

**110th MEETING OF THE CANADIAN ENGINEERING QUALIFICATIONS BOARD
SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 2020
10:00 a.m.– 4:30 p.m. EDT**

Held via Webinar

AGENDA

	Agenda item	Presenter
1	Opening of the meeting	Ron LeBlanc
1.1	Call to order and introduction of attendees	Ron LeBlanc
1.2	Approval of the agenda <i>Motion: That the agenda for the 110th meeting of the Qualifications Board be approved as distributed.</i>	Ron LeBlanc
2	Approval of minutes of the previous meeting (attachment 2) <i>Motion: That the minutes from the 109th meeting of the Qualifications Board held on January 22nd, be approved as distributed.</i>	Ron LeBlanc
3	Review of action items from last meeting	Mélanie Ouellette
4	2021 priorities (attachments 4.1 – 4.11)	Ron LeBlanc
5	Committee and task force reports	Ron LeBlanc
5.1	Syllabus Committee	Amy Hsiao
5.1.1	Draft Biomedical engineering syllabus (attachment 5.1.1 A-B) <i>Motion: That the revised Biomedical engineering syllabus be approved and distributed on the public site.</i>	Amy Hsiao
5.1.2	Draft Basic Studies, Computer and Software engineering syllabi (attachments 5.1.2 A-D) <i>Motion: That the revised Basic Studies syllabus be approved and distributed on the public site.</i>	Amy Hsiao

	<i>Motion: That the revised Computer and Software engineering syllabi be approved and distributed on the public site.</i>	
5.2	Practice Committee	Frank George
5.3	Engineer-in-Training Committee	Margaret Anne Hodges
5.3.1	Revised Regulator guideline for the Engineer-in-Training Program (attachments 5.3.1 A-B)	Margaret Anne Hodges
	<i>Motion: That the revised Regulator guideline for the Engineer-in-Training Program be approved and distributed on the members-only site.</i>	
5.4	Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion	Margaret Anne Hodges
5.4.1	Terms of reference for the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion (attachments 5.4.1 A-B)	Margaret Anne Hodges
	<i>Motion: That the Terms of reference for the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion be approved as distributed.</i>	
5.5	Task Force on Software Engineering	Ian Sloman
5.5.1	Terms of reference for the Task Force on Software Engineering (attachments 5.5.1 A-B)	Ian Sloman
	<i>Motion: That the Terms of reference for the Task Force on Software Engineering be approved as distributed.</i>	
6	National groups	Ron LeBlanc
6.1	National Admissions Officials Group update	Kim King
6.2	National Discipline & Enforcement Officials Group update	Shawna Argue
6.3	National Practice Officials Group update	Kris Dove
6.4	Comments from the regulators	Ron LeBlanc
7	Information and discussion items from other Engineers Canada groups	Ron LeBlanc
7.1	Report from the Accreditation Board	Pierre Lafleur
7.2	Report on Engineers Canada Board activities and decisions	Christian Bellini Jeff Holm

8	Other Qualifications Board business	Ron LeBlanc
8.1	Vote on selected 2021 priorities	Ron LeBlanc
	<i>Motion: that the top 3 priorities chosen by QB be put on the 2021 priorities list and distributed for consultation.</i>	
8.2	Vice-Chair election process (attachment 8.2 A)	Christian Bellini
9	Items added to the agenda	Ron LeBlanc
10	<p>Future meetings</p> <p><i>The next CEQB Teleconference in Summer 2020 will be determined by Doodle poll.</i></p> <p><i>The next Fall CEQB meeting will be held in Vancouver, on September 21-22, 2020.</i></p> <p><i>A CEQB Teleconference call will be held on January 27, 2021.</i></p> <p><i>A Spring CEQB meeting will be held in Ottawa, on April 10-11, 2021.</i></p>	Ron LeBlanc
11	Review of action items of 110th Qualifications Board meeting	Mélanie Ouellette
12	Conclusion	Ron LeBlanc

MINUTES OF THE 110TH MEETING
1. Opening of the meeting

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1.1. Call to order and introduction of attendees

