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SUBJECT: Revision of IES 3 – Issues and proposals from IAESB task force related to comments received on exposure draft (7/13)

OBJECTIVES OF AGENDA ITEM

1. The aim of this paper is to assist the CAG in its discussion of the issues related to the revision of IES 3. Specifically the paper will:
   (i) Provide updated background information on the revision of IES 3
   (ii) Identify changes made to IES 3 arising from the full analysis and discussion of comments on the Exposure Draft and IAESB directions
   (iii) Present a revised IES 3

2. This agenda item contains the following materials:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 3-1</th>
<th>Revision of IES 3: Issues and proposals from IAESB task force related to comments received on the exposure draft (7/13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda item 3-2</td>
<td>Revised Draft of IES 3 – Clean version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda item 3-3</td>
<td>Revised Draft of IES 3 – Marked up version showing changes made since exposure as presented to the IAESB at its June 2013 meeting (New York) plus changes agreed by the IAESB at that meeting to common paragraphs and minor editorial corrections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND

3. The review of IES 3 is part of IAESB’s project to update all of the International Education Standards. This takes into account:
   (i) conclusions of the Framework and Drafting Conventions project;
   (ii) experience and feedback received since IES 3 was first published;
   (iii) changes in the environment; and
   (iv) the need for further clarification and emphasis.

4. IES 3 has been discussed at IAESB meetings in November 2010 (Singapore), March 2011 (Geneva) and May 2011 (Toronto) and October 2011 (Cape Town), and March 2012 (Merida) and June 2012 (New York) and March 2013 (New York) and June 2013 (New York) and at the September 2010, May 2011, September 2011, April 2012 and February 2013 CAG meetings.

5. The following issues have been previously discussed and agreed:
   (i) IES 3 should not include general education;
   (ii) IES 3 should address professional skills for Initial Professional Development (IPD), but the Explanatory materials should refer to lifelong learning and CPD for further developing these skills;
   (iv) IES 3 should not over-emphasize the development of technical skills at the expense of generalist professional skills: the coverage needs to be balanced;
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(iv) IES 3 skills should be reviewed and updated to reflect the needs of today's professional accountant;
(v) IES 3 skills should be expressed as high level learning outcomes;
(vi) IES 3 skills should aim to address the minimum core professional skills expected of a new entrant;
(vii) The main sections to include under professional skills are: personal, interpersonal and communication, organizational and intellectual;
(viii) Skills relating to Professional values, ethics and attitudes are adequately addressed in IES 4 and so can be removed from IES 3; and
(ix) IES 3 should include a requirement for member bodies to establish appropriate assessment processes for professional skills.

6. A full history of discussions about IES 3 (at Board meetings, CAGs and task force meetings) is shown as Appendix 1 to this paper. The most recent IAESB meeting output (June 2013) is, however, discussed within the main body of this report.

DISCUSSION

Issues raised during public consultation period and IAESB’s response to discussion on this initiated by the IES 3 task force

7. This section of the paper identifies outstanding issues raised by the task force in response to the outcome of the public consultation period and summarises the IAESB’s response to these issues at its June 2013 meeting and the task force's action taken since that meeting.

General Education

8. The IAESB was happy with the proposed way forward in relation to General Education as shown in the revised IES 3 at Agenda item 3-2 and asked that the task force ensure that there was no conflict between the wording in the revised IES 3 and the IAESB’s glossary and framework. The task force checked this and is satisfied that there is no conflict.

Proficiency Levels

9. The IAESB supported the task force’s recommendation to move Intellectual Skills from Advanced level to Intermediate level and this is now marked as a change to the draft (see Agenda item 3-2) which was considered by the IAESB at its June 2013 meeting.

Specific learning outcomes

10. The IAESB discussed the relative merits and disadvantages of including professional judgement and skepticism within IES 3. There was some support for their inclusion in IES 3 in order to stress their importance, coupled with some discomfort in terms of duplication as these concepts also appear in IES 4. There was some discussion around the need to include them within IES 3 to make it clear to readers that professional judgement and skepticism applies broadly to the work performed by a professional accountant and is not just specific to the auditor role. After discussion at the Board, it was agreed to include professional judgement and skepticism in IES 3 and to make sure that there is either consistency in the wording for both in IES 3 and IES 4, or alternatively, to find logical and meaningful differences to make each context specific. The task force considered the Board’s recommendation and revised the draft of IES 3 to be consistent with IES 4; updates are shown in the Table A extract below.

11. The IAESB expressed a preference for consultation with experts being expressed as consultation with specialists rather than experts in order to avoid potential legal complications/connotations associated with the term expert. There was some discussion over whether this learning outcome...
belonged within the Intellectual Skills competence area and it was agreed that this was appropriate.

12. The term *logical reasoning* was discussed as the IAESB queried the relevance of the word *logical*. This discussion also covered the potential for other cognitive skills such as reflection and appreciation to be included within the Intellectual Skills competence area. However, it was agreed not to include any new skills, and it was noted that reflection was covered under the Personal Skills competence area. It was agreed that the task force should remove the word *logical* and simply refer to *reasoning* as this could appropriately cover various types of reasoning.

13. The IAESB discussed the appropriateness of the inclusion of *innovative thinking* in the Intellectual Skills competence area and recognised that a desire for its inclusion had been a strong feature of the consultation responses and therefore agreed that it should be included.

14. *Hypothesis testing* was discussed as possibly appropriate for inclusion within the Intellectual Skills area, but it was agreed that there was no compelling reason to add this, particularly as there had been no mention of it in the consultation responses to the exposure draft.

15. The IAESB discussed the use of the term *multi-disciplinary problems* and debated whether the original exposure draft term of *multi-faceted problems* would be more suitable. It was noted that the change had been made in relation to two comments only received on exposure, and that the original term *multi-faceted problems* might potentially provide a better indicator of the skills to be developed through this learning outcome. The task force considered this, and was in favor of reverting to the words *multi-faceted problems*.

