEAB members to take on leadership roles. In this model, what is normally undertaken by the Chair and the Vice-Chair would be distributed across three 'leads' with specific portfolios (academics, regulatory and improvement processes). The CEAB Chair would assume the overall direction of the P&P and coordinate the work of the committee through the Leads. Selection of P&P members would be the responsibility

of the CEAB Executive Committee and volunteers would be chosen who meet the pre-established eligibility criteria.

Members of the Working Group continue to refine their proposal, taking into consideration the recommendation of the Engineers Canada Nominations Task Force, the operational flow of the CEAB, and the implications that could be a result of implementation of both models.

Next steps:

- The Working Group will finalize its report and present its recommendations at the September 2021 CEAB meeting.

3156 INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

3156.1 INTERNATIONAL ENGINEERING ALLIANCE MEETING

B. Dony provided a brief update on the upcoming International Engineering Alliance meetings to take place virtually June 20-25.

Engineers Canada will participate in workshops, forums, and closed sessions related to the agreements to which they are a signatory (Washington Accord, International Professional Engineers Agreement, and the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Engineers Agreement).

Washington Accord monitoring visit

Engineers Canada is due to receive a monitoring visit for ongoing signatory status. Originally scheduled to take place in November 2020, the visit will now take place in the Fall of 2021 due to ongoing restrictions related to the pandemic. As the 2021/2022 CEAB visit cycle will be conducted entirely virtually, the monitoring visit will also be conducted virtually. A monitoring team will observe the visits to the University of Ottawa (November 7-9) and to Université de Moncton (November 14-16). Translation and simultaneous interpretation will be arranged for the visit to Université de Moncton (at no additional cost to the institution).

Signatories will be presented with a *Logistics protocol for virtual accord reviews* document at the June IEA meeting. The protocol was developed using the insights provided by signatories on their virtual information sharing platform and during conferences and virtual meetings hosted by signatories during 2020 and 2021. If approved, Engineers Canada's virtual monitoring visit will follow the protocol.

In October, Engineering Deans Canada requested to have an active role in Engineers Canada's 2021 Washington Accord monitoring review. Engineers Canada awaits further information from the Washington Accord Chair on this request.

Next steps:

- B. Dony will report on the proceedings at the September CEAB meeting.

3156.2 WASHINGTON ACCORD DECISIONS – GENERAL TOPICS

M. Warken discussed the procedures to be followed during the Washington Accord decision deliberations.

It is part of the CEAB's mandate to "produce information needed for the Engineers Canada Board to make decisions on matters relating to engineering education and

accreditation both in Canada and in other countries”. CEAB members were assigned to the following review, the results of which will be shared with the Engineers Canada IEA meeting delegation.

3156.2.1 APPLICATION FOR SIGNATORY MEMBERSHIP

J. Pieper and P. Klink presented a recommendation on Acredita CI's application for signatory membership to the Washington Accord.

MOTION:

“That the Accreditation Board recommends that the Engineers Canada delegation to the Washington Accord support that, in accordance with Rule B.2.2.3 d), the signatories approve the establishment of a Verification Review team, comprising three Assessors who have not served as nominators and/or mentors of Acredita CI.”

Moved by P. Klink, seconded by J. Pieper

Carried

3157 NEW BUSINESS

3157.1 APPENDICES 10 AND 16 – PROCEDURES FOR FORMAL REVIEW OF AN ACCREDITATION BOARD DECISION TO DENY ACCREDITATION

The CEAB considered how the CEAB appeals process will work in light of recent changes to the Engineers Canada Board structure which eliminated the Engineers Canada Executive Committee. As such, P&P presented the following policy changes (additions are emphasized in **bold**, while deletions are noted in ~~strikethrough~~):

Appendix 10 (Confidentiality: policies and procedures)

Special note: The Formal Review Committee, established by **the Engineers Canada Board** ~~the Engineers Canada Executive Committee~~, will establish its own confidentiality policy. However, this policy must be within the spirit of the general policy statement unless otherwise required by subsequent legal action.

2.1 ... The Accreditation Board consists of 20 voting members appointed by the Engineers Canada Board, and a non-voting secretary. ~~A member of the Engineers Canada Executive Committee and a member of the Engineers Canada Board are ex-officio non-voting members of the Accreditation Board.~~

4.2 ... ~~The designated Engineers Canada Executive Committee representative and the member of the Engineers Canada Board of Directors designated to the Accreditation Board are ex-officio non-voting members of the Accreditation Board.~~

Appendix 16 (Procedures for formal review of an Accreditation Board decision to deny accreditation):

3. ... Ruling on such objections shall be made by **the Engineers Canada Board** ~~Engineers Canada Executive Committee~~, with such rulings to be final and binding.

5. ... The Review Committee is charged by **the Engineers Canada Board** ~~Executive Committee of Engineers Canada~~ to review the stated grounds for the formal review.

9. ... The Review Committee decides on its recommendation in an in-camera session following the hearing. The decision is made by a majority of members of the Review Committee. The Review Committee reports its recommendation in writing, together with a summary of the evidence and the reasons for the recommendation, to **the Engineers Canada Board** ~~Executive Committee of Engineers Canada~~ within 30 days of the conclusion of the hearing.

9.1.4 ... Therefore, the Review Committee would recommend to **Engineers Canada's Executive Committee** that there be no change in the action taken by the Accreditation Board regarding the accreditation of the program under review.

9.2.4 ... Therefore, the Review Committee would recommend to **the Engineers Canada Board** ~~Engineers Canada's Executive Committee~~ that the matter be sent back to the Accreditation Board and that the Accreditation Board be instructed to reconsider its decision to deny or terminate accreditation of the program under review, taking into account the finding of the Review Committee.