Canadian Engineering Qualifications Board Members	Ron LeBlanc, FEC, P.Eng.	Chair
	Mahmoud Mahmoud, PhD, FEC, P.Eng.	Vice-Chair
	Dennis Peters, PhD, FEC, SMIEEE, P.Eng.	Past Chair
	Frank Collins, FEC, P.Eng.	Atlantic Provinces Representative
	Nadia Lehoux, ing., PhD	Québec Representative
	Margaret Anne Hodges, FEC, FGC (Hon.), P.Eng., PMP	Member-at-Large Representative
	Amy Hsiao, FEC, PhD, MBA, P.Eng.	Atlantic Provinces Representative
	Samer Inchasi, P.Eng., PMP	Member-at-Large Representative
	Karen Savage, FEC, P.Eng.	British Columbia, Yukon Representative
	Ian Sloman, MEng, P.Eng.	Saskatchewan, Manitoba Representative
	Roydon Fraser, PhD, FEC, P.Eng.	Ontario Representative
	Frank George, FEC, FGC (Hon.), P.Eng.	Alberta, Northwest Territories and Nunavut Representative
	Qing Zhao, PhD, P.Eng.	Member-at-Large Representative
	Nikeetta Marshal, P.Eng.	Member-at-Large Representative
Engineers Canada Board appointees	Christian Bellini, FEC, P.Eng.	
	Jeff Holm, FEC, P.Eng., FGC (Hon.)	
Engineers Canada Board observer	Changiz Sadr, FEC, P.Eng., CISSP (GDPR), TOGAF	
Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board Representative	Pierre Lafleur, FIC ing.	
National Admissions Officials Group representative	Kimberly King, FEC (Hon.)	Engineers Yukon
National Practice Officials Group representative	Kris Dove, P.Eng., MBA	Engineers Nova Scotia
National Discipline and Enforcement Officials Group	Shawna Argue, MBA, FCSSE, FEC, FGC (Hon.), P.Eng.	APEGS
Engineers Canada staff	Stephanie Price, FEC, P.Eng., CAE	Executive Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
	Megan Falle	Manager, Regulatory Liaison

	Mya Warken	Manager, Accreditation and CEAB Secretary
	Mélanie Ouellette, MA, MBA	Manager, Qualifications
	Isabelle Flamand	Coordinator, Qualifications
Observers	Matthew Oliver, CD, P.Eng.	APEGA
	Greg Pope, M.Sc.	APEGA
	Gillian Pichler, FEC, P.Eng.	Engineers and Geoscientists BC
	Kate Sisk, MA, FEC (Hon.), FGC (Hon)	Engineers Geoscientists NB
	Claudia Shymko	Engineers Geoscientists Manitoba
	Pal Mann, P.Eng.	Engineers Nova Scotia
	John Runciman, PhD., P.Eng.	Biomedical Syllabus Committee Chair

1.2 Approval of the agenda

Motion: That the agenda of the 110th Meeting of the Qualifications Board be approved, moved by Dennis Peters and seconded by Ian Sloman. None were opposed. The agenda was approved.

It was stated that item 5.1.1 will be discussed after item 3.

2. Minutes

Motion: That the minutes from the 109th meeting of the Qualifications Board, held on January 22nd, be approved as distributed, moved by Dennis Peters and seconded by Mahmoud Mahmoud. None were opposed. The minutes were approved.

3. Review of action items from last meeting

	Action item	Assigned to	Status
109.1	Modify the Regulators Guideline on the Assessment of Engineering Work Experience Using Competency-Based Assessment and send it to the Engineers Canada Board for final approval.	Secretariat	Completed

Item 5.1.1 was discussed after item 3. of the agenda.

4. 2021 priorities (attachments 4.1 – 4.11)

Karen Savage, member of the CEQB, presented one proposed 2021 priority:

- New Public guideline on fitness to practice.

Amy Hsiao, member of the CEQB, presented two proposed 2021 priorities:

- New Public guideline on the assessment of the engineering workplace;
- New Public guideline and tools for the assessment and performance of engineering teams.

Roydon Fraser, member of the CEQB, presented seven proposed 2021 priorities:

- New Regulator guideline for exam developers;
- Revised Guideline on use of syllabi to include the role of design in CEQB academic assessments;
- New Regulator guideline on decreasing experience requirement;
- New Public guideline for engineers on whistle blowing;
- New Engineers Canada paper on natural scientists;
- New public/regulator guideline or Engineers Canada paper on globalization;
- New Engineers Canada paper on demand-side legislation for emerging areas of practice.

