

Evaluation of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors Fair Registration Practices Code

The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors (AOLS) was established in 1892. It is a self-governing association, responsible for the licensing and governance of professional land surveyors, in accordance with the Surveyors Act. As with all self-governing professions, the AOLS has a responsibility to ensure that the public interest is paramount. Section 2(2) of the Surveyors Act states:

"The principal object of the Association is to regulate the practice of professional land surveying and to govern its members and holders of certificates of authorization in accordance with this Act, the regulations and the by-laws in order that the public interest may be served and protected."

The AOLS has contracted with Professional Testing Inc. (a professional credentialing examination development and maintenance provider offering psychometric and measurement services to professional bodies) to conduct a fairness review of the registered Ontario Land Surveyor (OLS) and Ontario Land Information Professional (OLIP).

A draft report was initially submitted on March 9, 2021. Subsequent to the draft report, interviews were conducted with:

- Mel Truchon (AERC Junior Member) – Interview conducted March 23, 2021
- Mike Chapman (AERC Consultant) – Interview conducted March 23, 2021
- Keven Wahba (Registrar) – Interview conducted March 24, 2021
- Andy Shelp (AERC Senior Member) – Interview conducted March 24, 2021
- Al Buckle (AERC Chair) – Interview conducted March 25, 2021

This report was revised after the interviews and this report is now submitted as a final report of findings.

Two recommendations related to the inter-rater reliability of oral examiners and an appeals process for failed candidates of the oral exam are provided at the end of the report and at the request of persons interviewed.

Professional Testing has conducted a thorough review and reports the following:

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
1. A regulated professional has a duty to provide registration practices that are transparent , objective, impartial and fair. (2006, c.31, s.6)	<p>AOLS's registration practices are transparent. Information may be obtained about the process from the website here: Become An OLS - AOLS The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors</p> <p>There is a candidate handbook available online here: ait-aols-handbook---20201116.pdf</p> <p>All processes are clearly described in policies and procedures and presented in a transparent manner on the website.</p>	AOLS's registration practices are transparent.

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
	<p>Professionals may become a licensed member to practice cadastral (legal) surveying or may hold a Certificate of Registration allowing them to practice disciplines of surveying other than cadastral surveys including Geodesy, Geographic Information Management, Hydrography and Photogrammetry.</p> <p>AOLS maintains a publicly available disability policy.</p>	
<p>2. A regulated professional has a duty to provide registration practices that are transparent, objective, impartial and fair. (2006, c.31, s.6)</p>	<p>The process of becoming a registered Ontario Land Surveyor (OLS) or an Ontario Land Information Professional (OLIP involves providing evidence of meeting the academic requirements, meet the articling requirements, and passing the appropriate and relevant examinations.</p> <p>Areas for review relative to Objectivity, Impartiality and Fairness include the application process and review of pre-requisites, the examination process (both written and oral) and the articling process. Each is further reviewed below.</p>	<p>Each of these areas are further explored below.</p>
<p>3. Objectivity, impartiality and fairness of Application process.</p>	<p>The first step for all candidates for membership is to apply to the Association (to the Registrar) for a detailed evaluation of their post-secondary education and experience.</p> <p>Professional membership in the Association requires completion of a baccalaureate level program in professional surveying (often referred to as Geomatics), approved by the Association’s Academic and Experience Requirements Committee (AERC), or a course that is in the opinion of the AERC equal in content and level of difficulty, or experience and knowledge that provides equivalent competencies to such an academic program.</p> <p>A detailed description of the AOLS academic requirements is available online in a table. Additionally, Program information on existing professional surveying programs in Canada is available online. There are written policies and procedures for the timeline to review applications—there is a manual with policies and procedures. The review assignments align with quarterly meetings.</p> <p>Candidates submit their application for review of their educational requirements through an academic education evaluation form and after submitting the fee, transcripts and resume, academic evaluations are conducted by an assessor approved by the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee (AERC).</p> <p>Approved courses are determined by AOLS; the Canadian Board of Professional Landscapers (CBPL) has a process AOLS affiliates with, which is a recognized entity with approved courses</p>	<p>The application process appears to be objective, impartial and fair.</p> <p>However, the following weaknesses were identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The requirements used by the consultant who reviews the applications for academic courses appears to be slightly subjective. Despite the expertise of the current consultant (university faculty familiar with courses) who reports he uses a template, there is no formal documentation of the process. To improve objectivity and to facilitate another consultant conducting reviews in the event something should