16. One member of the IAESB queried whether the learning outcome (a) (ii) under the Intellectual Skills competence area fitted in this competence area. The task force considered this and agreed to take no action as it was not raised through public consultation.

17. Table A of IES 3 from Appendix 3-2 is reproduced below, updated with the amendments proposed by the task force and described in paragraphs 10-16 above.

Table A: Learning Outcomes for Professional Skills (Updated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence Area (Level of Proficiency)</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Intellectual (Intermediate)</td>
<td>(i) Evaluate information from a variety of sources and perspectives through research, analysis and integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Apply professional judgment, including identification and evaluation of alternatives, to reach well-reasoned conclusions based on all relevant facts and circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Identify when it is appropriate to consult with specialists to solve problems and reach conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Apply reasoning, innovative thinking and critical thinking to solving problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The level of proficiency for a competence area to be achieved by the end of IPD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence Area (Level of Proficiency)</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(v) Identify, evaluate, and recommend solutions to unstructured, multi-faceted problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Interpersonal and communication (Intermediate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Promote cooperation and teamwork when working towards organizational goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Communicate clearly and concisely when presenting, discussing and reporting in formal and informal situations, both in writing and orally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Demonstrate awareness of cultural and language differences in all communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Apply active listening and effective interviewing techniques.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Apply negotiation skills to reach solutions and agreements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Apply consultative skills to minimize or resolve conflict, solve problems and maximize opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Present ideas and influence others to provide support and commitment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Personal (Intermediate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Demonstrate a commitment to lifelong learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Apply professional skepticism through questioning and critically assessing all information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Set high personal standards of delivery and monitor personal performance, through feedback from others and through reflection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Manage time and resources to achieve professional commitments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Anticipate challenges and plan potential solutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Apply an open mind to new opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Organizational (Intermediate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Undertake assignments in accordance with established practices to meet prescribed deadlines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Review work to determine whether it complies with the organization’s quality standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Apply people management skills to motivate and develop others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Apply delegation skills to deliver assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Apply leadership skills to influence others to work towards organizational goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Apply appropriate tools and technology to tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ease of assessing learning outcomes
18. It was agreed that the mention of workplace - in the last sentence of paragraph A18 - in relation to assessment of professional competence should be removed. The paragraph will now refer to keeping diaries rather than keeping workplace diaries as this covers activities outside the formal workplace which might, for example, include voluntary work.

Other issues

19. It was agreed that paragraphs A9 and A10 should be swapped to ensure consistency with other IESs.

20. Other than the relatively minor changes outlined above, the IAESB was happy that the revised IES 3 was appropriate for presentation to the CAG, since it had now been amended appropriately to reflect the comments received on exposure. The task force believes that IES 3 should be ready for final consideration and voting out at the IAESB October 2013 meeting.

Action Requested:

1. Does the CAG have any comments on the issues outlined above (points 8 – 19) in terms of the way the task force intends to respond to the IAESB’s comments?

2. Does the CAG have any further comments on the draft IES 3 presented as Agenda item 3-2?

3. Are there any additional significant issues that you wish to identify, to be addressed by the Task Force, relating to the respondents’ comments on the exposure draft and the IAESB’s related responses?

Proposed Way Forward

21. The task force will reflect on the CAG’s advice and make any necessary editorial changes to IES 3 for the Board’s discussion at its October 2013 meeting.
Appendix 1

History of discussion on IES 3

May 2011 IAESB Meeting

1. The Board noted that there was significant overlap of content with other standards. One suggestion made was for IES 2 to cover the majority of Technical and Functional skills. There was general support for only having subjects in one of the three standards (IES 2, 3 or 4).

2. In discussion, it was suggested that the standards should make greater use of the IES 2 taxonomy of verbs, adding to this if necessary. There was a counter-view expressed that this taxonomy only dealt with cognitive and not affective skills and was therefore not suitable for IES 3.

3. Another suggestion was that conceptually each standard could have an element of knowledge and skills, but that IES2 should deal with technical abilities, IES 3 with non-technical/soft/pervasive abilities and IES 4 with abilities (both technical and non-technical) specifically related to Ethics.

4. There were mixed views in the Board about the value of introducing a new sub-category of “professional skills”, not least since the proposed title would be confusing given the title of the standard.

5. There was not much support for the new proposed definition of ‘professional context’ nor the revised definition of ‘Professional Skills’. Instead, the Board suggested IES 3 should specify levels of competence for each skill (e.g. “1”, “2”, “3”). So, “1” might denote a basic appreciation; “2” might denote ability to demonstrate within a supervised or non-complex environment; and “3” might denote mastery.

6. There was broad agreement in the Board that the 35 proposed skills could be reduced to those that justified a ‘shall’ requirement. This could dispense with the need to have sub-categories of skills.

September 2011 CAG Meeting

7. The CAG discussed an issues paper in Jacksonville in September 2011.

8. The CAG supported an outcomes-based approach to drafting the skills required by IES 3, but was divided as to whether the IES 2 taxonomy could be used for this purpose.

9. The CAG did not support the introduction of additional skills levels related to the degree of supervision required to display the skill. Instead, the CAG suggested incorporating the level of skill into the wording of the outcome.

10. There was strong support in the CAG for eliminating duplication where possible between IESs 2 and 3. However, the CAG felt it important to reinforce the importance of ethics across all three standards even if this led to some repetition.

