

# Fireside Chat- November 13, 2024:

## Question & Answer

---

- ✚ **In my experience companies look for the title P.Eng. and really don't look at us with much appreciation of our skill sets. Is it expected that this change would improve our status and how?**

While certainly linked to the marketing that will support a change to the designation, recognition of the contribution of technicians and technologists will remain a key initiative that OACETT undertakes on several fronts and that work will continue. As noted in the presentation on our new Strategic Plan "Expanding Recognition" is a key strategic pillar.

- ✚ **I'd rather be a Professional Engineering Technologist (P.E.T.) if I have to change from being a C.E.T. Your thoughts?**

As noted during the webinar, the options for a common national designation were reviewed and discussed within Technology Professionals Canada and Professional Technologist (P.Tech.) was the agreed designation to bring to our respective memberships.

- ✚ **Was Ontario Society of Engineering Technology (OSET) considered as a possible name change - as it still resonates as OACETT.**

The only two options considered were those put to the members in the survey. Others were invited and will be reviewed as the Board reviews all the feedback, but it should be noted that the goal was to get away from including "association" or "society" as both could be considered insufficiently inclusive of being both a regulator and a professional association.

- ✚ **Not sure if this is a way to distinguish in title, but I recall my College course actually indicated that our group were studying as Electronic Engineering Technicians. Have College program titles for courses been considered?**

As course titles are not necessarily consistent from college to college, this was not a consideration in the proposed change to the name of the C.E.T. certification.

- ✚ **Why only C.E.T. title is in consideration, there are so many titles OACETT awards, what will happen to those other designations?**

There will be no change to OACETT's other certifications.

- ✚ **What is the status of the next iteration of the Chapter Operations Manual?**

We have reviewed all chapter responses and have made changes accordingly. Staff are now updating the document for a final review by MESC in the new year.

- ✚ **If the organization name and designation title will change..., will we be having new physical copy of our certification, so it aligns with the change?**

Yes, it is intended that, if there is a decision to change the certification, those members who wish to change to the P.Tech. certification can apply to be issued a new certificate. It is not anticipated that certificates will be re-issued for other certifications as a result of an organizational name change, in the event an organizational name change is approved by the members.

- ✚ **There is a lot of questions from the Q&A that suggest to me the survey percentage shown earlier, I.e., Opposed, Against & Neutral may be a little topsy-turvy. How do you see the Q&A based on this meeting?**

The data from 7820 surveys vs. the significantly fewer opinions expressed as part of the Fireside Chat Q & A would not make the Q & A information more valid or compelling. It is to be expected that those with strongly held opinion may feel more compelled to use multiple opportunities to share those opinions, and that's why multiple consultation mechanisms will be employed.

- ✚ **So I went through pros and cons stated in the survey and I don't believe the idea of the name changes have been thought through. Here is what Many members think!**

**1) P.Tech. is not a nationwide designation. Not all provincial engineering technology associations issues P.Tech. If OACETT changes the name of the designation from C.E.T. to P.Tech., it will still not get a nationwide recognition.**

We would foresee that any decision on OACETT's part to change the C.E.T. certification would only be made if there is nationwide consensus on the use of P.Tech. That is why all the provincial organizations not currently using P.Tech. are undertaking a similar consultation with their members. Even a decision brought to OACETT's members at the AGM could be conditional on their being national consensus.

- ✚ **I am also appealing that the management and board of directors OACETT should look into other applicable Fees either to reduce fees or consider any application requesting for reduce fees on Application Fees, Membership Dues, Exam Fees, Seminars Fees Ring Fees, Stamps Fees and Frame Fees as this will encourage more member specially from Africans to join us this is due to the Low Income Rate / Salary Earning.**

OACETT has a reduced dues program for members experiencing financial difficulty. Also, please note that OACETT waives the application fee if you apply for membership within one year of initially arriving in Canada. Finally, OACETT conducts an annual review of particular fees to ensure they are priced accordingly, including any potential reductions.

- ✚ **Can this recognition across Canada can be done via Memorandum of Understanding?**

Such agreements do currently exist, but they are not as seamless as having a common certification, nor is national marketing/promotion possible with multiple certifications.

- ✚ **Good insights in the proposed P.Tech. designation that can bring additional recognition whether you are a C.E.T. or P.Tech. (C.E.T. which is already a recognized brand) How can a potential employer hire a P.Tech.? He may think is that P.Tech. is a Professional Engineer. It could confuse them... How do you intend to clarify this confusion that may take place?**

This would all be part of a multi-faceted communication strategy that would be developed in the event that there is member agreement on a change to the C.E.T. certification. We would also ensure that all members are equipped with the necessary information to provide clarification to their employers.

