

**Safety Training Standards & Delivery Fall Protection SME**  
**April 15, 2009**

<b>Invitees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Attend?</b>	<b>Invitees</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Attend?</b>
Dave Taylor	Chemfab	Yes	Kevin Mackowski	IOL	No
Blair Allin	Boilermakers	Yes	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	Regrets	Ron Mombourquette	ALUMA	Yes
Brian Strong	Millwrights	Yes	Moe Carson	UA	Yes
<b>Doug McKay - Scribe</b>	Kel-Gor	Regrets	Shelly Brown – Guest	IEC	Yes

**Acceptance of Previous Meeting Minutes**

Minutes accepted as written

**Follow Ups from Previous Meeting – Action Items**

**1. Populating Training Template**

Content and Evaluation teams met on April 10<sup>th</sup> and April 15<sup>th</sup> respectively. Completed list of objectives was attached to April 8<sup>th</sup> minutes. Objectives were then revised at this meeting and are attached. Minutes for the April 15<sup>th</sup> Evaluation meeting are also attached.

Additional discussion around whether the Evaluation team can proceed without content. It was agreed that the content would need to be fleshed out in order to proceed with learner verification. Evaluation team could still move ahead with items such as trainer evaluation, field validation, expiration, etc.

**Other Discussion Items**

1. Ron clarified that it is clearly the SME team's responsibility to complete the Fall Protection training program. The IEC is assisting with the process at the SME team's invitation.
2. The group recognized the need to address questions that workers may have re: why their CSAO training is not sufficient and agreed that the Evaluation team should try to determine the best way to bridge this gap.
3. The group discussed the possibility of having a 2 tiered training program with a full training session and a session where a worker would complete a test and then be trained to match the gaps identified. The general consensus was that this type of system would be difficult to manage effectively and was not the recommended path forward (**this discussion was tabled until a later meeting**).
4. There was further discussion around the need to keep the technological requirements for the training as simple as possible in order to facilitate ease of use in the field.

5. The group discussed the marketing challenges around the mistaken perception from people outside the committees that this was being managed by the IEC. The group recognized that in general people are uncomfortable with change. Several members of the group have been approached by people with questions/comments and those members have explained that the process involves clients, labour and contractors equally. Moe said he will inform his membership at their next union meeting about the link on the IEC website and members' ability to go in and make comments or suggestions on our progress.
6. There was a lengthy discussion around the pass/fail considerations for trainee evaluation. It was agreed that if we are too stringent it may unfairly affect someone's ability to earn a living. Tom expressed that the IEC mandate is to let workers re-write the test if they fail. If they cannot pass the second time they are required to take the training again. The Evaluation team will be responsible for preparing a remediation plan to address if a trainee fails the evaluation.
7. Shelly explained that the evaluation should be driven by the learning objectives but agreed that without the content it was difficult to determine which areas should be covered more extensively and the total number of questions that would be required for adequate learner verification.
8. There was discussion around the ability of the new IEC database to keep track of statistical information and the IEC's responsibility to align this info with tests. Although the database is capable of performing this task it was decided that the statistical information for falls should be incorporated with the description of fall hazards and their effects. It was agreed that these objectives are attitudinal and that there is no valid way of evaluating attitude.
9. The group agreed that in general the Green Book was difficult to navigate around in and that it should not be used in conjunction with an evaluation for fall protection. Workers generally consult with their supervisor or their H&S advisor if unsure of the regulations rather than going directly to the Green Book.

## **Action Items**

1. The design template has been modified. Tom and Tracey agreed to populate the revised template before the next meeting.
2. The Evaluation team would like to meet again before the next general meeting but a day and time has yet to be decided.

## **Next Meeting**

April 22, 2009 – 1:00 – 3:00 IEC Badger Room

## Evaluation Team Minutes – April 15, 2009

### **Discussion:**

1. It was agreed that the content should drive the evaluation. Until the content has been fleshed out it is difficult to determine the appropriate number/type of questions required for learner verification.
2. The team discussed whether the IEC would be responsible for aligning any statistical information with the evaluations. Will follow up at general meeting.
3. The team thought that it should be possible to have trainees utilize the Green Book to find an answer to a specific question – wouldn't necessarily require a copy of the book for everyone.
4. The team agreed, as Ron proposed, that a form and checklist is required (similar to what IOL uses) for equipment inspection and donning and doffing.
5. It was agreed that a conversion chart for applicable heights and weights needed to be included with the training material.
6. Because of a lack of legislation around the use of portable ladders at heights over 10 feet the team was unsure how to address this objective. Further investigation/discussion required.
7. It was felt that some "fill in the blanks" type of questions along with the previously suggested methods would be a good way of determining whether trainees are really absorbing the material.

## **Content - April 15, 2009**

After review the Objectives were revised as follows:

1. Describe Fall Hazards and their effects on:
  - a. Workers
  - b. Family
  - c. Co-workers
2. Appreciate statistics (needs more discussion)
3. Recognize where to access the Regulations and apply them to the workplace
4. Identify the proper care, maintenance and storage of fall protection equipment
5. Identify how to select, inspect and use portable ladders
6. Correctly identify the safe use of a fixed vertical ladder
7. Recognize the fall protection requirements of a scaffold system
8. Describe the fall protection requirements of a Powered Elevated Work Platform (PEWP)
9. Identify the proper selection and use of:
  - a. Fall Arrest
  - b. Fall Restricting
  - c. Travel Restraint
10. Describe and demonstrate the inspection of fall protection equipment
11. Demonstrate the ability to properly don and doff a fall arrest system
12. Recognize the dangers of suspension trauma and demonstrate the ability to install, deploy and use a relief strap
13. Identify the requirements for adequate anchor points and the hazards of unacceptable anchor points
14. Develop the basis of a rescue plan

**Notes:** A few things came up during the review that weren't incorporated into the objectives but should be noted for going forward with content:

- a. Statistics for falls between 6 and 10 feet
- b. Fixed vertical ladder over 10 feet has cage
- c. Emphasis needed on adjustments during donning and doffing
- d. Might be need for additional "attitudinal" objectives