A CEQB member noted that there is statistically significant data suggesting that dementia is on the rise within the general population, but not specifically within the engineering profession. It was mentioned that other professions (e.g. health care providers) have legislation and guidelines on this topic, and that this type research should be done prior to Engineers Canada beginning work on a new Public guideline on fitness to practice. It was also mentioned that PEI's legislation does touch on fitness to practice. CEQB members acknowledged that fitness to practice is a matter that should be better addressed in the engineering profession. Another CEQB member stated that the timing of the development of documents should be taken into consideration as some could benefit from other guidelines or Engineers Canada papers.

It was clarified that the new Public guideline on the assessment of the engineering workplace and the new Public guideline and tools for the assessment and performance of engineering teams were suggested for the Practice committee to provide tools and ways to assess workplace and teamwork, but isn't entirely related to the regulation of the profession. Another CEQB member said that these guidelines could be linked to the regulation of the profession if it goes beyond the requirements for licensure and focusses on ensuring healthy engineering workplaces and teams management. A third CEQB member mentioned that these two guidelines are timely and that it is in the public interest to address these, especially since the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion has been struck.

A CEQB member suggested that the knowledge of experts should be leveraged during the development of certain proposed documents to provide input on broader topics (e.g. Regulator Guideline for exam developers, Engineers Canada paper on natural scientists).

It was suggested that the work on the new Public guideline for engineers on whistle blowing begin with an environmental scan.

A CEQB member mentioned that they see great value in developing the New Regulator guideline for

exam developers, as the strength of the examination process is currently being tested. A guideline to assist exam developers in creating consistent and verifiable evaluation content is valuable.

Regarding the revised Guideline on use of syllabi to include the role of design in CEQB academic assessments, the role of design is a broad question and its place in academic programs should be reviewed. It was explained that graduate attributes were not included in this proposal since they aren't used to for the academic assessment of applicants, but for the assessment of programs for accreditation.

A CEQB member asked whether the development of a Regulator Guideline for exam developers is work that PEO could take on as they are the ones developing and administering exams. It was clarified that OIQ also develops and administers exams. Although this is work that PEO may undertake in the future, some committee members agreed that a national perspective on the matter would be beneficial.

A CEQB member mentioned that whistle blowing and protection of whistle blowers are important topics. They have recently received attention in BC as being an important element to protect the public.

Matthew Oliver, Deputy Registrar & Chief Regulatory Officer, and Greg Pope, Director, Examinations, APEGA, presented a proposed An Evaluation of Assessment Processes for Engineering Licensure in Alberta: Implications for a National Entry-to-Practice Examination. APEGA is facing pressure from their provincial government to take action if the accreditation process doesn't improve. There is a lack of national standard in the assessment of the education content of applicants as the CEAB accreditation requirement differs from the examination syllabi. APEGA faces a high volume of applicants that come from different education systems around the world.

The geoscientists have a standard knowledge and experience requirements for all applicants that is used across Canada describe the foundational sciences that are required in order for a registrant to demonstrate an acceptable postsecondary academic record. Confirming education content using Mutual recognition agreements (MRAs) remaining challenging as there are different paths depending of the level of knowledge of programs. This creates a problem as regulators remain legally responsible and liable to ensure that applicants meet both academic and experience requirements. Given the different available assessment tools, the assessment of academic requirements is not uniform across all applicants, which is a fairness and consistency issue.

High stakes examinations (life changing) require more rigorous standards in their design, development, administration, scoring, reporting and maintenance. Concerns have been raised about the syllabi when benchmarking against the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Other professions use a psychometric exam for their entry-to-practice exam.

A QB member stated that there are issues with cut scores as the cut off is subjectively determined. He argued that a national standard is objective and that the syllabi are a national standard as they reflect CEAB programs. Base knowledge is not sufficient to be competent to practice. The US model has two

different exam steps. The QB should start by working on the Guideline for exam developers to educate individuals on the current system. The multiple choices approach for the National professional practice exam (NPPE) is more unfair than a written or scenario approach. Consistency does not necessarily lead to fairness and objectivity. Sameness is what should be sought not equivalency.

