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CBA effective Jan 1, 2019

• Affects professional engineer applicants (i.e., engineers-in-training) and engineer-in-training applicants who are int’l grads and have experience review option to waive confirmatory exams (“Academic Review cases”)
• What constitutes acceptable engineering experience is not changing, we are better defining it
• More quantitative, precise, objective, transparent, consistent measuring system
• Increases the confidence of all who participate in the process: applicants, validators, employers, assessors
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Transition from the current system – pg 1

• Use the new CBA system if, as of Jan 1, 2019:
  – Current engineer-in-training, no experience reports received at APEGs in the paper-based system
  – Current engineer-in-training applicants who are int’l grads and have experience review option to waive confirmatory exams (“Academic Review cases”)
  – Applied to APEGs as engineer-in-training on or after Jan 1, 2019
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Transition from the current system – pg 2

• Given the choice to use the paper-based or the new CBA system if, as of Jan 1, 2019:
  – current engineer-in-training* and APEGs has received one or more experience reports in the paper-based system
  * and engineer-in-training applicants who are int’l grads and have experience review option to waive confirmatory exams (“Academic Review cases”)
  – however, you are encouraged and invited to switch to the new CBA system.
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Transition from the current system – pg 3

• If you have the choice and you choose to continue in the paper-based system, you do not need to submit the rest of your reports by Jan 1, 2019
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How to switch to CBA system

• Current engineers-in-training who have already submitted one or more reports in the paper-based system:
  – Copy and paste any info from those reports that you want to be considered into the appropriate spots in the online system
  – The ERC will not refer to your previously submitted, paper-based experience reports when doing your CBA assessment
  – Switching does not mean you have lost previously granted experience credit toward professional registration

What Is Competency-Based Assessment?

• Competencies are observable and measurable skills, knowledge, abilities, motivations or traits required for professional registration

• Demonstrated through the actions and behaviours of the applicant

Why we assess experience

• Prior to being granted a licence, must demonstrate ability to practice engineering
• The onus is on the applicant to provide evidence that they possess, through experience, the capability to practice engineering at a professional level
• Self-regulation: peer review system
  – Put in your best effort

Other requirements (unchanged)

• 4 years* of experience minimum required
  – Tallied from the brief, chronological Employment History Table in the online system
• Minimum 1 year in a Cdn or equivalent-to-Cdn environment *
  – *exception - engineer-in-training applicants who are int'l grad and have experience review option to waive confirmatory exams (‘Academic Review cases’)
• Maximum 3 years credit for int’l and grad studies combined (Cdn grad studies does not count for the Cdn experience requirement)

Eligible experience (unchanged) – pg 1

• All post-bachelors experience is eligible
• Up to 1 year of pre-grad
  – From after half of degree completed
  – Close professional oversight required
  – Technologist experience prior to completing bachelor degree

Eligible experience (unchanged) – pg 2

• Up to 24 months for graduate studies:
  – 12 months for thesis-based Masters (M.Sc.)
  – 24 months for PhD
  • 24 months only if went straight from bachelor program into PhD program
  • Normally 12 months is granted because most people do a Masters
  – Enter graduate studies as a period of employment in the Employment History table
Eligible experience (unchanged) – pg 3

- Engineering work while doing graduates studies including:
  - Teaching Assistant / Research Assistant work not related to your M.Sc/PhD thesis or M.Eng. project.
  - Concurrent employment outside the university setting
  - entered as separate employment periods in the Employment History even though the time periods might overlap

Eligible experience (unchanged) – pg 4

- Teaching of engineering
  - include the applicable content of what you taught in order to demonstrate a competency
  - include the name of the course you taught and details on the applicable part of the course that fulfills the competency and how that content is applied in a real-world situation (the outcome
  - See the Guide for more detail...

CBA Framework

- 34 competencies
  - 7 categories
  - 1 example required per competency chosen from any of your past experience. Each passed once.
- Indicators for each competency - guidance on example content that will demonstrate the competency
- Rating scale 0-5
- Interim submission
- Final submission

Competency Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category name</th>
<th># of competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Technical competence</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project and financial management</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Team effectiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Professional accountability</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social, economic, environmental and sustainability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personal Continuing Professional Development (CPD)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competency Rating Scale – p1

- 6 levels of competence (0-5)
- Minimum rating of 1 for each competency individually to pass it, plus:
- Minimum average of either 2 or 3 for each category, depending on the category

Competency Categories – Min. Avg. Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category name</th>
<th>Min. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Technical competence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project and financial management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Team effectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Professional accountability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social, economic, environmental and sustainability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personal Continuing Professional Development (CPD)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Competency Rating Scale – p2**

- Competency Rating Scale (condensed):
  - 0 – little or no exposure to the competency
  - 1 – general appreciation and awareness
  - 2 – knowledge and understanding of objectives, uses standard engineering methods, limited scope and complexity
  - 3 – moderate scope and complexity
  - 4 – responsible, varied assignments, working at a professional level
  - 5 – mature professional level, independent

**Competency Example**

- Technical competency 1.4:
  “Apply engineering knowledge to design solutions.”