11. The CAG supported the proposed list of skills to be covered under the requirement. It suggested including “knowing how and when to bring in specialist expertise” as an additional essential skill. It also suggested re-ordering the skills to give due prominence to professional skepticism,

12. The CAG noted that the Issues paper made no reference to assessment. The CAG suggested the task force consider whether IES 3 should contain requirements or guidance on how Professional Skills should be assessed.
Actions taken following the CAG meeting

13. The IES 3 task force met by teleconference in October 2011. Having considered the comments from the May 2011 IAESB and the September 2011 CAG, the task force proposed four areas in which IES 3 should be revised in addition to those listed in paragraph 4 above:
   - an outcomes-based approach, using verbs appropriate for skills-based learning outcomes in a hierarchy loosely based on Bloom’s work;
   - elimination of unnecessary duplication of coverage among IES 2, 3 and 4, but with a strong emphasis on ethics retained in IES 3;
   - reduction in the number of skills covered to those deemed ‘essential’ and inclusion of the ‘essential’ skills within the Requirements section of the standard; and
   - addition of a requirement on assessment of Professional Skills.

October 2011 (Cape Town) meeting

14. The task force presented a discussion paper to the IAESB in October 2011, moving its work on by taking into account the discussions outlined above.

15. The Board agreed that IES 2 and IES 3 needed to be consistent when addressing criteria for selecting learning outcomes. The Board also agreed that consideration be given to ensuring there are sufficient references to integration skills across IES 2, 3 and 4.

16. The Board considered the task force proposals for dividing IES 3 skills into three levels, using the terminology set out below:

   Proposed Professional Skills (IES 3) Taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert (master)</td>
<td>Act, Display, Resolve, Manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (proficient)</td>
<td>Adapt, Control, Demonstrate, Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic (able)</td>
<td>Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. The Board generally supported for the three level approach. The Board suggested that this could be adapted to apply across the three domains of Cognitive, Affective and Psychomotor skills.

18. Some Board Members expressed concern that it may be difficult to show post qualification development with only three levels. However, others argued that this factor could be captured by reference to different levels of complex context, rather than by adding a fourth level of learning outcome.

19. The Board noted that the term ‘expert’ could be problematic, as this had a specific legal connotation in the US.

20. Some Board members asked for more verbs at each level, to provide greater flexibility when drafting outcomes. In discussion, the Board noted that if the level and context were both specified it could be argued that the choice of verb was far less critical, and possibly easier for the non-expert reader to understand.

21. The Board fully supported the proposed approach to coordinating the redrafting of IES 2, 3, 4 and 8.
22. The Board considered a prioritized list of Professional Skills. It asked the task force to review the wording of the outcomes to see if it were possible to make them more measurable. Some Board members expressed concern over the use of the verb “display” with respect to professional skepticism. The Board suggested that specifying the level of the outcome and also the context (level of complexity) in which it should be demonstrated would help sharpen up the meaning of the outcomes. The Board agreed that the critical point was that outcomes needed to be demonstrable and observable. Moreover, constructing the outcomes with a noun, verb and qualifier would reduce reliance on the verb alone.

23. The Board noted that IES 3 presents a framework for professional skills, not a competency map nor an exhaustive list of the outcomes expected of a professional accountant. However, IES 3 should address the core professional skills expected of a new entrant to the profession. The expectation will be that member bodies would take these high level outcomes and break them down further into very Specific competences the aspiring professional accountant should be demonstrating.

Some Board members suggested that this notion of ‘fleshing out’ the learning outcomes could be a requirement of IES 3, with an example of how this might be done included in the explanatory material.

24. Some Board members queried the omission of ‘influence’ and ‘fraud’ as core skills. Others questioned the inclusion of ‘professional skepticism’ for all professional accountants at the highest level.

25. Some Board members suggested that the rewriting of the delegation and self-directed outcome had lost some of its original strength and clarity. The outcomes must link to the service the client receives by considering the competences required of the professional accountant to deliver this service.

26. The Board considered whether Intellectual Skills sat best within IES 2 or IES 3, and broadly agreed that they should be retained within IES 3.

27. The Board also discussed the most appropriate place of the new section on Professional values, ethics and attitudes. It agreed that these areas were already adequately addressed in IES 4. Responses from the public consultation on IES 4 did not indicate any gaps, so this section could be removed from IES 3, to avoid duplication. The IES 3 task force will reconcile how the IES 3 outcomes are addressed in IES 4, for completeness.

28. The Board agreed it was important IES 3 included a requirement for member bodies to establish appropriate assessment processes, and that this was consistent with the approaches being taken to IES 2, 4 and 6.

29. The Board agreed that the IES 3 requirements should not be written in a way that implied the professional skills listed were an exhaustive list. Rather, the Standard should make clear to the reader that the list is a minimum requirement; this approach would mirror that used for IES 4.
Actions taken following the IAESB meeting in Cape Town (October 2011)

30. The task force held a teleconference on 16 January to discuss the outcomes from the Board meeting, to consider a revised proposed competence framework for use within IES 2, 3, 4 and 8, and a first version of the Exposure Draft for IES 3. The task force also exchanged views by email during January and February.

31. The task force agreed that a foreword was needed to explain how IES 2, 3 and 4 worked together. This would describe the overall competence needed by a newly qualified professional accountant, and help provide a ‘golden thread’ through the standards.

32. The task force had mixed views on the coverage of general education in its proposed revision of IES 3. Some felt there was too much explanatory material; others considered this would be helpful for readers. The task force also discussed the appropriateness or otherwise of referring to general education in the Explanatory Materials when it was not part of the Requirement itself.

33. The task force noted that it would be necessary in the drafting process to ensure that IES 3 was consistent with the other standards, particularly as regards inclusion of standard paragraphs and ordering of paragraphs. The objective wording needs to be consistent with IES 2 and 4. It was agreed that these issues would be addressed in the next iteration of the Exposure Draft, following the March 2012 Board and April 2012 CAG discussions.

