

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP 2018 – EVALUATION

This report summarises the evaluation conducted at the end of the 2018 Stakeholder Workshop. Workshop comments on the Cadastral RPSurv Value Proposition are set out in Appendix A and workshop comments on Transitional Arrangements are summarised in Appendix B.

What was good about the workshop?¹

- Best form of communication, better than using e-mail or technology.
- Hear other experiences from streams, boards and branches.
- Networking.
- Meeting others – networking.
- Great opportunity to share ideas.
- Good engagement.
- Emphasis on dialogue/discussion.
- Cross section of attendees.
- Important to get a good section of members leading into the AGM.
- Good number of people/representation of streams and branches.
- Good diversity.
- Diversity of opinions.
- Representation (diversity of age, experience etc.)
- Good format.
- Relevant updates.
- RPSurv high level questions.
- CPD points.
- Letting people decide where to sit.
- Morning tea.

What was missed?

- Not referring to S+SNZ strategy.
- Topics beyond cadastral.
- Data standards (as-builts).
- Management of RPSurv?
- Spatial topics
- National Office/ branch support?
- What branches/streams or other groups are doing – key projects worth sharing and others learning from?
- Streams, branches, divisions need to cough up topics.
- Renumeration of volunteers – examination panel.
- Awards - more discussion next year.

¹ As set out in the responses by workshop participants on 15 November 2018.

How could the workshop be improved?

- Align discussion and content with the goals of S+SNZ.
- Agenda
- Have an agenda on each table.
- Better agenda please on what we are to talk about.
- Poor communication - late notice of topics.
- Documentation supplied beforehand, standard of document.
- Early indication of workshop structure, questions and documents to read.
- Everything on one webpage.
- Introduce attendees at the beginning of the workshop.
- List of attendees, introductions.
- Lack of time to talk to branch members.
- Too much one-way talking.
- Have more time for workshop, less information. (Keep LINZ etc but allow more time for discussion.)
- Opportunity to raise issues.
- Put speakers' names on screen.
- Put questions on screen.
- Need more drama and engagement.
- Need more success stories.
- LINZ update in communications forum not in workshop time.
- Feedback provided to members.
- A roving microphone.
- Circulate summary document from workshop discussion.
- Butter with muffins for morning tea.

Commentary/Interpretation

What was good?

Fact-to-fact time, networking, catching up and sharing news with the wide diversity of members present were highly valued activities associated with the workshop. High-level questions on RPSurv and updates and were specifically noted "content" items.

What was missed?

No discussion of strategy and a restricted range of topics (little outside of cadastral) featured on the downside. Omission of a number of topics was raised, including: data standards (as-builts), spatial topics, management of RPSurv, awards, remuneration of Examination Panel, and what branches and streams were doing.

How could the workshop be improved?

This can be summarised by "considerably better planning" and the need for "strategically driven content" which should limit complaints about non-inclusion of relatively small single-issue items that are not aligned with strategic direction.

The Stakeholder Workshop is Council/member driven and an opportunity to obtain feedback, gain the pulse of the membership, and provide a forum for engagement of strategic issues for the organisation. This requires a close collaboration between Council (responsible for content) and National Office

(responsible for support) to produce a targeted seamless event. This did not happen in 2018 – materials for consultation were delivered to members with insufficient time for consideration, content organisation was ad hoc, materials were being prepared and changed at the very last moment and there was no agenda circulated to members. We need to do better in 2019 with a suggested timetable as follows:

- December 2018 – circulation of summary of discussion of 2018 Stakeholder workshop, presentations and evaluation (to respond to suggestion at 2018 Stakeholder Workshop).
- No later than mid-August 2019 – Council (teleconference agenda item) to determine theme of 2019 Stakeholder Workshop and establish small working group to assist President.
- Early September 2019 – draft agenda developed by Council with National Office providing support as required. Tasks assigned for content development of items and materials (papers) identified that will need to be circulated at least three weeks prior to AGM.
- October – agenda and papers for 2019 Stakeholder Workshop available on website at least three weeks prior to the AGM and members advised by email with hyperlink (taking on board the suggestion made at the 2018 Stakeholder Workshop).
- 14 November - 2019 Stakeholder Workshop - name tags, table copies of agenda, roving microphone available. Meeting to begin with introductions. PowerPoint presentations to identify speakers (which should also be on the agenda). Evaluation to be completed at end of Stakeholder Workshop. Butter to be provided with scones for morning tea!

Compiled by Karin Knedler
Manager Advocacy and Policy
December 2018

Stakeholder Workshop 2018 – Cadastral RPSurv Value Proposition

Members' comments on flip charts

- Expert witness.
- Expert witness.
- Equivalency with CPENG, NZIA, NZPI.
- Need TAs to understand.
- Need to be satisfied TAs will accept.
- Employee qualification – staff differentiation.
- Value is different in different regions.
- Value to industry - keeping up to date: industry-wide standards.
- Value to individuals - RP = recognition of your peers for level of your professional ability and ethics. Personal value.
- L.C.S – What is the value of RPSurv (Cad) other than personal achievement?
- Different streams have varying value of RPSurv and different locations (TAs) – Educate them. You cannot have a broad-brush approach.
- (Insurance) – Ask Glen Stone if the insurance companies would make RPSurv a prequalifier for sole businesses and will they insure me as an RPSurv through my membership fees?
- Confidence of minimum standards for surveying.
- Clear separation LCS vs RPSurv (Cad) – raise the value and promote RPSurv (Cad) to Councils.
- Advertise.
- No understanding [?of RPSurv] at Otago University by students.
- Needs options.
- Confusion in names with public.
- Connection with misconduct and Board?
- Clarity around LCS and RPSurv.
- For consistency we should have RP for all streams/practice areas (endorsements).
- General consultant practice area is too fuzzy.
- Multiple endorsements/certifications can't take too long – maybe we need clarity here.
- Should be about standards not exclusivity.
- Must look attractive to young professionals and students.
- Challenge for generalists – how do you accumulate three years of specialist work? Need more detail about how “cross credit” would work.
- RPSurv spatial – Photogrammetry/remote sensing/carto/GIS.
- Perception of 2-step still being promoted – education/comms issue.
- Hydro – OK.
- LD – OK.
- Professional interview not understood – what is involved (interviews etc).
- Interaction with LCS needs to ?refresh (?reflect).
- Huge variety of permutations.
- Degree May 2017 - can continue under existing [model].
- Last laws and regs exam June 2020.
- Make it simple.
- Will there be a variety of certificates?