- Indicators (for guidance only. Just one actual example required):
  1. Prepare technical specifications
  2. Demonstrate use of theory and calculations to arrive at solutions
  3. Demonstrate the development of a unique design solution which could not be accomplished with a standard design solution

*Note: the same project can be used several times for various competency examples*

**Competency Example Components**

- Situation
  - A brief overview of a specific situation or problem

- Action
  - Actions taken in the situation, including engineering judgments made or solutions found.
  - Typically the longest portion, has most of the details

- Outcome
  - The impact that your actions, solutions or judgments generated

**Validators – pg 1**

- Are normally the supervisors, whether they are a professional or not (P.Eng., P.Geo., Engineering Licensee, Geoscience Licensee or equivalent)
- With prior APEGS approval, may also be colleagues, clients or consultants with first-hand knowledge of the work experience
  - At least one Validator must be a direct supervisor and share your discipline of practice
- A minimum of four individuals who verify and provide feedback on the experience *exception “Academic Review cases”*

**Validators – pg 2**

- Minimum of two must be P.Eng., P.Geo., Engineering Licensee, Geoscience Licensee (or equivalent) *exception “Academic Review cases”*
- You need one validation per competency
  - One Validator can validate (verify) multiple competencies
- Combined, the Validators’ first-hand knowledge covers as much of the experience as possible but a minimum of 4 yrs *exception – 5 yrs for “Academic Review cases”*

*Academic Review cases who do not meet the Validator requirements will have to do so before being approved as a professional engineer*

**Validators – pg 3**

- Validators who verify specific competency examples must have direct personal and professional knowledge of that experience
- Some Validators may not be given specific competencies to verify but provide input in the overall feedback section only
  - For example, co-op work term supervisors - allows them to comment on and confirm the employment occurred
Validators – pg 4

• Not required in CBA (paper-based system only): P.Eng./P.Geo. mentor when the supervisor is not a P.Eng. (or equivalent)
• Side note: Validator feedback will also serve as references for your P.Eng. application (3 required)
  – Include their names on your P.Eng. application (separate from the CBA system)
  – Validators from the CBA system who you nominate as references will not be contacted again
  – References not included in your CBA submission will be emailed a reference form directly from APEGs staff

Academic Review Cases – special note

• Recap: “Academic Review Cases” are engineer-in-training applicants who are int’l grad and have been given the experience review option to waive confirmatory exams
• After you are approved as an engineer-in-training, you will be informed in writing of any experience requirements remaining in order to become a professional engineer, if anything
  – May include the remaining Canadian or equivalent-to-Canadian experience (12 months required) and/or the remainder of the Validators that you need (four minimum, two being professional engineers or equivalent)
• You will be allowed to update that information in the online CBA system once you have achieved those things.
  – Email APEGs with your request on what you want “opened up” in the online CBA system to update, when the time comes

Online submission – New!

• “Engineering Competency Assessment System”
  – https://competencyassessment.ca
• Developed by Engineers & Geoscientists BC for use by other regulators in Canada
• APEGs applicants are managed directly by APEGs (Eng&GeoBC is our software provider)
• Create an account, use APEGs registration / file #
• Account verified directly with APEGs

Engineering Competency Assessment System

Online Submission - Process

1. Engineer-in-Training (or int’l grad applicant) enters employment history, validator info, competency examples, self-rating
   – Selects “Submit”, validators receive automatic email with a link
2. Validators rate each example, insert comments, answer additional feedback questions
   – Option to provide feedback to the applicant and/or recommend edits
   – Comments and ratings are only visible to Assessors and APEGs staff
3. APEGs staff automatically notified that all entries are validated, then assigns Assessors
4. Assessors from Experience Review Committee (ERC) enter comments and ratings