March 2012 (Merida) meeting

34. The IAESB received an Issues paper which provided issues and task force proposals for discussion. A summary of the Board’s discussion is as follows:

(i) Outcomes for Professional Skills

In general the IAESB supported that IES 3 describe professional skills in terms of outcomes. For purposes of consistency among IESs 2, 3, 4, and 8, IAESB members suggested that three levels of proficiency be applied to the competence frameworks being proposed for IESs 2, 3, and 8. IAESB members also suggested that the three proficiency levels be reviewed to identify more suitable descriptors, especially the term, expert, which creates expectations that could be viewed as contentious in some jurisdictions. A few IAESB members expressed concern that the three levels did not provide enough flexibility for development of the professional accountant in specializations occurring after qualification. Other IAESB members indicated that this flexibility could be achieved by describing the context in which the learning needs to be achieved rather than creating an additional fourth proficiency level. Some IAESB members requested that the verbs identified for each proficiency level be expanded to enable greater flexibility when describing the outcomes. Alternatively, some IAESB members suggested that each outcome be described in terms of proficiency level and context rather than create a fourth level.
(ii) **Approach to Coordinate the Redrafting of IES 2, 3, 4 and 8**

The IAESB agreed with the task force’s proposal that a small working group representing IES 2, 3, 4 and 8 task forces with the support of IFAC staff should be tasked with maintaining the mapping of subject coverage between the proposed new standards and considering the alignment of timelines for finalization of the standards.

(iii) **List of Professional Skills**

The IAESB requested that the outcomes of professional skills be reviewed to ensure that outcomes be observable, demonstrable, and measurable. IAESB members suggested that the understanding of the outcomes could be sharpened by specifying the proficiency level and the context (level of complexity) of each outcome. IAESB members indicated that there was too much reliance being put on the verbs in describing the outcomes and more emphasis should be placed on providing appropriate context when describing the expected outcome.

IAESB members indicated that the competence framework should not include the details of a competence map, but aim to address core professional skills expected of a professional accountant who is entering the profession. IAESB members suggested that member bodies should take these statements of high level outcomes and break them down even further into very specific competences that an aspiring professional accountant should demonstrate.

IAESB also indicated that a requirement should be included in IES 3 to require member bodies to further develop the learning outcomes according to the needs of their marketplace. IAESB members suggested that the task force consider the following suggestions in developing the competence framework; including skills related to fraud and influencing as core skills; reviewing the proficiency level of skills associated professional scepticism; and improving on the clarity of outcomes describing delegation of responsibility.

In each of these the outcome statements IAESB members suggested that the outcome should be linked to the services required of the client, customer, or employer.

(iv) **Intellectual Skills**

The IAESB indicated that the section on Intellectual skills be kept within IES 3. The IAESB also suggested that the section on Professional Values, Ethics, and Attitudes should be deleted to avoid duplication with outcomes expressed in IES 4. IAESB members suggested that reconciliation between outcomes of IES 3 and outcomes of IES 4 be prepared for purposes of completeness.

(v) **Requirement on Assessment**

In general the IAESB members agreed with the task force proposal to include a requirement on assessment in IES 3 and ensure consistency with IESs 2, 4, and 6. A few members suggested that the inclusion of an assessment requirement was redundant if it did not add new content to what was stated in IESs 2, 4, and 6.

(vi) **Requirement of Professional Skills**

IAESB indicated that the requirement should not imply that the list of professional skills was exhaustive. IAESB members suggested that the inclusion of ‘at an absolute minimum’ could address this issue and was consistent with the approach used in IES 4.
35. During the three days in Merida, a meeting was held between the Chairs and Secretaries of IES 2, 3, 4 and 8 to clarify a number of consistency issues. This group had a further meeting, by teleconference in April 2012. As a result, a number of standard paragraphs were developed for all these IESs and were incorporated into the IES 3 exposure draft.

CAG meeting (teleconference) April 2012

36. The CAG meeting was presented with a summary of work to date on IES 3, and was asked a number of questions. The CAG was very supportive of the direction IES 3 is taking, and gave the following responses to specific questions:

(i) **Q1: Does the CAG have any comments on the draft competence framework?**

1. Before the meeting, a CAG member sent round an email proposing a different way of approaching the framework. The CAG concluded this was very helpful, nothing that it highlighted well the challenge of dealing with the difference between cognitive and other skill domains. The Chairs and Secretaries of IES 2, 3, 4 and 8 are taking forward consideration of the overall competence framework.

2. The CAG agreed that further consideration needed to be given to how the framework can better express levels of complexity and ambiguity, and realism of problems as progress was made upwards through the levels within the framework.

3. The CAG agreed that, should the different approach on the framework be taken forward, then paragraph A11 in the latest draft IES 3 needed only minor amendments.

4. However, the actual draft competence framework (intended to be applicable for many IESs) had what was seen as a fundamental flaw, in that many skills (e.g. synthesis) were necessary at every level from Foundation to Master, but would still be applied to different situations or sets of information. For example, one can synthesise both straightforward, non-complex issues, as well as synthesizing more complex information at advanced level.

5. CAG members agreed with this direction of thought and welcomed Clare Minchington’s support for this approach from an IES 3 perspective.

6. It was agreed at the CAG that a joint Chairs/Secretaries task force meeting should consider how to develop the competence framework along these lines.

7. Dr Ray Johnson, the CAG member who suggested this alternative approach, would engage further with the task force Chairs/Secretaries on this and provide help.

(ii) **Q2: Does the CAG support the idea of calling the framework a taxonomy and issuing it alongside the Framework, following exposure?**

1. The CAG supported the use of the word **framework** rather than **taxonomy**. It was thought that **taxonomy** sounded rather too scientific and implied very tight and specific definitions, which might be inappropriate and was not a term likely to resonate well with readers.