10. When **the Engineers Canada Board** ~~Engineers Canada's Executive Committee~~ sends the matter back to the Accreditation Board, the Accreditation Board reconsiders the accreditation decision, taking into account the Report of the Review Committee and any clarifying information it may require from that Committee or the institution.

MOTION:

***"THAT** the CEAB approves the proposed changes to Appendices 10 and 16 and refers the matter to the Engineers Canada Board for final decision."*

Moved by P. Lafleur, seconded by R. Subramanian

Carried

Next steps:

1. The Engineers Canada Board to consider the recommended policy changes at their October meeting.
2. If approved by the Engineers Canada Board, the changes will be integrated in the 2021 Accreditation Criteria and Procedures.

The CEAB workplan is created annually and reflects the requests for accreditation visits submitted by undergraduate engineering programs, priorities under Engineers Canada's strategic plan, and continual improvement initiatives informed by stakeholder feedback (including higher education institutions, Engineering Deans Canada, accreditation visiting team members, and CEAB members).

B. Dony provided an update on the workplan including:

- The draft 2022 CEAB workplan was presented for member feedback.
- The workplan includes the decisions resulting from the 2021/2022 visit cycle and considers any change management efforts required to implement 2021 workplan items.

Next steps:

- CEAB chair to update the draft workplan with any additional feedback from CEAB members.
- Secretary to circulate draft 2022 CEAB workplan to all regulators and to the Engineers Canada Board for feedback.
- Draft 2022 CEAB workplan presented to CEAB members at their September meeting; approval to submit to Engineers Canada Board for feedback at their October meeting.
- Final 2022 CEAB workplan presented to Engineers Canada Board for approval at their December meeting.

3157.3 ENGINEERS CANADA 2022-2024 STRATEGIC PLAN

S. Price provided a verbal report on the outcomes of the May 29, 2021 Annual Meeting of Members.

The Engineers Canada Board approved the 2022-2024 strategic plan. The strategic plan includes a strategic priority related to accreditation, which was assigned to the CEO for execution. The strategic plan is as follows:

Investigate and validate the purpose and scope of accreditation

What we will do

Major regulatory and educational changes have taken place since the creation of the Canadian engineering accreditation system in 1965. We will conduct a fundamental review of the accreditation process, investigate the best practices in engineering education, and collectively work with regulators and stakeholders to understand if there is a desire to adopt a new, national academic requirement for licensure as well as an updated purpose of accreditation. If there is, we will reconsider accreditation criteria and procedures.

How?

- Benchmark the Canadian engineering accreditation system
- Investigate a minimum academic requirement for licensure
- Re-examine the purpose of accreditation in the context of the overall licensure system
- Hire external expertise and convene pan-Canadian, multi-stakeholder advisory groups to inform all recommendations

What does success look like?

- All stakeholders understand the purpose of accreditation
- Regulators have an academic requirement for licensure, applicable to all

- Engineers Canada, including the CEAB and CEQB, have direction to implement systems aligned with the purpose and the academic requirement for licensure

3157.4 SEPTEMBER 2021 WORKSHOP TOPICS

B. Dony presented suggestions for September 2021 CEAB workshop topics. After discussion, it was agreed that the workshop topic would be: “An examination of the Accreditation Unit and the Learning Unit as conceived by the AU Task Force considering COVID-era changes to undergraduate education delivery methods.”

3157.5 COMMENTS FROM OBSERVERS

B. Dony invited the meeting observers to provide feedback on the meeting.

3158 OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was added to the agenda.

3159 FUTURE MEETINGS

Proposed future dates and locations for the Accreditation Board meetings were presented.

2021 meetings:

- Fall meeting and workshop: September 18 & 19 - virtual.

2022 meetings:

- Winter meeting and workshop: February 5 & 6 in Ottawa, ON.
- Spring meeting: June 3, 4 & 5 in Ottawa, ON. (note 2.5-3 days in duration)
- Fall meeting and workshop: September 17 & 18 in Vancouver, BC (tentative).

3160 SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

M. Warlen listed the summary of action items and are included in these minutes as appendix “A”.

3161 MEETING EVALUATION BY ACCREDITATION BOARD MEMBERS

3161.1 MEETING EVALUATIONS REPORT

Members were reminded to use the link to the electronic survey provided in the agenda to submit their evaluation.

3162 ADJOURNMENT

The 170th meeting of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board adjourned at 19:00 on Sunday, June 6, 2021.



Bob Dony, FEC, P.Eng.
Chair



Mya Warlen
Secretary

APPENDIX "A"

Minute number / meeting agenda number and subject title	Action item	Notes
3150.2 / 1.2 – Declaration of conflicts of interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and Procedures Committee to consider creating a CEAB addendum to the Engineers Canada’s Declaration of Conflicts of Interest policy to cover the CEAB’s specific situation. 	In Progress
3151.2 / 2.2 – Follow up on action items from the minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to send the link to the collaboration space’s “Resources” folder. 	Completed
3153.2 / 4.2 – Programs under development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to contact Humber College to advise them of criterion 3.6.2 which states: An accredited program must have the word “engineering” in its title. 	In Progress
3153.4 / 4.4 – Anticipated visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Policies and Procedures Committee to discuss the possibility of virtual visits when conducting single program visits. 	For discussion summer 2022
3155.4 / 6.4 – Nominating Committee report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The secretariat to distribute the CEAB appointment letters during the week of June 7, 2021. 	Completed