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
	<p>for articling. AOLS aligns with this. Relationship between required courses and the job—e.g. hydrography is now required so provinces can recognize exams and provide mobility.</p> <p>In 2014 AOLS went through a process to determine equivalency for courses (Al Buckle was one of the participants). Mark Truchon convened the group to look at the existing requirements, changes such as technology replacing geodesic astronomy; GNSS/GPS now; digital cameras, UAVs, laser scanning, so time to take a fresh look at the requirements. Compared to the UK, US, Germany and Australia, and came up with the list.</p> <p>M. Chapman reviews the credentials (degrees, courses) within the application against the required academic component, and there is a template he uses that has a list of titles, competency descriptions, geomatics completed at institutions to make sure they match the requirements surveyors should have. Decisions of substitution and equivalency are based on the course syllabus and course content.</p> <p>After the student applies, it is handed to Lena Kassabian. The student submits official transcripts, course descriptions, resume, details about themselves, equivalency if it is a foreign degree (WEST service), certificates of equivalency, and then M. Chapman receives the entire package to review.</p> <p>M. Chapman prepares a preliminary assessment, sends to student, and communicates with applicant. Applicant can submit additional information. M. Chapman works diligently to avoid appeals as much as possible, and to be up front. Pre-COVID, students were interviewed.</p> <p>The preliminary assessment results in few appeals, only one since they started this. Appeal was resolved, and student completed the required courses.</p> <p>M. Chapman maps assessment to the requirements for AOLS; this list of required courses is sent to the applicant. Occasionally, the applicant is asked to submit additional material, course descriptions, etc. A high percentage of applicants are from overseas and have a hard time obtaining their records.</p> <p>Evaluations are then reviewed and approved by the AERC during the next quarterly meeting of the AERC. Each candidate is assessed on an individual basis by comparing the content of their completed courses with the content of the AOLS required subjects, and a list of approved courses required to complete the AOLS requirements is provided to the candidate. AERC reviews the file and if it passes motion to approve articling candidate, the</p>	<p>happen to the one consultant conducting all of the reviews, it is recommended that the process used to evaluate courses (especially those needing equivalence determined) be documented and detailed. Descriptions of how the course outlines and content are used to determine equivalency should be documented.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Description of the qualifications of the consultant(s) should be provided together with evidence the consultant(s) meet the requirements. It was reported that training has been provided in the past by York University. This should be documented. 3. It was reported that AOLS went through a process in 2014 to establish the course requirements and course equivalency. A few of the interviewees were familiar with this event and one participated. This process should be redone on a regular basis and course requirements updated. This process should be documented. 4. Candidates requesting to substitute courses are required to submit the

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
	<p>articling process/period occurs with field work and office work followed by the statutes exams and professional exams. AERC makes sure candidates complete the work and are eligible for the exams.</p> <p>Detailed minutes are kept of all AERC Meetings. A review of the minutes shows the AERC reviewing the recommendations of the “consultant” and noting the courses needed by each applicant to enter the process. Appeals information is provided.</p> <p>The entire process is all documented in a digital file.</p> <p>Appeals are possible at various points during the process. If a candidate wants to appeal a course, the candidate submits an application for appeal, the reason, and can provide an explanation, additional information, if candidate disagrees the candidate can appeal but might not be successful. AERC sees some of the appeals cases; Mel has not seen one for equivalency as Mike does a good job guiding candidates.</p>	<p>proposed course and a detailed course description to the Registrar for approval before registering for that course. Approval will be based on whether the proposed course contains substantially the same material and at an academic level substantially the same as the approved course. The consultant reported he uses his professional judgement to determine substantial similarity. It is recommended this process be documented with details sufficient for another person to perform the activity.</p> <p>5. Candidates may request an appeal of denials of substitute courses, however the reasons for upholding the denial (following the appeals process) do not appear to be communicated to the applicant. Template letters verified this. See c. 31,s 9; it does not address the reasons for failed appeal.</p>
<p>4. Objectivity, impartiality and fairness of the <u>articling requirements</u>.</p>	<p>“Articles” is an agreement respecting training and service between a member of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors (Articling Surveyor) and a student. The requirements for entering into and completing articles are defined in Section 23 of Regulation 1026 under the Surveyors Act. Applications for articles are considered at each quarterly meeting of the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee. The procedures and forms required for articling applications are available on the AOLS website, or by contacting the AOLS directly.</p>	<p>The articling process appears to be objective, impartial and fair.</p> <p>The following weaknesses were identified:</p> <p>1. A conflict-of-interest policy should be developed to</p>