Another QB member mentioned that some individuals study to pass an exam, not necessarily for learning about the topic. The presenter responded that this is not the goal of high stakes exams, whereas they seek to determine if the individual possesses the knowledge, skills and abilities and is competent to practice. He also mentioned that a multiple questions exam is only one of the options for an entry-to-practice exam; other professions also offer rounds of exams to measure knowledge base and then more specific knowledge to measure competence to practice.

Another QB member commented that this topic was linked to an idea that was previously considered and tied in with the proposed Guideline on use of syllabi to include the role of design in CEQB academic assessments. With globalization, considering other options than the current system might help enhance the relevance of the profession.

Another QB member commented that one of the issues with the current system is that the program curriculum is not centrally controlled by the CEAB, unlike other professions. This situation accommodates an increasing number of disciplines and makes it challenging to define the exam content. The only prescriptive aspect are the AU categories, which were included in the new Guideline on the use of syllabi. Given that the current system has multiple disciplines, there is likely a need for multiple entry-to-practice exams. He also mentioned that ABET accredited schools select content so that students can pass the FE. The presenter responded that other professions face similar issues and are pulling away from having academic exams to focus on knowledge, abilities and skills to practice engineering. The QB acknowledge this statement. He also acknowledged that this is not an easy problem to solve and that other professions have faced this issue. This has yet to be determined by the proposed analysis.

An attendee voiced concerns about the fact that some CEAB applicants would not be able to pass the non-CEAB exams. She echoed concerns previously raised that students will study for the exam and that entrepreneurs would create businesses to help students pass the exams. While recognizing that the current system is not perfect, she expressed concerns that if a national exam is created to replace syllabi, exams are waived for some and not others, efforts would be put in a system that would end up being the same as the existing non-CEAB process. She mentioned that if a national exam be created, it should be applicable to both CEAB and no-CEAB applicants.

A QB member clarified that his concerns are more about the US PE model than the FE. The FE is not equivalent to a CEAB education. The difficulty in establishing a national exam is to capture depth of knowledge, as presented in discipline-specific syllabi. Another QB member stated that he understood APEGA's concerns for fairness. He stated that his understanding was that Competency-based assessment was going to replace academic exams. If they did not, he would be in favour of the same exam for both CEAB and non-CEAB applicants.

The other presenter clarified that APEGA is not pushing for the establishment of a national exam but an analysis of what it could look like, and if it is feasible. This should be undertaken by a national body. There are varying admission practices across the country and under the mobility agreement, regulators have to accept each other's members. The root of the problem is that there is a need to deal with this variation across regulators. Regulators are already using a psychometric exam as 7 of them already use the FE.

Items 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 and 6.4 were discussed after item 4. of the agenda.

5. Committee report (item 5.1.1 followed item 3 as per amendments made to the agenda)

Amy Hsiao, chair of the Syllabus Committee, presented.

5.1.1 Draft Biomedical engineering syllabus (attachment 5.1.1 A-B)

Since September, the Syllabus Committee sent the Biomedical engineering syllabus for consultation. Received feedback was consolidated, reviewed and integrated by the expert panel into the revised version. Responses to each comment have been disseminated. John Runciman, chair of the Biomedical engineering syllabus review committee, was present to answer questions regarding the revised document. The Syllabus Committee chair thanked the chair of the expert panel, as well as the rest of the members for their work in the revision of the syllabus.

Motion: That the revised Biomedical engineering syllabus be approved and distributed on the public site, moved by Amy Hsiao and seconded by Dennis Peters. None were opposed. The motion carried.

5.1.2 Draft Basic Studies, Computer and Software engineering syllabi (attachments 5.1.2 A-D)

Since September, the Syllabus Committee sent the Basic Studies, Computer and Software engineering syllabi for consultation. Received feedback was consolidated and no major changes were proposed. It is proposed that the Computer and Software engineering syllabi be included in the 2021 priorities for review.

Motion: That the revised Basic Studies syllabus be approved and distributed on the public site, moved by Amy Hsiao and seconded by Dennis Peters. None were opposed. The motion carried.