- ✚ **As I hear some of the chats and read the questions, what is the actual end game we are trying to achieve? Are we trying to achieve greater status in our various disciplines?**

As noted above, seeking greater recognition for OACETT-certified members is a core strategic priority. Those efforts will be expanded on, and staff and the Board do see correlations with re-branding, but that will only be a small part of efforts related to recognition.

- ✚ **Hiring a consultant would increase the budgeted proposal on the web site, [https://search.app?link=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.oacett.org%2Fnews-announcements%2Foacett-name-and-title-change-survey&utm\\_campaign=aga&utm\\_source=agsadl2%2Csh%2Fx%2Fgs%2Fm2%2F4](https://search.app?link=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.oacett.org%2Fnews-announcements%2Foacett-name-and-title-change-survey&utm_campaign=aga&utm_source=agsadl2%2Csh%2Fx%2Fgs%2Fm2%2F4)**

**How much is too much in order to decide if a consultant is necessary or not?**

**The question is, is the proposed \$90,000 include the brand and the P.Tech. designation cost or will it be extra?**

There were two budget figures provided in the survey introduction in terms of the costs that would be incurred in the 2025 budget: \$160K is the budget for a change to P.Tech. and \$90K was the additional amount needed to support changing the name of OACETT. The survey introduction also indicated that this was the investment for 2025 only and that an equivalent investment would likely be needed in 2026 for the actual execution of the marketing campaign. As noted during the webinar, OACETT has sufficient reserves to fund these campaigns without taking away from current initiatives or by requiring an increase in dues.

- ✚ **Has consideration been made concerning the fact that P.Tech. and C.Tech both sound like Technician? Why are we not differentiating between technologists and technicians using designations? This will create confusion and I believe it is important to also maintain "engineering" within the title.**

The potential for confusion with "Tech" was identified as a possible "con" to the transition, though it is not an issue for those provinces where both are currently used. This is once again an outcome of a solid marketing and communications plan. Similarly there are arguments for and against keeping "engineering" in the title. Removing engineering is more inclusive of the applied science disciplines for which OACETT also provides certification.

- ✚ **If the proposed changes are implemented, will the Ontario Association of Certified Engineering**

## **Technicians and Technologists (OACETT) become the Ontario Association of Professional Technicians and Technologists (OAPTT)?**

The organization name will change only if members vote on the change. Better alignment with the proposed certification change was certainly one of the motivators for proposing that a change to the organization name could occur at the same time.

- ✚ **Should we have the absolute majority votes in favour (50% more) before we decide to change the name and title?**

**As per the survey results, it seems that the percentage of members supporting this change is almost the same as the members who are opposing (both approx 30%)**

Correct, any change to the name of the certification or to the name of the organization would have to be approved by a majority of members, and it is proposed that that would be determined by a vote at the AGM on June 7, 2025. Currently you are correct that opinion is quite divided, as there is a further third that are neutral. That is why ongoing consultation and discussion will be required.

- ✚ **What steps can be taken to ensure that P.Tech. will not be compared directly to P.Eng.? C.E.T. provides a unique designation, but P.Tech. will be compared to P.Eng. and that may create a “hierarchy” of importance or superiority. This should not be the case as C.E.T. holders provide unique and valuable skill sets.**

Again, this clarity would all be part of the marketing and communications strategy. It is perhaps worthy to note that a common theme among those members who voted in favour of continuing to explore changing to P. Tech. liked the alignment of "Professional" as a demonstration of similarly valuable contributions.

- ✚ **As a C.E.T. in the Civil Technologist, is seeing some issues with my Township, and other townships not recognizing my certified designation. What would be the approach here?**

As noted above, OACETT has ongoing strategies in place to enhance the recognition of certified members with employers and governments. For municipalities in particular, there is a significant campaign under way, linked to our new municipal infrastructure designations, to create more awareness of the value of municipalities hiring certified technicians and technologists.

- ✚ **I understand that there is an active discussion of changing designation names. As C.Tech. and P.Eng. seems similar. The difference between C.E.T. and C.Tech. is only Technical Report writing, do you think that it will be better to keep C.E.T. only and add P.Tech. as a higher level designation?**

This would not create the desired equivalency among the provincial organizations, which is one of the key motivations for proposing the change.