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
	<p>Once a candidate has received his academic evaluation and has three or less courses remaining to complete, he can apply to article under an Ontario Land Surveyor. The Surveyors Act requires that all candidates for membership must have obtained a minimum of 1-1/2 years of training and experience in professional land surveying to the satisfaction of the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee. This is done by means of an Articling Contract with an Ontario Land Surveyor/Ontario Land Information Professional. Surveyors will normally only enter into Articling Contracts with their employees.</p> <p>The articling process is publicly described in the articling student handbook available on AOLS's website. Policies and procedures associated with articling are clearly defined in the AERC policy manual. The AERC assigns a monitor from the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee and ensures there are no conflicts of interest when assigning a monitor per their AERC policy manual.</p> <p>Any reductions in the articling experience follow a detailed procedure that includes impartial review.</p> <p>Businesses where candidates article are determined by the student, who is looking for the opportunity. Business needs to have a license for 5 years. Need a good working relationship with articling surveyor.</p> <p>Conflict-of-interest (COI) is not looked at by student and pairing organization; there are other COI considerations. With person supervising, COI has not been looked at. There is a monitor, but not between articling surveyor and student. There is no consideration of conflict-of-interest; some students have articulated with family members. Being a professional, and following the Code mitigates COI. It's up to the supervising surveyor to give the student the appropriate experience. The requirement of a supervising surveyor is a minimum of 4 years' experience and being in good standing with AOLS.</p> <p>Training for the articling surveyor is provided in a workshop. There is a candidate manual, but it may not include training on completing the forms. Articling can be done in 1.5 years and must be completed in 4 years. Candidate typically stays with the same articling surveyor, but there can be movement to achieve all relevant experience. Presentation slides from the workshop are presented on the website here: https://www.aols.org/site_files/content/pages/membership/becoming_an_ols/articling/2019-02-13-articling-presentation.pdf.</p>	<p>strengthen the articling process. Policies regarding conflicts of interest would ensure the objectivity, impartiality and fairness of the articling process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There is a workshop that the articling students attend as well as the supervisors. Presentation slides are available and documented. 3. Instructions for the supervising surveyor for using the articling candidate assessment forms should be developed. Instructions should be developed to ensure a consistent and fair evaluation of the candidate. This would strengthen the articling process. 4. It was suggested that the role the AOLS Monitor plays should be increased and made more visible. Some candidates may not even know who their monitor is or what role they play. They may not know they can reach out to their monitor if needed.

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
	<p>Objectivity, impartiality and fairness is assured through monitoring the process to make sure the student is progressing through essential areas of knowledge; not much is done in the way of checking assignments (articling surveyor is responsible). The tests are a check. Student is paid during articling. Articling supervisor is not paid other than their own employment. Benefit of being a supervisor is “prestigious,” not financial incentive; opportunity to grow business is a benefit. Firm has the most to benefit. People tend to stay at the really good firms; others leave once they obtain their commission.</p> <p>Getting at the value of the experience—in the past, the process was more onerous; it has been simplified to get people through the process; there is a trust factor, but also consequences if done improperly.</p> <p>Candidates don’t fail the process; they may be remediated with more courses or time in the process, or they fail the exams. Candidates struggling can sit out and try again</p>	
5. Objectivity, impartiality and fairness of the Examination Process.	Once the term of articles and the statutes exam have been completed, the articling student is required, as a final step, to pass a professional entrance examination which consists of a written test and an oral test, which is held in front of a panel of two Assistants and one Member of the AERC. Examinations are offered twice per year in May and November.	Objectivity, impartiality and fairness in examinations involves review of both the development of the written and oral examinations and the process for administering and scoring the examinations. The examination processes will be further explored in the following sections.
6. Objectivity, impartiality and fairness of the Written Examination Process.	<p>There are 4 examinations the candidate must pass (Plan check, statutory, written and oral).</p> <p>The Academic and Experience Requirements Committee creates a new Professional written examination for each sitting. It may be prepared using questions from the existing repository of questions as well as some new questions. This repository is maintained by the Registrar, who updates it with any new questions as they are provided by the AERC. Following each exam sitting the Registrar updates the statistics in the repository for each question used on that examination, including the average mark obtained, the range of marks and the number of students who wrote the exam. The repository is reviewed by the AERC at least every two years and updated as appropriate.</p> <p>The written professional examination papers are prepared by two members of the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee, to be chosen at the meeting immediately preceding the May and November examinations.</p>	<p>The written examination process appears to be objective impartial and fair.</p> <p>The process could be strengthened by the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AOLS should have an examination blueprint that clearly specifies the number of questions from each content area to ensure the examinations are equivalent between various writings of the exam. Questions should not be completely randomly