2. The CAG noted that the competence framework was designed to sit within the IAESB’s Framework document. There was some discussion about whether it was confusing to have one framework within another framework. However, the CAG agreed that this was not an issue and that the word **framework** should be used.
3. The CAG also agreed that, once the competence framework is fully developed, it should be exposed for public comment.

(iii) Q3: Does the CAG have any comment on the draft professional skills presented above, which the task force can take into account when making the revisions outlined below?

1. The CAG was very supportive of the professional skills as presented and made the following suggestions for improvement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional skills</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>CAG Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal</td>
<td>(a) Apply the principles of lifelong learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Deliver work assignments of a high standard, in accordance with established methodologies and within the prescribed timeframes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Evaluate own performance, through feedback from others and/or through reflection, seeking out ways in which it can be enhanced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Evaluate professional commitments and manage own time and resources to achieve them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Be proactive by evaluating the working environment and anticipating potential problems. Anticipate and evaluate the environment working in to seek opportunities in order to be proactive to potential problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Display enthusiasm for new ideas and opportunities; remain positive in the face of changes to goals and priorities.</td>
<td>Enthusiasm is not always appropriate. The word open might be better, with a change of wording to incorporate it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interpersonal and communication</td>
<td>(a) Promote cooperation and teamwork, working towards appropriate solutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Exercise clear and concise communication skills when presenting, discussing and reporting through formal, informal, written and spoken channels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Exercise active listening and effective interviewing techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Apply effective negotiation skills to reach appropriate solutions and agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Understand and respond appropriately to the characteristics of conflict and how it manifests itself in professional and organizational contexts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Exercise sensitivity to cultural and language differences in all forms of communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. A query was raised as to whether the inclusion of leadership was set at too high a level, and whether some of the other learning outcomes were also too high level. It was agreed that this issue was linked to Dr Johnson’s comments and that the task force should look at setting all the learning outcomes at an introductory level.

3. It was also noted that the table contains some grammatical errors and should be consistent in terms of referring to the first or third person etc.

(iv) Q4: Does the CAG agree that each professional skill should be associated with a level?

1. The CAG unanimously agreed that many of the professional skills listed could be associated with multiple levels. It was noted that one option would be to assign appropriate levels to each outcome, which would set a minimum level for each learning outcome. Another option discussed would be to set every professional skill at the introductory level, which would demonstrate that this was a minimum, beyond which member bodies could determine their own increased levels as appropriate.

It was agreed that this issue needs further discussion in connection with other IESs being considered by the CAG as part of its agenda.
2. The conclusion at this point was that further discussion was needed on this issue and it was noted that similar issues would also apply to other IESs being considered by the CAG at this meeting.

(v) **Q5:** Does the CAG support the task force’s proposal to recommend to the June 2012 Board that general education is not mentioned within IES 3, but considered as a topic for future guidance material?

The CAG fully supported this recommendation.

(vi) **Q6:** Does the CAG have any comments on the draft Requirement relating to Assessment and the related Explanatory Material, bearing in mind the intention to make editorial changes to ensure consistency with IES 6?

**Q7:** Does the CAG have any additional comments on the draft IES 3 at Agenda item 2-2?

As time was short, the final two questions above were not covered specifically, but the CAG was supportive of the direction the draft IES 3 was taking.

**Task force teleconference (April 2012)**

37. The task force met by teleconference in April 2012 and discussed the issues raised by the CAG. These issues were taken into account and included within the exposure draft presented to the IAESB at its meeting in June 2012 (New York).

**IAESB meeting June 2012 (New York)**

38. The IAESB received a draft of the revised International Education Standard (IES) 3, *Initial Professional Development – Professional Skills*, and an Issues paper, which provided Board members with a summary of editorial changes made since the March 2012 IAESB Meeting.

The following summarizes the Board’s discussion

**39. IAESB Discussion of Issues and Task Force Proposals**

**The Learning Outcomes for Professional Skills**

In general the IAESB supported the task force’s proposals on the presentation of learning outcomes for professional skills, subject to amendments suggested by IAESB members. IAESB members made suggestions to clarify the learning outcomes of the following competence areas:

- **Intellectual.** Change the minimum level of proficiency from foundation to advanced.
- **Personal.** Change the minimum level of proficiency from foundation to intermediate.
- **Interpersonal and Communication.** Reword learning outcome (c) (v) to focus on consultative skills to minimize and resolve conflict. Change the minimum level of proficiency from foundation to intermediate.
- **Organizational.** Reword verbs of learning outcomes (d) (i) and (d) (v) to better reflect expected level of proficiency as a professional accountant. Include a new learning outcome that focuses on delegation skills to deliver work assignments. Reword learning outcome (d) to focus technology on work tasks rather than problems and the preparation of documentation. Change the minimum level of proficiency from foundation to intermediate.

In addition the IAESB suggested that for purposes of clarity paragraph A7 should be re-positioned to form a new paragraph A10 so as to explain what factors should be considered and who should be consulted in determining the appropriate approach to learning and development activities.
General Education

The IAESB agreed with the task force proposal to remove the reference to General Education.

The IAESB views general education as an important part of developing professional competence. General education may be undertaken as a concurrent pathway alongside a member body’s professional accounting education program, or may be taken prior to this. The IAESB therefore prefers not to emphasize general education as a requirement within the development of professional skills. The IAESB does, however, recognize the need for general education in the development of the aspiring professional accountant and has used the Framework (2009) document to highlight the importance of general education as a component of IPD. It was suggested that the IAESB consider a project to address the need for implementation guidance on how general education can be used to develop the aspiring professional accountant in the next Strategy and Work Plan.

