

CTAC Development or Review Second Level Review Process

Document No. TACDEV-2

Effective: July 29, 2015

Scope

This process shall be used by the Executive Director or designate upon the submission of a new or revised Canadian Technology Accreditation Criteria (CTAC) document for use in accreditation activities. This document is supported by a checklist - document number TACDEV-2A.

Definition

A second level review is a procedural review supported by documentation. This documentation confirms that all mandatory stages of the process by which CTACs are developed were followed and in meeting minutes.

Principles

The development of CTAC documents is to be an inclusive, open process, involving stakeholders including, but not limited to Academia, Industry, Members and representatives from the Provincial Professional Associations (PPAs). The process will include an announcement regarding the intent to develop new criteria, the creation of a Standards Development Committee to develop the criteria, a process to reach agreement or consensus on the criteria and a method by which any interested stakeholder may comment upon the criteria, prior to its final approval. This review step is intended to ensure that each of the above principles have been met.

Considerations during a Second Level Review:

Handling of an initial request for development of new or revised criteria

- Was the request for the development of new criteria or updating of existing criteria considered by the Standards Council?
- Was the submitter contacted with a response to their request?
- If denied, was a rationale provided?
- Does the documentation support this?

Announcement

- Was a general announcement made to stakeholders regarding the development of a new or updating of an existing standard?
- Did expressions of interest to join the Committee result? If so, were the applicants considered and informed of the decision?
- Does the documentation support this?

Establishment of Committee

- Was a Standards Development Committee established by The Standards Council?
- Does the Committee have multiple stakeholder representation?
- Was a Chair appointed?
- Does the documentation support this?

Agreement or consensus

- Did the committee agree to post the final draft for open stakeholder review?
- Does the documentation support this?

Public Review

- Was the draft posted with request for public comment?
- Was there an announcement to stakeholders that the document was available for review and comment?
- Was the period for comment 30 days or greater?
- Does the documentation support this?

Handling of Comments

- Did the Committee consider any comments received during the public review period?
- Was there a response to the commenter with rationale if the comments were not incorporated?
- Does the documentation support this?

Approval

- Were all Committee members in agreement that the document should move forward as a formal set of criteria for accreditation?
- Were any negative votes revoked or deemed non-relevant by the Chair and Committee?
- Did the Standards Council endorse the Committee's approval?
- Does the documentation support this?

Draft One