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
	<p>The draft examination is prepared using questions selected from the Professional Written Examination Repository of Questions as well as a maximum of two new questions prepared by the members setting the examination.</p> <p>The examination consists of approximately 10 questions, having a total value of approximately 100 marks.</p> <p>The examination tests the student’s knowledge regarding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The statutes and bylaws by which the Association is governed; 2) Professional ethics as it relates to his attitude in relation to the client, other members of the Association, citizens of the community; 3) General business practice regarding the general administration and functions of a survey office including business law; 4) Survey Law; and, 5) Other matters under the purview of a surveyor in Ontario. <p>The draft examination will be reviewed by the Registrar and the Chair of the AERC to ensure that it maintains fairness and equity in content and level of difficulty.</p> <p>The Statutes Examination is marked by two AERC assistants or Members and the Professional Written Examination is marked by one AERC Member and one AERC Assistant or a second AERC Member who use a response guideline showing the expected responses. The resulting marks are averaged; and where the marks for individual questions differ by more than 20% of the value of the question and where the student’s re-mark could determine whether the student passes or fails, the marked answer(s) are reviewed by a panel of two AERC members and the resulting mark substituted for the average mark for that question</p>	<p>selected for each exam. They should be selected based on matching the prescribed content outline and also by looking at the difficulty of the items.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There should be a documented process as to how the marks per question are determined. It should not be subjectively determined. 3. There should be documentation on how the passing percentage (cut point) was determined.
<p>7. Objectivity, impartiality and fairness of the Oral Examination Process.</p>	<p>Oral examination panels meet prior to the commencement of exams to discuss the day's approach. Printed copies of each of the 3 questions to be posed to the candidate are provided, with each candidate receiving one question from each of the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professionalism; 2. Business; and, 3. AOLS Matters. <p>The candidates is given ten minutes at the start of the exam to review the questions. The recommended examination period is between 45 and 60 minutes.</p> <p>Each examiner keeps detailed notes of each candidate's answers. Examination teams decide on a pass or fail status immediately after each exam by majority vote of examiners. The Examination panel chairperson prepares a detailed written report on each failure and forwards the report to the Registrar.</p>	<p>The Oral Examination Process appears to be objective, impartial and fair.</p> <p>The oral examination process could be strengthened as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Documenting how the 3 questions given to the candidate are developed and how they relate to the competence criteria.

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
	<p>The examination panel is composed of three AOLS members in good standing, two of which have previous oral examiner experience. The panel chairperson may be a full member of the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee or a former AERC member who has had prior experience on an oral exam panel.</p> <p>There is no opportunity to appeal the results of the oral examination.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Ensuring that all oral questions are equivalent in difficulty so that one candidate does not receive more difficult oral questions than another candidate. 3. Oral question evaluators should be formally trained for their roles and that training should be documented. Data should be kept on the performance of the evaluators to ensure they are not consistently scoring candidates harder or easier. AOLS should document how they ensure bias and subjectivity are addressed for the oral examinations. 4. An appeals process should be developed for the oral examination process. Perhaps the process could be recorded and stored until such time as an appeal has passed.
<p>8. A regulated profession shall provide information to individuals applying or intending to apply for registration by the regulated profession and, without limiting the generality of</p>	<p>Information is presented on the AOLS website:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) information about its registration practices was found here: Become An OLS - AOLS The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors and here: ait-aols-handbook---20201116.pdf (c) objective requirements for registration by the regulated profession together with a statement of which requirements may be satisfied through alternatives that are acceptable to the regulated profession was found here: Become An OLS - AOLS The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors and here: ait-aols-handbook---20201116.pdf 	<p>Information appears to be provided to applicants and candidates through the AOLS website. Some of the website links appear broken or in need of updating, for example, AOLS policy states:</p> <p><i>Detailed procedures, including application timelines, procedures and documents will be posted in the Join AOLS section of the AOLS website</i></p>