Motion: That the revised Computer and Software engineering syllabi be approved and distributed on the public site, moved by Amy Hsiao and seconded by Dennis Peters. Roydon Fraser was opposed. No one else was opposed. The motion carried.

A CEQB member stated that the "Discrete Mathematics" exams in the Computer and Software engineering syllabi should not be a "Group B" exam. It was clarified the Computer and Software syllabi

haven't been formally reviewed; therefore, it will be added to the 2021 Priorities.

5.2 Practice Committee

Frank George, chair of the Practice Committee, presented. Since September, the Committee sent the revised Public guideline on risk management for consultation. Received feedback was consolidated and is currently being reviewed by the contractor. A legal counsel will be hired to review the guideline before it is submitted to the CEQB for final approval at their September 2020 meeting.

5.3 Engineer-in-Training Committee

Margaret Anne Hodges, chair of the Engineer-in-Training Committee, presented. Since September, the committee sent the entrepreneurship website content for consultation. Given received feedback from the regulators, a decision was made to cease the work on the website material to address licensure of entrepreneurs.

5.3.1 Revised Regulator guideline for the Engineer-in-Training Program (attachments 5.3.1 A-B)

The committee updated the Guideline on Engineer-in-Training Program to include reference to competencies as per the NAOG's request. Given that the content is for regulators, it is proposed that it be changed to become a regulator guideline. Since only editorial changes are proposed, it is recommended that the edits be approved and that this revision of the guideline be treated as an administrative update. No comment on this proposed approach was received.

Motion: That the revised Regulator guideline for the Engineer-in-Training Program be approved and distributed on the members-only site, moved by Margaret Anne Hodges and seconded by Jeff Holm. None were opposed. The motion carried.

5.4 Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion

5.4.1 Terms of reference for the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion (attachments 5.4.1 A-B)

Margaret Anne Hodges, chair of the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion, presented. The Engineers Canada Board directed the CEQB to develop a Guideline for engineers and engineering firms in support of its strategic priority for 30 by 30. The task force was created in January 2020, and a contractor has been hired. The membership was approved by the CEQB Executive Committee during their meeting in March. A survey and consultation webinars will be held instead of a CEQB workshop. It is anticipated that the guideline be completed by Summer 2021.

Motion: That the Terms of reference for the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion be approved as distributed, moved by Margaret Anne Hodges and seconded by Amy Hsiao. None were opposed. The motion carried.

A CEQB member mentioned that the terms of reference are vague, and asked what the objectives of the task force is and for additional details on the contractor. It was clarified that the directives are to produce a guideline for engineers and engineering firms on the topic of diversity and inclusion, and that this effort would especially help small-medium size firms who have not had the benefit of addressing the challenges of attracting and retaining women in the profession. The guideline will provide them a better understanding of those issues and provide recommendations on how to address these issues. It was stated that the scope of this document is more defined than it usually is at this stage. Another CEQB suggested allowing the task force to provide input on the terms of reference before they are presented for approval. No specific edits were proposed to the Terms of reference.

The timelines of documents that are currently being developed or reviewed may be affected due to COVID-19, but since the CEQB has received clear direction for this guideline, the task force may still be able to meet their deadline. The survey, which is replacing the workshop, will enable the task force to reach out to engineers in firms who are facing these issues and gather more input. This survey will help determine the content of the guideline. The scope of the guideline will be further defined during the “general direction” stage of the consultation. The contractor hired by Engineers Canada to assist in developing the guideline is Denise MacLean, Ph.D.

5.5 Task Force on Software Engineering

5.5.1 Terms of reference for the Task Force on Software Engineering (attachments 5.5.1 A-B)

Ian Sloman, chair of the Task Force on Software Engineering, presented. The Discipline and Enforcement Officials Group requested that the CEQB update the Paper on Software Engineering to emphasize enforcement of software engineering titles, educate employers, and address misuse of the software engineer title. The task force was created in January 2020, and the membership was approved by the CEQB Executive Committee during their meeting in March. The revised document will be written by task force members and the Secretariat.