Page-by Page Review

40. In general the IAESB accepted the task force’s proposals for amendments to the wording of the revised draft of IES 3 subject to suggestions agreed by the Board to improve clarity. The nature of the agreed amendments included:

- Paragraph 1: New content has been added to introduce what professional skills include and how they are related to the development of professional competence.
- Paragraphs A3-A4: Content from paragraph A1 has been re-positioned to form a new paragraph A3 so as to provide explanation on the four competence areas of professional skills: intellectual, personal, interpersonal and communication, and organizational. Paragraph A4 provides a definition of competence areas and gives examples of competence areas for technical competence and professional values, ethics, and attitudes.
- Paragraph A11: A new paragraph has been added to define and explain professional accounting education programs.
- Paragraph A13-A15: New content has been added to paragraph A13 define assessment activities, to paragraph A14 to explain the challenges of achieving high levels of levels of reliability, validity, equity, transparency, and sufficiency in workplace assessment, and to paragraph A15 to clarify the advice to address these challenges.
Other Editorial Changes

The IAESB agreed to several small editorial changes to improve the clarity of the Introduction, Objective, Requirements, and Explanatory Material sections. These changes addressed issues that improved the understanding of the document without substantially changing the content of these paragraphs.

Responses to the exposure draft

41. 32 responses were received, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFAC Member Bodies and Associates</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Accounting firms</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulators</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals and Others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the responses are from bodies representing multiple organizations, such as the Federation des Experts Comptables Europeens (FEE) which represents 43 professional institutes. The original comment letters are posted on the IFAC website at http://www.ifac.org/publications-resources/ies-3-initial-professional-development-professional-skills

There was strong general support for the revised IES 3 with some concerns raised, which are discussed below.

Activity undertaken since the closure of the exposure draft comment period

43. The task force discussed the issues raised during the exposure draft consultation period via a teleconference and, as a result, presented the proposals and questions outlined below for the CAG’s comment and guidance at its February 2013 meeting. Following this meeting, the task force agreed the proposed way forward via email discussion, as presented to the IAESB at its meeting in March 2013 and discussed below.

CAG meeting February 2013

44. The CAG met on 7/8 February 2013 and were presented with an Analysis of Comments document, as well as an Issues Paper which included background information and questions for discussion on the Exposure Draft. The following summarizes the discussion of CAG members.

General Education

45. In general the CAG members agreed with the task force’s proposal to delete the requirement on general education and that the Explanatory Material section should be enhanced with
further explanation and guidance material. CAG members suggested that further clarification is needed to describe what general education means in a global educational environment and how it is to be included in the career pathway of an aspiring professional accountant. CAG members indicated that a stronger statement on general education should be included since it contributes to the acquisition of professional skills and general education provides one way of helping aspiring professional accountants become broad-minded individuals who communicate effectively and are able to research, analyze and apply logical and critical thinking to problems. CAG members supported the task force proposal to include additional wording on general education in the Explanatory Material section, subject to the consideration of some editorial suggestions that improved the clarity of the statement.

Learning Outcomes Approach

46. In general the CAG agreed with the task force proposal to retain the learning outcomes approach, subject to further explanation being included in the Explanatory Material section. CAG members that this area needed guidance material to assist member bodies and other interested stakeholders in the implementation of a learning outcomes approach in professional accounting education.

Assignment of Levels of Proficiency

47. In general the CAG supported the four competence areas identified in the Professional Skills, but suggested that the proficiency levels for Interpersonal and Communications skills should be increased to an advanced level from intermediate level. CAG members suggested that communications skills were important for financial reporting and auditing when reporting to the public and clients of these services. It was also suggested that competence areas of Interpersonal and Communications Skills and Intellectual Skills are interlinked and should therefore be set at the same level as one another.

Specific Learning Outcomes

48. In general CAG members agreed with the task force’s proposal of assigning proficiency levels to the competence areas, subject to a consistency review of the verbs used in the learn outcomes statements and those provided in the Appendix on the Classification of Proficiency Levels. CAG members also suggested that the learning outcomes of Quantitative Methods be given more prominence, possibly as a competence area or by including learning outcomes in the logical reasoning area. CAG members supported the including learning outcomes for professional judgment in personal skills area and learning outcomes for professional skepticism in the Intellectual Skills area given their importance, and suggested that they should have an intermediate level of proficiency. CAG members also suggested to include ‘knowing when to consult an expert’ within the Organizational Skills area.
Ease of Assessing Learning Outcomes Related to Professional Skills

49. In general CAG members agreed that professional skills could be assessed, even though some of the professional skills can be challenging to assess. CAG members suggested that Explanatory Material section identify that there is a role for employers to play in the area of assessment, but indicated that area would be a suitable area for further guidance on IES 3.

IAESB meeting March 2013 (New York)

At its March 2013 meeting (New York) the IAESB considered the task force’s work and proposals following direction given by the IAESB at its June 2012 meeting and the CAG at its February 2013 meeting. The issues discussed and the IAESB’s responses and directions are shown below:

Issues raised which are generic to IES 2, 3 and 4

50. A number of issues were raised on exposure which are generic to IES 2, 3 and 4. These include:

   (i) what is meant by the term “regular review”? It is hard to interpret as a requirement

   (ii) proficiency levels and their minimums were felt by some to be subjective and contained a number of drafting inconsistencies. The inclusion of the Mastery Level was seen as superfluous given it was not used in IES 2, 3 or 4. Respondents indicated that some of the proficiency levels set seemed too high for completion of IPD, whilst some seemed too low. Clearly this difficulty is connected with the confusion expressed around the precise point at which IPD ends, as outlined below. A number of respondents suggested removing the proficiency levels associated with each competence area, leaving only the learning outcomes as requirements, whilst others requested the level to be set for each individual learning outcome

   (iii) As we know, accounting education programs vary in structure between jurisdictions. To accommodate this variation, the IAESB has used “the end of IPD” as a marker for the requirements of IES 2, 3 and 4. However, this still appears to present an issue for some respondents.

   (iv) A number of respondents wrote in favor of merging IES 2, 3 and 4 and this has been discussed previously by the IAESB and rejected, mainly due to logistical reasons concerning revision and release dates, but clearly this is still an issue that needs further discussion.

