

Component	What We Heard	Response from ESA
Need for Continuing Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, members of CoAC, ECRA and MEC were supportive of the premise of continuing education. Out of 13 responses received, survey participants indicated mixed support for continuing education. Some participants indicated that mandatory CE is unnecessary as existing Code update courses are sufficient. A smaller group of survey participants were supportive of continuing education. Members of CoAC, ECRA and MEC identified the desire to see CE included for all license holders, not just Master Electricians (MEs). Survey participants agreed with this approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESA believes that continuing education is important for professionals, our industry and overall public safety. Continuing education has many benefits, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting a system of ongoing learning to strengthen knowledge and standards Ensuring that qualifications do not become outdated Allowing individuals to up-skill and re-skill throughout their careers ESA acknowledges the potential benefits of CE for CofQ holders but does not have jurisdiction. ESA is committed to work with Skilled Trades Ontario (STO) via MGCS to ensure ongoing communication and exchange of information.
Mandatory and Elective Courses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of CoAC, ECRA and MEC, were supportive of elective content that provides learning opportunities for various skills MEs employ in their specific sector of the industry. Members were supportive of ESA involvement in a course focused specifically on the Electrical Safety Code. Survey participants felt that the code refresher course offered by the ESA is important and should be included in Phase 1 of CE requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESA agrees that continuing education requirements should include two components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compulsory courses focused on the Ontario Electrical Safety Code (OESC) and, Elective courses on a variety of topics relevant to the industry such as Health & Safety; Consumer Protection / Business operations, etc. As suggested by stakeholders, ESA believes that it has a role to play in the development and delivery of course(s) especially focused on the OESC, given its expertise with the subject matter.
Frequency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members felt that that the cycle for CE should occur more frequently than five years. Support for five-year renewal was mixed amongst survey participants. CoAC, ECRA and MEC identified the opportunity to align training with licensing requirements. For example, a suggestion was made to align the CE cycle with the OESC (Code) update cycle so that MEs are reflecting the most current Code requirements in their practices. Members of CoAC, ECRA and MEC, identified the need to ensure CE is not burdensome on the time and finances of individuals who are required to participate. Survey responses aligned with this feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently, the Code is updated every three years. ESA supports a three-year CE timeframe as it fulfills the organization's mandate, mission and vision to improve electrical safety for the public, as well as reflecting the feedback we received from the Advisory Councils and the public consultation. The three-year cycle also aligns with existing legislation and logistical requirements.

<p>Model</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most members of CoAC, ECRA and MEC, supported beginning a CE program under the Hybrid Model framework (with both ESA as well as third party providers providing training courses) with a transition to Third-Party Delivery Model over time. • Members consistently identified ESA's wealth of knowledge within the industry as an asset to bring into the delivery of CE. • Some members identified that ESA's educational role should be limited to content on the Electrical Safety Code. • Survey participants felt that the most important elements of a CE model are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courses are affordable. • The content is standardized and delivered in a consistent way. There is quality content, and it is technically accurate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESA recommends beginning a continuing education program under a hybrid model, where both ESA and third parties are involved in the development and delivery of continuing education courses, with a transition to a third-party delivery model. • This would allow ESA and its third-party partners to participate in the development of course content that reflects the technical information that is most relevant to MEs, while ensuring that courses can be delivered across the province, without gaps. • Once this foundation has been built and the transition criteria are met, the continuing education program would transition to delivery by third parties; ESA would only deliver courses where a gap exists in delivery options. • ESA would retain its role in accrediting course providers and approving course content. • Most ECRA and MEC members supported this option and the discussions during the consultation helped us to understand your priorities and concerns and ultimately inform this recommendation.
---------------------	---	---