



Motions from the Floor at the 2010 AIBC Annual Meeting

During the Members' Forum portion of the AIBC Annual Meeting on Saturday, May 8, 2010, nine Motions from the Floor (MFTF) were moved, seconded and voted upon by those members in attendance. Four were carried while the other five did not obtain the necessary votes (The complete text of all nine MFTF can be found in the draft minutes of the 2010 Annual Meeting). Council's response to the four carried motions can be found on this page. Council has also responded to three additional motions that were submitted too late for review during the forum in May.

While AIBC Council is not bound by the four carried motions, it did undertake to consider the intent of each, and to respond, with reasons, to the membership. This consideration was given at Council's September 14, 2010 meeting, with the results as indicated below.

MFTF 1: Balfour / Rust re Continuing Education Database

Summary: That the institute become part of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada's national database for tracking Continuing Education requirements.

Decision: Council has declined to pursue this MFTF.

Reasons: The "continuing education database" decision (i.e., to *not* join the RAIC database) was made operationally last Fall on the basis of very thorough analysis. That rationale has been recently reviewed, considered by council, and stands unchanged for the foreseeable future. It has also been shared with the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities (CALA) in recent national meetings, and conveyed to the RAIC. In summary, the costs to the institute of joining the RAIC database would far outweigh the disproportionately minor benefit to very few members. As well, the wholly unmonitored nature of the current RAIC program is at odds with current AIBC Council policy and would put many

members at risk of non-compliance, with adverse consequences.

It is noteworthy that the CALA is establishing a task force (with the AIBC's support and participation) to review the potential of further national harmonization of continuing education regulation. At this time, it excludes consideration of the RAIC database.

MFTF 2: Diamond / Schmitt re Dialogue on Legislative Reform

Summary: That AIBC Council conduct a formal process for dialogue with membership on legislative renewal to determine consensus within the profession.

Decision: Council supports the thrust and spirit of this MFTF.

Reasons: The essence of this MFTF is at the core of AIBC Council's ongoing, consultative 'Engagement Strategy' as well as the related efforts of council's newly-established Engagement/Communication Working Group. Results of these efforts will be compiled and shared with both the membership and the provincial government.

MFTF 3: Lunde / J. Meiklejohn re Pilot Unmoderated AIBC Web Site Forum

Summary: That, as a pilot project, the AIBC establish an unmoderated online forum for use by Members, Graduate Architects, Retired Architects and Intern Architects.

Decision: Council has declined to pursue this MFTF.

Reasons: An unedited, unmoderated AIBC on-line forum, even on a trial basis, would be unwise, bringing undue risk and exposure to the institute or any other, similar regulatory body. The motion's internal caution about "illegal or inflammatory language" is well-taken and speaks to a serious, detrimental factor that cannot be negated regardless of any exculpatory disclaimer that might be appended. An open forum is ripe for misinformation, disrespectful dialogue and abuse

likely to alienate most members, damage the reputation of the profession and compromise the institute's role as a professional regulator. It would also require greater use of the institute's limited resources and finances, at the loss of other activities and with minimal strategic benefit.

Council does recognize and value the need for member dialogue and consultation in various forms. The new Engagement/Communication Working Group will consider viable, alternative avenues for members to openly communicate with council and each other.

MFTF Gies / Lovell re Justification of Legislative Renewal

4: Process

Summary: That members be provided with a detailed report outlining the reasons for and against legislative renewal.

Decision: Council has referred this MFTF to its newly-established Legislative Renewal Working Group.

Reasons: This motion is extensive in its ambit and requires diligent, thoughtful effort. Its essence will comprise a significant part of the Legislative Renewal Working Group's undertakings. While much has been published on this matter, there is a palpable need for earlier material to be distilled, understood and communicated in an accessible fashion with the broad range of membership. That process should also serve to help sharpen people's thinking, both on "big picture" and "statute repair" items and their connection (or independence) in moving forward.

(NB: Earlier draft legislation language, created in the hope of facilitating discussion with government, has been withdrawn from the AIBC web site and consideration by the provincial government. Instead, the scope and nature of future legislative renewal will be a function of (*inter alia*) feedback from member consultations and recommendations emanating from council's working groups' deliberations.)

Members' efforts to bring forward informed, well-formulated suggestions and recommendations for council's consideration are sincerely appreciated.

Michael A. Ernest MAIBC
Executive Director