   (v) Whether IES 2, 3 and 4 are merged or not, a number of comments were made about the need to carefully consider suitable effective dates, especially given the interrelated nature of IES 2, 3 and 4 and the current proposal for the new versions of each to have different effective dates.

These issues are being dealt with consistently across IES 2, 3 and 4 and were therefore not discussed further in relation to IES 3 alone. The issues were discussed by the Board at its March 2013 meeting in relation to IES 2, 3 and 4 and have been worked on since that meeting by the joint task force Chairs and Secretaries group. All agreed changes to ensure consistency have been incorporated within the revised IES 3.
**General Education**

51. The revised IES 3 which was exposed contains no requirement for general education as part of IPD and has removed the words “general education” from the title of IES 3. This is because general education may be undertaken as a concurrent pathway alongside a member body’s professional accounting education program, or may be taken prior to this. The IAESB therefore prefers not to emphasize general education as a requirement within the development of professional skills. The IAESB does, however, recognize the need for general education in the development of the aspiring professional accountant and has used the Framework (2009) document to highlight the importance of general education as a component of IPD. The IAESB is considering a project to address the need for implementation guidance on how general education can be used to develop the aspiring professional accountant in the next Strategy and Work Plan.

52. A majority of respondents from each category (member bodies, public accounting firm, regulator, professional organization, and individuals) supported the removal of general education from IES 3. Several respondents (e.g., AICPA, HKICPA, ICAI, IDW, and JICPA) from the category of member bodies did not support the removal of general education from IES 3. A number of respondents (IAAER, EYG, IDW) who agreed with its removal raised the point that general education is an input measure and that its removal is therefore consistent with the new learning outcomes approach now adopted by the IAESB.

53. A number of respondents also acknowledged that the differing approaches to accountancy education around the world mean that general education is highly relevant for inclusion in professional accounting education programs in some jurisdictions and highly inappropriate in other countries or regions.

54. Respondents indicated strong support for guidance on how general education can be used to develop the aspiring professional accountant and were very keen that this is included within the IAESB’s next strategy and work plan. Given the majority support for removing general education as a requirement from IES 3, the task force recommended to the Board at its March 2013 meeting that the exposure draft’s approach to non-inclusion of general education is taken as being supported, and that (a) the explanatory material in IES 3 should be expanded to emphasise the importance of general education and (b) guidance on general education should be considered for prioritisation within the IAESB’s strategy and work plan.

55. The Board agreed this approach and gave the task force editorial comments on draft additional explanatory material on this issue. The Board agreed that this additional explanatory material should be presented early in the Scope section of IES 3 to emphasise its importance. A discussion was held on whether this should also appear within the Framework as this is revised and this will be considered as part of the Framework revision project. A debate took place on whether similar material should also be included within the explanatory material of IESs 2 and 4. It was agreed not to do this.
56. Following the Board’s discussion of proposed explanatory material, a revised version was considered.

Learning outcomes approach

57. There was a high level of support (90% of respondents) for the principle of using the learning outcomes approach within the redrafted IESs, including IES 3. However, a number of respondents (CNN, CSOEC, ICPAS, IRBA) commented that support will be needed to help IFAC member bodies adapt their approaches to integrate the requirements related to learning outcomes within their professional accounting education programs. Some respondents (HKICPA, IRBA, ICPAS) pointed out that, professional skills in particular are an area in which high levels of ambiguity might present themselves in relation to learning outcomes and that many of the necessary judgements will be subjective.

58. The IAESB has always recognised that moving to a principles rather than rules based set of IESs will present challenges for implementation, but continues to believe that this approach is the most appropriate. The task force therefore proposed that IES 3 should continue using the learning outcomes approach but suggested that additional support should be given to member bodies on how to implement this change. This might be done partly through expansion of the IES 3 explanatory materials and partly through including development of further discrete guidance as part of the IAESB’s strategy and work plan.

59. The IAESB supported this approach.

Proficiency levels

60. When asked whether the minimum levels of proficiency included in the proposed revised IES 3 were appropriate for each professional skills competence area, several respondents from the following categories of respondents felt that the minimum levels set were not all appropriate (e.g., member bodies (11 respondents), public accounting firms (2 respondents), and professional organizations(2 respondents)).

61. A few respondents from member bodies (AAT, CGA-Canada) and the public accounting firms (KPMG) commented on the inconsistency between the proficiency levels as set out for use across IES 2, 3 and 4 and the application of this model within IES 3. Several respondents from the member bodies (CICA, CPA-Ireland, ICAI, IDW) and public accounting firm (DTT, EYG) highlighted inconsistencies between the model and the verbs used in IES 3. It was agreed by IAESB that these would be addressed in a revised version of IES 3 and this is now reflected in the revised IES 3.

62. Several respondents (CICA, ICAA, ICAEW, ICAI, ICPAU, ICPAS, IDW, SAICA, SAIPA) from the member bodies, professional organizations (FEE, IAAER) and public accounting firms
(DTT, KPMG, PWC) also commented on the proficiency levels being inappropriately set, either for individual learning outcomes, or for groups of learning outcomes. Various learning outcomes were considered to have proficiency levels set too high or too low and there was little consistency in the responses on this matter. A question was also raised as to whether proficiency levels should be set for individual learning outcomes or groups of learning outcomes. Some comments were also raised in relation to whether proficiency levels need to be set at all.

63. Following discussion with Chairs of the IES 2, 3, 4, and 8 task forces, the IES 3 task force proposed that within IES 3 proficiency levels continue to be used at group level rather than individual learning outcome level and that additional explanatory material is included. The CAG did not express a clear preference on this issue.

