

**Safety Training Standards & Delivery Fall Protection SME
May 6, 2009**

Invitees	Affiliation	Attend?	Invitees	Affiliation	Attend?
Dave Taylor	Chemfab	Yes	Kevin Mackowski	IOL	No
Blair Allin	Boilermakers	No	Lonnie Cope	Suncor	No
Dave Lambert	CSAO	Info only	Gary Krumholtz	Shell	No
Tom Hennessy	IEC	Yes	Emilio Iacobelli	NOVA	Yes
Tracey Verdone	LamSar	Yes	John Huybers	Curran	Yes
Victor Horvath	Laborers	No	Ron Mombourquette	ALUMA	Regrets
Brian Strong	Millwrights	Yes	Moe Carson	UA	Yes
Doug McKay - Scribe	Kel-Gor	Yes			

Acceptance of Previous Meeting Minutes

Minutes accepted as written

Discussion Items

The group discussed items from the Evaluation group draft. Several items were raised to the steering group level by Ron (attached) as a result of the evaluation group's meeting. The most significant of these items is the field evaluation section and what outcome would there be in the event that a worker was unable to demonstrate competency in the field or, more significant still, the auditor found trained workers in an at risk situation without proper protection. Because the auditor is likely to be someone from the IEC, they would have no real authority to stop the job in this case.

The group agreed that no auditor would perform a field audit without a member of the contractor supervision or safety staff accompanying them.

The group also felt that it was appropriate for us to present to the STS a proposal on auditing and the meaning of failure in an audit. The process developed for this course would be transferable to any other course developed in future.

The group also discussed the design and development process in some detail. The discussion consisted of the following:

- Who will do the actual course development (presentation materials, leader's guide, trainee's guide etc.)?
- How will the SME team control the development?
 - Whoever is chosen for the development of the program, the SME team will review and approve at each stage of the development
 - Each section will be presented to the SME prior to being included in the final package
 - The design team will continue to monitor the development on a weekly basis and the SME will meet bi-weekly from 11:00 to 12:00 for presentation of the current development
 - The development team will develop the instructor's notes, learner's notes as well as the program materials.

- After some discussion, the team agreed that it would probably be best to draw the development team from the IEC staff since they are more likely to be able to devote the time to the project. Since the attendance at this meeting was not high, it may be appropriate to get feedback from the entire team through a response by e-mail to these minutes
 - Does everyone agree with the development team being drawn from the IEC with oversight by the design team and approval by the SME?

Populating Training Template

We still require the sections for the template as follows:

- **Fall protection requirements for scaffold – Ron**
- **Warning Barriers and Bump Lines – Lonnie**
- **Protective Covers – John Huybers**
- **Safety Nets – Lonnie**

The group agreed, however, that the template in its current form could be provided to Shelly and Mike for their review in accordance with the recent request. The review is intended to look at the evaluation sections primarily and that is available for comment.

The group will continue to work on the remaining sections in the next week.

Action Items

1. Finalize template objective sections - as noted above
2. Signal agreement or disagreement with the proposed Development Team - All.

Next Meeting

The SME team will meet on May 20, 2009 from 11:00 to 12:00

Note to Steering Committee from Ron

Our fall protection SME team is working on homework and the subcommittees are meeting but we are missing our group meeting this week due to the AGM. **We have the following comments regarding the timeline we received last week.**

- Training Standards should be completed and submitted in the agreed upon format (the latest version of the Template) for audit to Mike Manz and Shelley Brown by May 8/09 – **This needs to be revised to May 15/ 09. We need to take the time to finish this right.**
- We will review and return the Standards to the SME Teams ASAP for any suggested changes
- **The draft Training Standards will be broadcast to all stakeholders via the IEC website commencing May 15/09**
- **Stakeholders will have two weeks to review the draft Standards and provide feedback/comments to the SME Teams by May 29/09**

I thought we discussed the danger in going back out for “stakeholder comments” as not being a good idea. Have we not communicated to all stakeholders that the work the SME teams are doing has been posted every week on the web page? Our team has zero feedback at this point and I don’t think we want to invite criticism at the end of the process. I think we could be asking for trouble at that point. I know I missed our last 2 Steering Committee Meetings but this is just a note of caution.

- SME Teams will make any necessary changes/revisions, after which the Standards are forwarded to the STS Steering Committee for acceptance
- The STS Steering Committee recommends/submits the Training Standards to the IEC Exec
- IEC Exec approves the Training Standards on June 16/09

The evaluation subcommittee has the following questions:

1. For the field evaluation we are working off this definition – a method of validating that the individuals in the field retained the information expected in the Learner verification phase. The question is – who manages the chain of events that would be set off if a worker or workers or a whole crew fails one of these audits?
 - a. What are the auditor’s responsibilities at that point?
 - b. Do we really want to bring worker knowledge – competency into the field audit?
 - c. Could we structure the field audit more around course evaluation?
 - i. When did you take the course and from who?
 - ii. How long was the course?
 - iii. What have you learned on the job that we did not teach in the course
 - iv. Etc.

We are thinking that the field evaluation should be the opportunity to check the quality of the course that was taught as well as how applicable the content was to the application in the field.

We don't want to cross over with the employer's responsibility to ensure that their employees are adequately trained and are demonstrating that knowledge in the field.

Please advise

2. Being one of the first two teams to standardize a training course we feel some questions around Remediation could be standardized as well and we would like the input of the Steering Committee. All of the competency based courses could have the same "rules" around remediation.
 - a. Pass / Fail mark
 - b. At what mark do you need to repeat the complete course and be re-tested?
 - c. In the range between a and b what steps are required?
 - i. Does the trainer go back over the content of the complete sections failed/
 - ii. Do we re-test? Just the questions failed or the complete section failed?
 - iii. How is this documented?

These are all questions we could answer but in the name of standardization we thought the Steering committee might want to set a common direction for all courses to follow.

3. The same thinking as question 2 might apply to timelines for implementation. I think we could set the requirement that all workers who need updated or first time fall protection training to work in the valley must take the new course but maybe their should be a standardized approach to implementation of all new courses for the workers who currently have some training?
 - a. For example – If we say Fall Protection needs to be re-certified every 3 years do we give people with the course now 3 years to recertify or do we set the standard at one year or two?

Maybe this decision should be guided and standardized from the beginning by the steering committee?

Please take the time to review these questions at the meeting on Thursday and let us know how you would like us to proceed.

Thanks,

Ron