Interim Submission*

• At approximately the two years of experience mark (including one year of pre-grad experience, if applicable)
• Benefits the applicant
  – Ensures acceptable experience (feedback from ERC)
  – Ensures correct writing style and type of information required
  – PREVENTS RE-SUBMISSIONS – more likely if no interim submission done
  – Prevent delay in professional registration
• Benefits Validators and Assessors
  – RE-SUBMISSIONS MEAN RE-WORK FOR VALIDATORS AND ASSESSORS
**Interim Submission** – How To

- Complete 3 competency entries, at least one of which is from Category 1 - Technical Competence
- The applicant clicks Submit for the online system to send notice to the validator(s) that the completed competencies are ready for validation
  - The system allows for validator feedback to the applicant until there is agreement between the two of you
- Applicant notifies APEGS by email that they have an interim submission ready. **NOTE**: this step is not currently automatic in the system for interim submissions

*exception - not required for “Academic Review cases”

---

**Interim Submission** – What ifs, pg 1

- If I have a better example for my final submission than the one I entered for my interim submission, can I redo that competency?  
  - Yes. You would email APEGS staff and tell us the specific competencies you want re-opened. Once complete, they would be sent for re-validation by the system as normal.
  - However, **if you passed that competency already, it’s not necessary to redo it even if you have a better example later.**

---

**Interim Submission** – What ifs, pg 2

- If I didn’t do an interim submission at the two year mark, can I still do an interim submission any time after that?  
  - Yes and it is highly recommended. An interim submission can still be done at any time prior to completing all of your competency entries to confirm you are writing them correctly
  - This also accommodates applicants who apply to APEGS with more than 4 years of experience

---

**Tips** – pg 1

- **Specific** descriptions of your work
- **Identify your role** – first person singular (“I” followed by action you took)
- Do not use general, vague statements that do not refer to specific projects and the work you did
- If confidentiality of a project is required, substitute project names and locations with surrogate names (for example, Project X located in Town Q) as long as the Validator knows which project you’re referring to

---

**Tips** – pg 2

- **Red flag words** (not specific enough in identifying the work you did personally):
  - assisted, involved with, participated or similar general references to your work because these are not
- Use **point form**

---

**Sample Actions** – not passed

- **Determined** (who determined?) the scope of proposed HVAC projects and estimated corresponding energy loads to confirm the projects were within existing system capacity and wouldn’t cause negative effects from the technological point of view.
  - No specifics, no picture formed in the mind of the Assessor
- **I installed** (probably not!) various new facilities on diverse existing HVAC/boiler systems. Through these projects, I obtained hands-on work experience and solid background for my future engineering work.
  - No specifics, no picture formed in the mind of the Assessor
  - The last sentence is fluff, no contributory information
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Competencies not passed – what happens

• An assessment by 2 Re-Assessors is automatic prior to the decision being confirmed
• Applicants are always given the chance to re-submit
  – Details of the concerns are provided
  – Most often the applicant did an unacceptable job of reporting an acceptable example
• Possible results upon re-assessment:
  – a) the competency is accepted, or
  – b) the applicant will have to use another example from other work experience, or
  – c) gain additional experience to satisfactorily complete a Competency Category

Role of Supervisor (Validator)

• Guide the development of the applicant into a technically capable professional
• Convey their understanding of the relationship with the employer/client, the professional Association and society
• Give fair and professional criticism when warranted (an obligation under Code of Ethics)
• Be ethical, fair and impartial (even if there is a personality conflict)
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Role of Supervisor (Validator), cont’d

• Employers are encouraged to offer a full range and progression in responsibilities so experience and exposure is gained in all areas
• Submission review and sign off (via personal login)
• Include comments please! Comments are not visible to the applicant (there is areas for feedback to the applicant though, that are separate)
• Suggestions for improvement are facilitated through the online system. Experience writing is a learning opportunity too

Role of Supervisor (Validator), cont’d

Comments might include things like:

• The impact the engineer-in-training had on the organization and the people involved
• Further detail the engineer-in-training missed (however engineer-in-training ideally adds that detail themselves)

Role of Supervisor (Validator), cont’d

• Must be registered as a member-in-training in good standing
  – Also need this in order for APEGs to assess experience*
• Interim CBA submission submitted to APEGs completed in full (does not have to be approved yet) by the PPE application deadline

*exception – “Academic Review cases”
For full details on CBA:

- This presentation does not cover everything you need to know for a successful CBA submission.
- Refer to the Competency Assessment Guide on www.apegs.ca under: Apply, Work Experience Reporting
- Engineering Competency Assessment System: https://competencyassessment.ca

Questions