64. A strong view was expressed by the CAG that interpersonal and communication skills should be set at the same proficiency level as intellectual skills. Various views were put forward in terms of whether interpersonal and communication skills should be set at the advanced level to highlight their importance, or whether this was too demanding for an entry level professional. It was also considered that both competence areas are interlinked and should therefore be set at the same level as one another. The task force therefore suggested to the IAESB at its March 2013 meeting to put both at the same level and asked the Board whether this level should be at intermediate or advanced, with a recommendation for intermediate. The Board agreed that intermediate level was appropriate for intellectual skills; this decision was made because IES 3 focusses on minimum levels of proficiency.

65. The Board asked the task force to review the ordering of the competence areas as readers may perceive them to represent a hierarchy of importance. The task force reviewed the ordering and a revised version was presented.
Specific learning outcomes

66. Several respondents from member bodies, public accounting firms, and professional organizations commented on learning outcomes that did not appear in the exposure draft, but which respondents would like to see added. The task force carefully considered these suggestions and proposed to the IAESB at its March 2013 meeting the following actions for each of the proposals:

Table A: Summarised findings - additional outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation responding</th>
<th>Additional outcomes suggested</th>
<th>Proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AICPA-PCEEC</td>
<td>Maths and statistics</td>
<td>None – see application in IES 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective speaking</td>
<td>None – see IES 3 learning outcome (c)(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICPA-PCEEC</td>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>Add to Intellectual skills in IES 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCC-CSOEC IAAER</td>
<td>Logical reasoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deductive and inductive reasoning to develop and apply judgments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analytical abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDO</td>
<td>More prominence of scepticism and professional judgment</td>
<td>Add to Intellectual skills (professional judgment) and Personal Skills (professional scepticism) in IES 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional judgment</td>
<td>See also IES 4 learning outcome (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPFA</td>
<td>Professional judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPMG</td>
<td>Professional scepticism and professional judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZICA</td>
<td>Professional scepticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge assumptions of management and data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>Respect of privacy and confidentiality</td>
<td>None – see IES 4 learning outcome (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKICPA</td>
<td>Use information technology effectively</td>
<td>None – see IES 3 learning outcome (b) (iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None – see IES 3 learning outcome (b) (i) and (v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Relevant Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAI-India</td>
<td>Explore new ways of delivering effectively</td>
<td>None – see IES 3 learning outcome (b)(iv) and (v) and (d)(i) and (ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDW</td>
<td>Recognise when expert assistance is required</td>
<td>Amend IES 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDW</td>
<td>Integrative or multi-disciplinary skills. Synthesis of knowledge from a range of disciplines</td>
<td>Amend IES 3 learning outcome a(ii) to refer to multi-disciplinary problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZICA</td>
<td>Ethical behaviour, Project management, Strategic management skills</td>
<td>None – see IES 4, None – see IES 3 learning outcome d(i), None – see IES 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>Ability to anticipate and adapt to change, Ownership of career and development, Curious to learn, Build and maintain relationships, Resilience, Giving feedback, Commerciality</td>
<td>None – see IES 3 learning outcome (b)(iv) and (v), None – see IES 3 learning outcome (b)(i) and (ii), None – see IES 3 learning outcome (b)(i) and (ii), None, None, None – see IES 3 learning outcome (d)(iii), None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. Various comments were made about specific changes which could be made to the wording of the learning outcomes. Some of these, as might be expected, were minor and some were in contradiction with one another. The task force carefully considered the suggested changes and made minor editorial changes as appropriate; these were shown in the revised draft IES 3 considered by the Board.
At the February 2012 CAG meeting there was general agreement that the task force should re-insert professional skepticism and the task force therefore proposed that this be included within the Personal category. Similarly, in light of the CAG’s preference the task force proposed re-inserting professional judgment within the Intellectual category. The task force also proposed putting in place the CAG’s suggestion, taking into account the consultation feedback, to include ‘knowing when to consult an expert’ within the Organizational category.

The IAESB agreed that we should include professional judgment within intellectual skills and professional skepticism within personal skills. It was agreed that, rather than duplicating the descriptors within IES 4, instead IES 3 should focus on the aspects of professional judgment and professional skepticism that are specifically relevant to professional skills. This action was taken and proposed wording appeared within the revised draft IES 3 considered by the Board.

The Board gave strong support for including the professional skill of knowing when to consult an expert within IES 3. It was agreed that this was closely linked to professional judgment and could be seen as an integral part of professional judgment. The task force considered these two options carefully and recommended that knowing when to consult an expert should be included within the professional judgment learning outcome.

Ease of assessing learning outcomes related to professional skills

Several respondents from member bodies, public accounting firms and professional organizations commented on the difficulties they could see in relation to assessing professional skills expressed as learning outcomes. This was not an unexpected response, as the learning outcomes approach is new to many IFAC member bodies. The task force believes that assessment of the redrafted IES 3 requirements is perfectly possible and does not present insurmountable difficulties. However, it also recognizes that this approach is new to many users of the IESs and that additional explanatory material is therefore needed. A number of IFAC member bodies have experience in assessing learning outcomes, which is likely to enable the IAESB to provide helpful additional information with practical examples.

The task force proposed that the IES 3 explanatory material should be expanded to give further information and guidance on how the learning outcomes might be assessed eg through various different forms of assessment including written or computer based exams, observations by employers, portfolios of evidence etc. The task force also proposed that additional guidance on how to assess learning outcomes for professional skills should be considered by the IAESB as part of its strategy and work plan.

At its February 2012 meeting the CAG agreed the professional skills specified are assessable, albeit that some can be challenging to assess. The CAG believed that reference within the IES 3 explanatory material to the role employers can play would be helpful and also agreed that this would be a suitable area for further guidance outside IES 3.
74. The IAESB agreed this approach at its March 2013 meeting and this has been actioned in the revised IES 3 considered by the Board.