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
<p>the foregoing, it shall provide,</p> <p>(a) information about its registration practices;</p> <p>(b) information about the amount of time that the registration process usually takes;</p> <p>(c) objective requirements for registration by the regulated profession together with a statement of which requirements may be satisfied through alternatives that are acceptable to the regulated profession;</p> <p>and</p> <p>(d) a fee scale related to registrations.</p>	<p>(d) a fee scale related to registrations. 2006, c. 31, s. 7. Fees are available here: Academic Evaluation (Step 1) - AOLS The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors here: Articling (Step 2) - AOLS The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors and here: ait-aols-handbook---20201116.pdf</p>	<p><i>(http://www.aols.org/join/membership).</i></p> <p>However the link provided went to a non-existing webpage.</p>

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
2006, c. 31, s. 7.		
<p>9. A regulated profession shall,</p> <p>(a) ensure that it makes registration decisions within a reasonable time;</p> <p>(b) provide written responses to applicants within a reasonable time; and</p> <p>(c) provide written reasons to applicants within a reasonable time in respect of all registration decisions and internal review or appeal decisions.</p> <p>2006, c. 31, s. 8.</p>	<p>The timeline is provided for responding to decisions in AERC Policy 5.5 stating students have 30 days from receipt of letter advising them of their results to appeal the results of the Statues or written Professional examinations.</p>	<p>Weakness:</p> <p>AOLS should provide detailed timelines including how long it will take in each step of the process and for the entire appeals process to be resolved.</p>
<p>10. A regulated profession shall provide an internal review of</p>	<p>AOLS provides an appeal process as described here:</p> <p>Registration Appeals - AOLS The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors</p>	<p>This requirement is met.</p>

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
<p>or appeal from its registration decisions within a reasonable time. 2006, c. 31, s. 9 (1).</p>	<p>The appeals process speaks to the timeline.</p>	
<p>11. A regulated profession shall provide an applicant for registration an opportunity to make submissions with respect to any internal review or appeal. 2006, c. 31, s. 9 (2).</p>	<p>AOLS provides an appeal process as described here: Registration Appeals - AOLS The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors</p> <p>The appeals process speaks to the timeline.</p>	<p>This requirement is met.</p>
<p>12. A regulated profession may specify whether submissions in respect of an internal review or appeal are to be submitted orally, in writing or by electronic means. 2006, c. 31, s. 9 (3).</p>	<p>AOLS provides an appeal process as described here: Registration Appeals - AOLS The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors</p> <p>The appeals process speaks to the timeline.</p>	<p>This requirement is met.</p>
<p>13. A regulated profession shall inform an applicant of any rights the applicant may have to request a</p>	<p>AOLS provides an appeal process as described here: Registration Appeals - AOLS The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors</p> <p>The appeals process speaks to the timeline.</p>	<p>This requirement is met.</p>

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
<p>further review of, or appeal from, the decision. 2006, c. 31, s. 9 (4).</p>		
<p>14. No one who acted as a decision-maker in respect of a registration decision shall act as a decision-maker in an internal review or appeal in respect of that registration decision. 2006, c. 31, s. 9 (5).</p>	<p>The AERC reviews appeals and Policy 5.5 states the two persons involved in the marking or evaluation process will be involved in review of the appeals.</p>	<p>This requirement is met.</p>
<p>15. A regulated profession shall make information publicly available on what documentation of qualifications must accompany an application and what alternatives to the documentation may be acceptable to the regulated profession if an applicant cannot obtain the required documentation</p>	<p>AOLS makes this information available on its website here: Become An OLS - AOLS The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors</p>	<p>This requirement is met.</p>

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
for reasons beyond his or her control. 2006, c. 31, s. 10 (1).		
16. A regulated profession shall make information publicly available on what documentation of qualifications must accompany an application and what alternatives to the documentation may be acceptable to the regulated profession if an applicant cannot obtain the required documentation for reasons beyond his or her control. 2006, c. 31, s. 10 (1).	<p>AOLS makes this information available on its website here:</p> <p>Become An OLS - AOLS The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors</p>	This requirement is met.
17. A regulated profession shall ensure that individuals assessing qualifications and making registration decisions or internal review or	<p>The appeals process is a remarking of the exam; in terms of the process, there is a registration committee dealing with appeals for people applying for a license and were denied. This process is done in legislation. In terms of training of committee members, this is a weakness that can be addressed.</p> <p>Once an appeal is requested, it is handled by the AERC, but their internal processes for conducting appeals are not available. This does not assure fairness or much of due process.</p> <p>This also applies to the Code of Ethics (p. 30 of the Policy Manual) which states the process for submitting a report of an incident in violation of the Code, but does not say how the</p>	This requirement is met.