- Ethics.
- Hearings.
- Membership of professional body.
- Need clarity about using L.C.S projects for RPSurv (Cad).
- Barrier is perception of effort required to seek RPSurv.
- Timing for gaining LC.S is at a good level.
- Need to think ahead.
- C.P.D
- Support?
- Could offer training for new business?
- CPD is important topic here. S+SNZ should be intentional here.

Commentary/Interpretation

Members' comments can be broadly grouped into four areas:

1. Value

RPSurv (Cadastral) would have value in being recognised as requiring more experience than LCS – a point of differentiation that could add value to many areas including staff structure and to TAs (provided the difference is understood by them). RPSurv (Cadastral) is expected to also have high personal value and be recognised by peers as having met (and maintained by CPD, see later) a consistent level of professional ability and behaviour that is set by standards of entry, and a code of ethics. More widely there is recognition of experience such as being called upon as an expert witness. There may be financial benefits (other than remuneration) e.g. insurance advantages of having a lower risk profile associated with having met a higher professional threshold.

2. Design

Design is critical. Pathways must be clear. Differentiation from LCS must be clear and be easily understood so that there is no confusion, including recourse for misconduct. RPSurv (Cadastral) must be based on standards and be sufficiently flexible to cater for multiple endorsements which, on the other hand, can pose challenges in terms of length of time to acquire, and for the generalists in the profession. The design needs to be attractive to student and young professionals. Development should involve the Licensed Cadastral Surveyors Board.

3. Process

The process and requirements need to be simple and clear. It is about professional membership and all that that involves. The requirements should reflect that but not act as a barrier of disincentive.

4. CPD

Maintaining currency is an important co-requisite achieved by continuing professional development. S+SNZ has an important role in this regard.

Stakeholder Workshop 2018 – RPSurv Transitional Arrangements

Members' comments on flip charts:

- Strategy, needs to be a fair selection/criteria.
- Prioritise LD and engineering recertification cycle– they have the immediate need.
- Logistical planning required.
- Resourcing issue for certification (1-6 years).
- Examiners during transitional process.
- Time for recertification testing and when to apply. Laws and regulations – annual CPD events instead?
- Laws and regulations – interviews are the most effective - can't fudge it!
- Templates in the transition – need experts, note that we are professional but it will make Admission Panel (Certification) job easier, screening, could help with uptake.
- Current process – choice to continue but acknowledge competency towards other RPSurv categories.
- New graduates follow new policy.
- Easier for licenced cadastral surveyors.
- Please explain the two pathways.
- Clean record - cases by case basis, guidelines.
- Last exam?
- Cross credit of experience.
- Is it just like grandfathering again?
- Structure around 1-6 years (how to apply/decide).

Commentary/interpretation

Members' responses on transitional arrangements can be broadly grouped into three areas:

1. *Strategy*

There needs to be a clear strategy around the transitional arrangements. There are two aspects. The first involves a key decision is whether RPSurv is going to be rolled out simultaneously for all disciplines or in a staged manner according to, for example, greatest need of particular disciplines such as engineering and land development. The second aspect involves a clear strategy around the actual recertification/transitioning of existing RPSurv members. That will involve determining dates by which recertification has to occur (and by implication the date that use of existing RPSurv ceases. Once all those matters have been decided, guidelines and processes need to be put in place to execute the strategy and will need to be resourced (see below).

2. *Resourcing*

This covers not only resourcing of "recertification" of existing members but also certification of new applicants using the new RPSurv requirements. The former is a considerable additional body of work for which process (see below) and remuneration, in addition to resources, have yet to be considered and established.

The certification of new applicants is expected to continue as usual by the Examination Panel (according to the new RPSurv requirements for particular disciplines). The Panel is made up of

appointed volunteer members who receive some remuneration for examination marking, assessing of projects and interviewing the applicants.

The certification of existing RPSurv members (“recertification” process) will require experts and support (e.g. by way of templates and National Office administrative services) and has yet to be scoped. That scoping will, in turn, depend upon the process. Remuneration is likely to be an issue. The same, similar or different remuneration model to that used for the Examination Panel will need to be investigated.

3. Process

The process aspects are similarly multifaceted with a number of questions to be answered in the course of developing processes that will need to align with the strategy. For example, when does the new system kick in for new applicants (new graduates)? Processes will need to address all pathways. Over what period will the recertification take (1-6 years)? What will the roll-out process look like? Who will be in what tranche for recertification? What will it involve? How will it be managed? How will CPD be subsequently managed to ensure currency? Will there be any implications for the current certification process of new graduates, e.g. will the cadastral law examination continue?

All three areas will need to be supported by effective communications.