- ✚ **Since we are trying to align the title nationally, are the certification requirements for P.Tech. across the other provinces the same as we currently have with C.E.T.? If certification requirements are not the same across the country, does it still make sense to change the title?**

Certification requirements are the same across provinces. The only known difference is that some provinces require a competency test as opposed to a technology report.

**I understand that the name change from C.E.T. to P.Tech. will help provinces to become better aligned on a national stage.**

**For example, a P.Tech. in Ontario should be able to move to Alberta, join ASET, and continue to operate as a P.Tech.**

**Unfortunately, ASET recognizes both C.E.T. and P.Tech, and they are vastly different (2 years experience for C.E.T. vs. 6 years experience for P.Tech).**

**<https://aset.ab.ca/Home/Registration/Become-A-Member/C-Tech-C-E-T>**

**<https://aset.ab.ca/Home/Registration/Become-a-Member/P-Tech>**

**Do we know how ASET responded to the national (TAC/TPC) recommendation?**

**Do we expect them to change and conform to a national "standard", or would we try to align with them, or will we make the name change without achieving any alignment with Alberta?**

As noted above, it is anticipated that OACETT would not make the change without national agreement on a common certification. Alberta has indicated potential challenges in changing from their existing model, but they are no different than the challenges for any of us seeking member input into making a change.

**It appears that a lot of the arguments for changing the designation comes from the fact that OACETT is not gaining members. Don't we think that \$160,000 can be better used marketing and branding and reaching out to companies and schools?**

Reaching out to companies and schools remains a key part of OACETT's budget and annual initiatives. This is not an "either/or" situation.

**It also appears that most of the feedback towards the designation changes seem negative. What are OACETT leaders current thoughts on this?**

As per the survey results, OACETT members are clearly divided on the issue, though it is not accurate to say that most of the feedback seems negative, as the highest result on the survey for both changing the certification and changing the organization name was in support, albeit not by a very large margin.

**Now that you have had the Fireside chat will there be another survey issued to the members? I would be interested to see the results now that members have had a chance to ask questions and gain a better understanding of what is being proposed.**

The Board will be continuing to evaluate and develop strategies for ongoing discussion and consultation with members on this issue. It is not yet determined whether another member survey will be part of that strategy - OACETT has to be cautious about survey fatigue.

**Can OACETT work with PEO in any capacity to create more opportunities?**

There is ongoing dialogue with PEO at both the staff and volunteer level and there is an annual Joint Leadership Summit hosted in the fall each year. We are constantly exploring opportunities to work more effectively together.

**🚩 Do we have access to the data from the polls regarding the name change? Will it be made public?**

The Board will be discussing at the November meeting how best to share the information with members. There is certainly a desire to be transparent, but because of the volume of responses, the full report is over 600 pages in length and may not be very digestible. Staff are making use of AI to identify themes within the rationale responses provided, and this is likely what will be shared, along with the charts that provide the breakdown of responses. The information will also need to be available exclusively to members, as it is confidential to us, so member log-ins will be required and we will have to figure out that piece as well.

**🚩 This page <https://www.oacett.org/about-us/publications/annual-reports> says OACETT discontinued Annual Reports in 2022, with a verbal report provided at the AGM each year instead. I am concerned that members no longer have take-aways such as an annual Statement of Operations. What would take to bring back the annual reports?**

All members have access to the audited financial statements as part of the AGM materials and at any time on request from the office. There is also an annual article in the OT magazine that provides an overview of the yearly activities and progress against the strategic plan. In our experience, there has been little uptake of the annual report and the energies spent on its creation can be better employed on other activities, considering that the information is available from other sources.

**🚩 If P.Tech. designation is approved, are there going to be any pathways introduced for a certified member to transition into P.Eng. eventually?**

Pathways to the P.Eng. are controlled by PEO. That said, this certainly is part of the discussions that we engage in with them. The current pathway remains the L.E.T., and we definitely focus on having PEO provide it with the focus and the attention that it deserves.

**🚩 Can someone send me the membership breakdown within OACETT by designation please. Thanks.**

As of October, we have 5,041 Associates, 6,782 Technicians and 8,237 Technologists.

**🚩 I am member since 2015, the day I landed in Ontario as an immigrant. OACETT does not provide any platform to provide jobs. Focus should be more on providing employment by mutual connections with employers. I don't think so changing the name can provide me any job.**

While OACETT is not a direct job placement organization, we do provide members with tools, resources, and networking opportunities that support career advancement. This includes our CTEN job board, networking opportunities at chapter and conferences and our Internationally Educated Professional career event.