A CEQB member mentioned this could be an opportunity to pursue qualifying non-CEAB candidates in this field. Another CEQB member mentioned that this had been raised during the development of this document and it was decided that jurisdictions should refer to limited licenses as it is an option most of them offer. Candidates may also go through the non-CEAB process to obtain their full P.Eng. license.

Motion: That the Terms of reference for the Task Force on Software Engineering be approved as distributed moved by Ian Sloman, and seconded by Dennis Peters. None were opposed. The motion carried.

6. National groups

6.1 National Admissions Officials Group update

Kim King, the chair of the National Admissions Officials Group (NAOG), presented. The NAOG had two in-person meetings planned, one of which has already been cancelled and is being replaced by a series of webinars. The NAOG will have a cross-country discussion on admissions related complications related to COVID-19, and the response tactics of each regulator. In addition, an update will be provided from the CEAB regarding 2020 engineering graduates. A teleconference will be held to discuss issues brought up by Engineers Canada staff members. The NAOG's initiatives for 2020 include consultation on Engineers Canada admissions-related issues such as the CEAB "Definition of design working group report" and regulator's role in the annual measurement of the accreditation system, CEQB guidelines and Engineers Canada papers, and Engineers Canada services and tools (NMDB, IIDD, newcomers website, MRA's [international mobility work]). The NAOG is planning to formulate a small working group with other officials groups to discuss licensure of entrepreneurs. The group will also continue to discuss developments and promising practices in admissions. The Competency-Based Assessment system (CBA) is currently being used by five regulators, and four other regulators are using their own system. The NAOG has a working group which is working on the "Canadian environment competencies/working in Canada" seminar.

A CEQB member mentioned that the work done by the Engineer-in-Training Committee will be shared with the working group to discuss licensure of entrepreneurs, and that the committee looks forward to receiving recommendations as to how to move forward on this issue.

The NAOG has identified over a multi-year study 10 of the competencies in the Pan-Canadian Competencies Framework that must be demonstrated by all applicants, including CEAB graduates, in order to meet the Canadian environment experience requirement. In BC, applicants who do not meet the minimum score may be assigned the corresponding "working in Canada" seminar units. There are 4 units of 15 hours, bringing the total duration of the workshops to 60 hours. The 10 competencies have been incorporated into the CBA system. A comparison between the CBA system and the system used by four regulators showed that they are very similar. For this reason, it is not anticipated that those four regulators would adopt the CBA system. Since the experience requirement remains at 4 years, a study has not yet been conducting to determine the average duration of the CBA program for applicants.

6.2 National Discipline & Enforcement Officials Group update

Shawna Argue, chair of the National Discipline & Enforcement Officials Group (NDEOG), presented. The NDEOG will provide feedback to the CEQB on 2021 Priorities. Two teleconferences were held since September. At their next meeting, the NDEOG will discuss the sharing of regulator out-of-province lists, which some regulators may opt out of for privacy reasons. The NDEOG is also discussing changes to their Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that is set to be renewed this year. The group's annual in-person meeting, set to be held in June, has been cancelled due to COVID-19. The meeting would have

included regulator roundtables and discussions on current case volumes and activities; case history presentations; decision sharing and privacy legislation; discussions on software engineering, anonymous complaints, Crown immunity; and, a training session on investigative interviews. Timelines for the next meeting of the NDEOG will be determined during a teleconference next week.

6.3 National Practice Officials Group update

Kris Dove, member of the National Practice Officials Group (NPOG), presented. The NPOG held a teleconference on March 26 during which they shared updates on new standards and guidelines across jurisdictions. New information on COVID-19 is expected to be shared with the group (e.g. PEO Advisory Notice on Obligations and responsibilities of professional engineers and holders of limited licenses during the COVID-19 pandemic). During their meeting, NPOG also discussed CPD requirements; classes of licensure and postnominals (such as practising vs. non-practising, lifetime, and retired members), and the requirements for certificate of authorization/permit to practice. The NPOG has an upcoming teleconference on June 24 to provide feedback to the CEQB on 2021 Priorities, and an in-person meeting is planned for November 5-6.

