

Transcript of dialogue in discussion box with answers to questions for webinar *'Licensure for HR: What's the scoop?'*

November 8, 2017

Answers to questions are in red.

LL: I would argue these are exceptional cases and not the norm

LL: Based on working 20 years in HR, I have never see a significant difference in HRPAs Members and non HRP Members as far as who behaves ethically and unethically

The real difference is between those who believe that is important to be accountable to a governing body for their conduct and those who don't.

When you say that there is no significant difference between HRPAs members and non-members as far as who behaves ethically and unethically are you saying that both HRPAs members and non-members are equally ethical or that both HRPAs members and non-members are equally unethical?

MT: members or certified?

Some definitions here. 'Students' refers to students registered with HRPAs. Students are not 'members' in the technical sense of that work, but they do appear on the public register and are thus 'registrants.' Regulation applies to all registrants.

MT: pay my dues and I'm good to go?

Sort of. Remember that as a registrant of the HRPAs you also needed to agree to abide by the Act, the By-laws, the Rules of Professional Conduct and all other professional guidance issued by the Association. This is a legally enforceable covenant.

LL: Either / Or

MT: so then education, training, experience doesn't matter?

LL: Of course it does...but it can be from multiple sources

AP: why would anyone want to become a member of the HRPAs since the members only have obligations but no additional benefits in comparison with those who are not members

This comment demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of the logic of voluntary professional regulation. There are many answers to that question.

One answer is that it is the professional thing to do. The professional ethic is to think in terms of service to others and the public good. Taking on the duties and obligations of professionhood is something that professionals do because it is part of the professional identity.

Another answer is that it is in one's ultimate (enlightened) self-interest to take on the duties and obligations of being a true professional. Taking on the duties and obligations of professionhood leads to increased legitimacy, trust, and confidence on the part of the public. Public confidence, in turn, leads to higher status and remuneration.

JS: Networking, better employment opportunities, information resources

JE: AP, I often feel the same way. I work with many people who are not certified and have no greater benefits than them.

CG: I have worked for a few employers....the level of the HR department depends on how Management drives and understands what HR is about. Some companies do not know nor care if someone is certified, as long as the job is done. We are also working in a time where we have people who did not have to get their designations, as they did not exist when they started working, but it does not mean they are no less professional. Most people with "text book" knowledge can learn and grow from those before them. We all continue to pay-it-forward.

I like the idea of 'pay-it-forward.'

LL: Some organizations do recognize HRPA more than others as an asset, so it can (but not necessarily) make you more marketable

MM: good point Caroline

AP: An executive I've talked to recently told me that the organizations are better off when hiring a non-member (since any potential complaints would be investigated and stain the company's name)

A few things here.

Why would an employer not want to hire a member? Because they are subject to a code of conduct? This says to me that this employer wants to cut corners or do things that are not quite on the up-and-up. The kind of employer that will not hire a registered accountant because they want to be creative with their finances.

Question: Do you really want to work for such an employer?

Also, what is likely to 'stain the company's name?' The fact that a complaint was investigated or the misdeed that triggered the investigation in the first place?

VG: It can be seen in many job ads: CHRP is an asset, CHRP preferred

MT: can you explain more AP...if someone does something worthy of investigation would it matter if they were a member or not? I may be missing something

LL: I certainly believe it does have value, but I can't get behind a legal requirement that you can only call yourself an HR Professional unless you are an HRP A Member. There are many other HR Professional Associations (i.e. World at Work) out there, and to say one is the be all and end all of things HR would be challenging for many to accept.

Just to be clear, you can call yourself an 'HR professional' whether you are registered with HRP A or not. 'HR professional' is not a protected title. The protected titles are set out in the Ontario Regulation 55/16 <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/160055>

One cannot use one of the protected titles without being authorized to do so by HRP A.

The law thing is what it is. HRP A is not an 'association' like World at Work, it is a professional regulatory body. The Ontario Legislature has chosen to back HRP A. This doesn't mean that HRP A is the 'be all and end all of things' but it does mean something. To say that HRP A is just like any other HR association is just not correct on many levels. You may choose not to give any weight to the fact that HRP A is a statutory regulatory body, but that is not the view of government or the Courts.

AY: MT, HRP A cannot investigate a non-member, so some executives believe that by hiring a non-HRP A member they can have this person do dirty work without HRP A being able to do anything about it.

TA: I agree Lance

AP: Yes, Andrew expressed perfectly the substance of my discussion with the executive

EB: Would this include using "CHRL / CHR P Candidate" ?

Yes

MT: doing dirty work...I'd be more concerned with MOL, ESA, lawsuits....than the HRP A...

I would agree with that also.

LL: I could be wrong Andrew, but I believe that only applies to someone claiming they have an HRP A designation or if someone has been conducting Workplace investigations without an HRP A designation or are licensed under the Private Investigators Security Guards Act.....pardon my spelling ::))

RW: I want to get my cert for CHR P but; I have an HR degree, brokers licence for pension and benefits for 8 years plus. HRP A does not acknowledge and grant me points to max out my 50 points with my LLQP and IFIC licences, which are also regulated. But, I have to work backwards and take additional courses to be recognized for pension and benefits specialist by our Ontario HRP A. I don't understand that. My teaching degree in Ontario is not recognized unless I pay to keep it active. Why. This is not encouraging me.