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
<p>appeal decisions have received training that includes, where appropriate,</p> <p>(a) training on how to hold hearings; and</p> <p>(b) training in any special considerations that may apply in the assessment of applications and the process for applying those considerations . 2006, c. 31, s. 11.</p>	<p>AERC handles, reviews, and disposes of the case, just that the violation becomes an agenda item.</p>	
<p>18. Upon the written request of an applicant for registration by a regulated profession, the regulated profession shall provide the applicant with access to records held by it that are related to the application. 2006, c. 31, s. 12 (1).</p>	<p>AOLS makes this information available on its website here:</p> <p>https://www.aols.org/resources/policies-and-statements/access-to-records</p>	<p>This requirement is met.</p>
<p>19. Despite subsection (1), a</p>	<p>AOLS makes this information available on its website here:</p>	<p>This requirement is met.</p>

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
<p>regulated profession may refuse access to a record if,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the record or any information in the record is subject to a legal privilege that restricts disclosure of the record or the information, as the case may be; (b) another Act, an Act of Canada or a court order prohibits disclosure of the record or any information in the record in the circumstances ; (c) granting the access could reasonably be expected to lead to the identification of a person 	<p>https://www.aols.org/resources/policies-and-statements/access-to-records</p> <p>AOLS also maintains a record retention policy as well which speaks to some of this.</p>	

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
<p>who provided information in the record to the regulated profession explicitly or implicitly in confidence, and the regulated profession considers it appropriate in the circumstances that the identity of the person be kept confidential; or</p> <p>(d) granting the access could negatively affect public safety or could undermine the integrity of the registration process.</p> <p>2006, c. 31, s. 12 (2).</p>		
<p>20. Despite subsection (2), an applicant has a</p>	<p>AOLS makes this information available on its website here:</p> <p>https://www.aols.org/resources/policies-and-statements/access-to-records</p>	<p>This requirement is met.</p>

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
right of access to that part of a record that can reasonably be severed from the part to which the applicant does not have a right of access by reason of that subsection. 2006, c. 31, s. 12 (3).	The records policy addresses severance of records.	
21. A regulated profession shall establish a process under which requests for access to records will be considered. 2006, c. 31, s. 12 (4).	AOLS makes this information available on its website here: https://www.aols.org/resources/policies-and-statements/access-to-records The records policy addresses the process for handling requests.	This requirement is met.
22. A regulated profession may charge the applicant a fee for making records available if it first gives the applicant an estimate of the fee. 2006, c. 31, s. 12 (5).	AOLS makes this information available on its website here: https://www.aols.org/resources/policies-and-statements/access-to-records The records policy describes the services fees are associated with.	This requirement is met.
23. The amount of the fee shall not exceed the amount prescribed by the regulations or the	AOLS indicates which fees will apply on its website here: https://www.aols.org/resources/policies-and-statements/access-to-records	Professional Testing could not find evidence of fee amounts. The fees associated with making the records available are not provided on the website.

Requirement	Evidence	Finding/Comments
amount of reasonable cost recovery, if no amount is prescribed. 2006, c. 31, s. 12 (6).		
24. A regulated profession may waive the payment of all or any part of the fee that an applicant is required to pay under subsection (5) if, in its opinion, it is fair and equitable to do so. 2006, c. 31, s. 12 (7).	Information to this effect was not found on the website referenced in this section above.	Professional Testing could not find evidence to this effect. A policy should be developed and documented.

Documents reviewed included:

- AOLS Website: [AOLS | The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors](#) and documents found therein.
- Essential Areas of Knowledge (EAK) and how it was determined (referred to as job-task analysis, practice analysis or role delineation study) – refer to **Motion 14-45 and attachments in the Policy Manual**
- Information regarding the development of all assessments (written and practical) including who developed them, how they were developed, etc. – see **Policies 5.2 – 5.3.3**
- Passing Score Studies (Standard setting activities) for Written & Oral and Professional Plan Exams – **Passing score for all exams is set under section in Regulation 1026 under the Surveyors Act 23(9)**
- Grader/Rater Training and calibration activities for Oral and Professional Plan Check Exams – refer to **Examiners Manual 2020 Oral (Oral Exams) and Policies 5.2-5.3.3**
- Scoring Rubrics for Oral and Professional Plan Check Exams – refer to **Oral Marking Sheet – JKY July, 02 (oral) and 2020 November Plan Check Exam – Response Guideline**
- Statistical reports on performance of examinations (e.g., Annual Report of Exam Statistics, item analysis reports) refer to **Professional Exam Averages Spreadsheet**
- Policies associated with the maintained and improvement of test items and examinations as well as evidence these are being followed—See policies **5.2.1 and 5.3.1 (these are periodically updated and reviewed. The most recent review of the professional exam repository occurred in October of 2019.**

- Data associated with analysis of test items and examinations with minority and under-represented populations or any bias studies conducted on the assessments including written and practical examinations. **None. A bias training session occurred in January of 2020, and is a recurring session (every 5 years) refer to Motion 19-162 in October 2019 Minutes**
- Test Irregularity Reports and Follow-up – **None**
- Forensic Analyses Reports and Process/Plan – **None**
- Reports/studies for determination of eligibility, (academic requirements) – **Refer to sections 1 and 2 of policy manual and 2019 -06 academic requirements table**
- Credential maintenance Requirements – **Renewal of credential**
- Candidate Handbook – **Sent in first email**
- Application for certification – **refer to student hand book appendix D**
- Appeals Process for denial of entrance to exams or for failing the exams **Appeals for denial of entrance to profession are set by statute (Surveyors Act sections 12(3) and 17)**
- List of Key Vendors if vendors are used in any aspect of exam development, maintenance or administration – **Prolydian maintains the online repository and delivery of the exams; Examity provides online, remote proctoring services for the exams**
- Security Audits (office, test sites, examination) – **Examity sends security reports for students who have been highlighted as performing suspicious behaviour during the online, remote examinations**
- Minutes from Board Meetings or Examination Committee Meetings & Follow-up actions if exam related – **refer to AERC Minutes 2020 zip file (sent in second email)**
- Candidate Admission Letter to Examinations (sample) – **refer to Template Letters... zip file**
- Candidate Score Reports for each exam (sample) – **refer to Template Letters... zip file**
- Sample communications to candidates—Approval letters; Score reports; – **refer to Template Letters... zip file**
- Record Retention Policy

Recommendations:

The following two recommendations are made in reference to **“Objectivity, Impartiality and Fairness of the Oral Exam,”** page 9 of this report, items 3 and 4 respectively in the Findings section of the report (3rd column the table).

1. Finding: #3. Oral question evaluators should be formally trained for their roles and that training should be documented. Data should be kept on the performance of the evaluators to ensure they are not consistently scoring candidates harder or easier. AOLS should document how they ensure bias and subjectivity are addressed for the oral examinations.

Recommendation: AOLS should conduct studies to assure inter-rater reliability among its oral examiners to assure candidates are scored consistently to the standard. This may include implementation of monitoring procedures that can include on-site observation, review of examiners’ reports, feedback from candidates, complaints, and a formal training process for oral examiners that addresses how examinations are administered, scored and the results reported. Training may include case studies for examiners to review and discuss as a group, self-evaluation and peer evaluation tools. This needs to be incorporated in policy, and policy should address data that “flags” an examination and remediation requirements and practices for “flagged” examiners.

2. Finding: #4. An appeals process should be developed for the oral examination process. Perhaps the process could be recorded and stored until such time as an appeal has passed.

Recommendation: While it is understood that oral examinations are not recorded thereby making it difficult to establish grounds for an appeal, as suggested above, the examinations could be recorded with recordings stored for a period of time to accommodate an appeal, e.g., 60 or 90 days following receipt of a failed score report, or scheduled to coincide with the timing of the AERC committee meetings. The appeals should be conducted by a panel not involved in making the failed decision and should take into consideration conflict-of-interest and other mitigating factors. Other options would be to describe grounds for candidates to request an appeal, the timeline to do so, and remedies such as a retake of the exam, or the failed portion of the exam. The oral examiners (three interviewers) should be provided templates to keep sufficient and consistent notes on the performance of the candidate, deficiencies, and include a review of the notes in the event of an appeal. Appeals should be tracked for processing and to create a data point for setting precedent in decisions. Used anonymously, these data can be used for inter-rater reliability training purposes. The appeals process should be included in policy, and available to candidates as publicly available information.