6.4 Comments from the regulators

Representatives from the following engineering regulators provided updates to the CEQB:

- *Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists Saskatchewan*
- *Engineers Nova Scotia*
- *Engineers and Geoscientists New Brunswick*
- *Engineers Geoscientists Manitoba*
- *Engineers and Geoscientists British Columbia*
- *Engineers Yukon*

7. Information and discussion items from other Engineers Canada groups

7.1 Report from the Accreditation Board

The Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) has completed their 2019/2020 cycle (51 programs were evaluated at 13 institutions). The 2020/2021 cycle (58 programs at 13 institutions) may be affected by COVID-19 and next steps will be discussed at their next meeting. The CEAB has implemented the following new criteria, processes and tools: Criteria 3.4.4.1 and 3.4.4.4 (moved specific AUs from Interpretive statement to criteria); Appendix 1: Regulations for granting transfer credits for CEGEPs; Complaints Policy; and, Focus on Graduate Attribute/Continual Improvement process.

The CEAB has published two statements advising HEIs on significant impacts, including a small number of classes or individual labs cancelled, moving to distance learning, alternatives to letter grades, academic accommodation for final exams, and innovative alternatives to hands-on lab experiences.

In response to Engineers Canada's Strategic Priority on Accountability in Accreditation, the CEAB has

hired consultants in September 2019 and has developed a framework to assess effectiveness and transparency of accreditation development from September 2019 to March 2020, which includes input from a stakeholder survey and interviews. The CEAB also consulted the CEQB on this matter. The first measurement is set to begin in April 2020 until May 2021, and the first report is scheduled for Fall 2021.

The CEAB has also developed a paper on “Curriculum content measurement: Beyond the AU” and the consultation period closed on November 15. The CEAB recommended a reduction in minimum program AU (from 1,950 to 1,850) and it will be submitted to the Engineers Canada Board for approval. The CEAB approved the Engineering Design Task Force’s report for consultation in June 2019 and it published in Fall 2019. The consultation has been delayed due to COVID-19 impacts.

The CEAB’s upcoming workplan items include revamping the general visitor report template, developing appropriate ways within the accreditation process to incorporate the goals of the 30 by 30 initiative, reviewing onsite materials documentation requirements, and receiving the Washington Accord monitoring visit in Fall 2020. The CEAB is still using the current visitor database, but is working on a solution with an external vendor. It was also mentioned that the Engineering Design Task Force will provide a consultation report to all those who have provided feedback. Should further discussed be necessary, the CEAB will reach out to the CEQB in that regard.

A CEQB asked whether the Washington Accord establishes a standard within the profession. It was noted that in Appendix 1, under “Credit transfer”, the CEAB recognizes that the Washington Accord institutions are equivalent to the Canadian system. The document will be shared with the CEQB member. It was also clarified that the two statements that were issued in light of COVID-19 are to provided flexibility to HEIs, although most are expected to be completed their current terms.

A CEQB member asked whether the CEAB discussed removing criteria in the questionnaire and interpretation statements, and making it explicit within the main document. The specific AUs were recently moved to the criteria instead of the interpretative statement.

7.2 Report on Engineers Canada Board activities and decisions

Christian Bellini, an Engineers Canada Board appointee on the CEQB, presented. The last in-person meeting of the Engineers Canada Board was held in February 2020. On Tuesday, February 25, Engineers Canada hosted a strategic foresight workshop, which included participation by the regulator presidents, CEOs, Engineers Canada Board, and representation from the CEAB and CEQB. Participants discussed major trends, strategic risks and the vision, mission, and values of Engineers Canada. They identified proposed elements for an organizational vision and brainstormed potential strategic priorities for the 2022-2024 strategic plan. Input will be compiled and shared, and the vision and strategic priorities list will be refined at the Engineers Canada Board June workshop. Subsequently, a draft strategic plan will be consulted upon with regulators in the fall before being recommended by the Engineers Canada Board in February 2021 and by approved by the Members in May 2021.

The Board approved the proposed sub-strategy for *Operational imperative 8, fostering recognition of the value of the profession to society and sparking interest in the next generation of engineering professionals*, on recommendation of the CEO.

The Board discussed and approved the policy for assessments directors, committee chairs (including the CEQB chair), and of the Board itself, as well as the structure and content of the assessment surveys. There was some discussion on length of survey and the means by which the Board will address improvement opportunities where necessary. The Board’s next teleconference is scheduled for April 8, 2020, and the next in-person meeting is set for May 21-23, 2020.