HRPA does not recognize any specialties.

VSO: Isn't this what we are trying to prevent? Having a Professional Designation should give an HR professional the right (and duty) to ensure compliance of laws!

AY: MT-"dirty work" includes legal-but-not-ethical actions.

LL: Sorry Sue, I need more context to understand what you mean.

AE: As an HR Professional I wouldn't want to work for a company that would want me to do "Dirty work" and like MT I would be more concerned with MOL, ESA, Law Suits and Human Rights.

VSO: Again, ethical is a duty of a "Professional".

VH: yes, please clarify, Sue

VSO: We as a group, should be protecting the rights of the company and the employee, and ensure compliance.

LL: Absolutely...why would not having a designation make you do that less?

VSO: Sorry, this was meant to discuss the "dirty work" comment.

AP: Sue, in order for us as a group to "be protecting the rights of the company and the employee, and ensure compliance" we need to have licensure

Licensure of that kind is not going to happen anytime soon. So we have a choice, give up on being ethical until we get licensure or establish ourselves as the ethical practitioners.

LK: keep in mind folks not all companies are willing to hold the same values, as there is a cost to it. In those circumstances, as a professional we can choose not to do it, and we can choose not to work for those companies. HRPA holds a value system some companies respect, and some don't.

VSO: Agreed... but it can take some time for the corporate world (and government).

LL: Great Point Leslie...we also have multiple HR legislation at the Provincial and Federal levels to help support us in educating our employers in our requirements for both Human Resources and Human Rights.

VSO: Lance, totally agree. I would hope that is where our profession is going.

It is.

LK: It will take some time, but I do believe we are on the right path...

Yes!

RW: Financial Advisors are licenced. it was indicated earlier, it was not. They are held to a higher standard.

GL: Not all Financial Advisors are licensed only those who sell Mutual Funds under MFDA or IIROC

RW: Licences also include; LLQP and IFIC

AY: Greg is correct, many "financial advisors" are just sales representatives. The CBC did a report on this earlier.

MT: so they're not CFP's

AY: Google "CBC marketplace financial advisors"

GL: You don't need a CFP or a PFP to sell funds...

LL: The HR-tribunal is a little confusing...our LR folks represent the organization (not necessarily HR)...do they require licensure if they are representing the organization but not HR? Does the act consider them one and the same (HR versus organization)?

I don't know of any legislation that differentiates HR from the organization. There is only one corporation.

LG: did anyone else lose sound?

AY: Per CBC Marketplace: "There's a difference between a financial adviser and a financial advisor: 'Advisers' are regulated and have a legal responsibility to act in your best interest. 'Advisors' are not the same. So, be careful: Banks may call them 'advisors' so a salesperson sounds impressive, but you could be stuck without protection."

AE: NO I didn't lose sound

GW: No problem with me!

KM: No sound works for me!

VSO: Does anyone else understand the requirements for the Tribunals?

Exceptions in the *Law Society Act, 2006*

1 (8) For the purposes of this Act, the following persons shall be deemed not to be practising law or providing legal services:

- 1. A person who is acting in the normal course of carrying on a profession or occupation governed by another Act of the Legislature, or an Act of Parliament, that regulates specifically the activities of persons engaged in that profession or occupation.**

LC: I still have sound

FR: have sound

PS: a lot to think about. Thank you

LK: great presentation, thanks so much!

JR: Thank you for your presentation

VC: Thanks for the presentation

MS: thanks

Jodi Derrick: Interesting content and much to think about

Tracey van Gageldonk: thanks

Shari Knight: Thank you!

Jodie Bonham: I have a question, would an hr professional not a member of the HRP not be allowed to present at an HR tribunal if they were not a member, even if they are the primary HR person at the company?

LL: do we ask questions in chat?

Jodie Bonham: Did i understand that correctly?

HRPA Support: Yes Lance

Francesca Rakinic : thank you for the presentation

Kimberly Menezes: Thank you!

Cristina Stajan: Have a great day everyone

Kelley Ormonde : Thanks for the informative presentation!

Fiona Gardner: thanks for the presentation!

Sarah Dudleigh: Thank you!

Petruta Josie Petrescu: thank you for presentation

Michelle Harwood: thank you

Morgan Bello: How HRP is dealing with the companies across the province which are hiring not certified professionals???

Danielle Lyn: Thank you

Hetal Hotha: Thank you

Lia Charnicovsky 2: Thank you

AY: Thank you!

Vivian Huycke: thanks for all of the information

Christina Wong: thanks

LL: Cheers Everyone

Marie Limbo: thank you

Preston Puhakka: Thank you

Cecilia Leung: Thank you!

Janis Valentine: Bye

Brittany Browney: Thank you!

Tamara Lawson: Bye now

Theodora Stanescu: Thanks

Shannon Rowe: Thank you!

Surbhi Sud: Thank you

Brian Malott: thanks

Laura Centore: Thanks!

Linda Spence: Thanks

Vanessa Gacharna: Thanks

Marion Olivier: thank you

Chris Worth: thanks

Amanda Carnahan-Biggs: Thank you!

Morgan Malinski: Thanks

Roxanne Hart: thanks

Lillian Gayle: Thanks. Great info.

Rachelle Williams: I moved back to Ontario from out west, I want to be CRRP certified. I dont think the requirements are fair. I wish someone would reach out to me

Gary Waterfield: Excellent