The Governance Committee has highlighted that the name “Qualifications Board” may not be inclusive enough for their work on Practice issues and has asked that the CEQB considers changing its name to reflect this mandate. This is an issue that should be discussed by the CEQB by the end of the year.

8. Other Qualifications Board business

8.1 Vote on selected 2021 priorities

It was decided that CEQB members would vote for their top 3 priorities one by one. The National feasibility study for an entry to practice examination was not voted on as the Engineers Canada Board has directed the CEQB to conduct a consultation the National Admission Officials Group on the matter.

The results of the vote were:

Proposed priority	Number of votes
New Public guideline on fitness to practice	15
New Regulator guideline for exam developers	10
New Public guideline for engineers on whistle blowing	5
New Public guideline on the assessment of the engineering workplace	3
Revised Guideline on use of syllabi to include the role of design in CEQB academic assessments	3
New Engineers Canada paper on demand-side legislation for emerging areas of practice	3
New Public guideline and tools for the assessment and performance of engineering teams	2
New Regulator guideline on decreasing experience requirement	2
New public/regulator guideline or Engineers Canada paper on globalization	2
New Engineers Canada paper on natural scientists	0

A few CEQB members proposed to make changes to certain proposed priorities before the vote. It was recommended that amendments to the context of a priority requiring some adjustment be made during

the consultation stages as per the process that has been adopted by the CEQB. CEQB members were asked to vote on the priorities as they are presented. It was noted that CEQB members are encouraged to consult with their colleagues on their proposed priorities. This will be highlighted in the instructions circulated by the Secretariat when the consultation process begins in January. Voting results will be included in the consultation documents.

Motion: That the top 3 priorities chosen by QB be put on the 2021 priorities list and distributed for consultation, moved by Ron LeBlanc and seconded by Roydon Fraser. None were opposed. The motion carried.

8.2 Vice-Chair election process (attachment 8.2 A)

Christian Bellini, an Engineers Canada Board appointee on the CEQB, presented. The vice-chair election process, as per Engineers Canada Board Policy 6.10, has begun. The upcoming vice-chair position is from July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022 (a three-year commitment including the chair and past-chair positions). Applicants are required to receive approval from their regulator, and are asked to send the written confirmation of their regulator's support along with a filled declaration of interest form and CV to Mélanie by June 15, 2020.

9. Items added to the agenda

Due to COVID-19, there may be delays to CEQB timelines. The CEQB thanked Dennis Peters for his contributions to the CEQB for the past 12 years as his term is ending June 30, 2020. The CEQB also thanked Mélanie Ouellette for her work with the CEQB as she will be transitioning into a new role at Engineers Canada. Christian Bellini thanked the CEQB as his term as an Engineers Canada Board appointee on the CEQB is ending June 30, 2020.

10. Future meetings

The next CEQB Teleconference in Summer 2020 will be determined by Doodle poll.

The next Fall CEQB meeting will be held in Vancouver, on September 21-22, 2020.

A CEQB Teleconference will be held on January 27, 2021.

A Spring CEQB meeting will be held in Ottawa, on April 10-11, 2021.

11. Review of action items of 110th Qualifications Board meeting

Action item		Assigned to
110.1	Disseminate the basic studies, computer and software, and biomedical engineering syllabi on website	Secretariat
110.2	Disseminate the revised Regulator guideline for the Engineer-in-Training Program on the members-only site	Secretariat
110.3	Add the top 3 priorities chosen by QB and the National feasibility study for an entry to practice examination on the 2021 priorities list and send for consultation	Secretariat
110.4	Highlight in the instructions, circulated when the consultation process begins in January, that CEQB members are encouraged to consult with their colleagues on their proposed priorities	Secretariat

12. Conclusion

The meeting was concluded.

Prepared by: Isabelle Flamand, Coordinator, Qualifications on behalf of:



Ron LeBlanc, FEC, P.Eng.
Chair, Canadian Engineering
Qualifications Board



Mélanie Ouellette, MA, MBA
Secretary, Canadian Engineering
Qualifications Board