



Human Resources
Professionals
Association

OOTR 2017 Summer webinar series

What members have to say about HRPA as a professional regulatory body: Results from the 2017 HRPA Member Survey

June 22, 2017

Discussion with commentary

MM: the discussion box is brilliant

TS: how do you know that the 10% sample is representative? who evaluates this and based on what?
thank you

Unless one is using a probability sampling methodology and that the response rate is very high, there is no way of being certain that a given sample is representative of the population. At best one can look at various frequency distributions on demographic variables and compare these to the known distribution in the population.

AM: 10% response rate is insanely low!

If you are looking at the response rate as a measure of engagement, 10% would indeed be low. The point here is that samples which include only 10% of the population can be accurate if they are reasonable representative of the population.

Have a look at the following: <https://www.surveygizmo.com/survey-blog/representative-sample/#>

AM: Think about if that was an organization engagement survey - we would not even use it!

You may not use it, but that doesn't mean that the results are not accurate.

TS: exactly, so how is that representative, based on which criteria?

Heva a look at the following discussion:

<http://www.analyticbridge.datasciencecentral.com/forum/topics/how-to-determine-if-a-sample-is-representative>

SM: I agree with AM

EC: i think the low response rate is indicative of what members think of HRPAs as a regulatory body...

Actually, the response rate is the same for all sections of the survey including the section MY RELATIONSHIP WITH THE ASSOCIATION AND WITH MY LOCAL CHAPTER and the section CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND ANNUAL CONFERENCE. So you are saying that the low response rate is indicative of what members think of HRPAs as a whole.

AM: good question TS

MF: Polls are typically based on a very small sample of the population so 10% is actually very high relative to polls by Angus Reid, Ipsos, etc.

Polls are typically based on a very small sample of the population.

TS: Thank you AM so are your comments- very relevant

MM: good point EC

AM: But this is more important than a general poll

EC: I think the don't know/unsure responses indicate that although HRPAs have a platform to report unethical or incompetent HR professionals, there isn't enough communication on what the results of that platform have produced

I think that (1) it depends on the question, and (2) there is likely more than one reason for 'I don't know/not sure' responses.

HM: I can agree with that statement EC.

KB: Yes, agreed! Good points, EC

JG: Agreed, good points EC!

NK: I certainly agree as well with EC!

TS: Good point Elena and I think it could be extended to other questions as well, and also the Neither agree nor disagree point as well

SB: I think another issue is that these platforms are known throughout the HR community - however, not widely known to those outside of the community...

Indeed, the public-at-large does not seem to know that Human Resources is a regulated profession in Ontario.

KO: Yes, I agree SB.

EC: good point SB! it would be interesting to know if HRPA reaches outside our community regarding the performances of our members

No we don't but we are planning to.

SB: I personally work within a larger HR team and therefore if a peer had a concern with my ethics etc. then I would feel confident that it would be reported. However, think of the organizations which a single or two HR professionals who is there to report the behaviours?

OK, this is another topic altogether. This is about the reasons why HRPA does not receive many complaints. Perhaps we can tackle that issue in a future webinar.

MM: I'd be concerned these answers overlap with people who already conform to strict ethics and conduct and those who don't care about ethics at all

JL: It's not that HRPA is doing a poor job... I just don't need a regulatory body to persuade me to conduct myself ethically or professionally

Here is the issue—you may not need a regulatory body to persuade you to conduct yourself ethically or professionally, but the Ontario Legislature has determined that Human Resources needs to have a professional regulatory body which mandate is to reduce, suppress, mitigate or eliminate harms to the public stemming from the practice of Human Resources. This is our core mandate. If this is not needed then the Ontario Legislature made a big mistake and HRPA has become an organization with a useless mandate. Not only that, we can't change our mandate, only the Ontario Legislature can do that.

If we believe that there are no risks of harms to the public stemming from the practice of the profession, we have no business being regulated.

SB: MM I agree completely...HRPA should not necessarily drive ethical behaviours - they should be a core value to those in the HR profession

The mandate of professional regulatory bodies, of which HRPA is one, is to do what they can to ensure that the profession is practiced in a way that promotes and protects the public interest. Honesty and integrity are supposed to be core values for all professionals, yet in every profession, for one reason or another, there are professionals who fall short of the standards expected of their profession.

AM: And people who belong to more than 1 professional body would treat it differently

Professionals who belong to more than one professional regulatory body are subject to the regulatory authority of each and every professional regulatory body they are members of.

GW: Agree with JL

JL: Thanks GW

SC: Agree with JL

TS: Agree with JL and MM also has a good point

JL: Thanks all

MS: I agree, for those of us who conduct ourselves professionally at all times, HRPAs has no impact on us. The Question may not be appropriate.

But here is another perspective. Research in many professions has shown that professionals who think of themselves as highly ethical can engage in behaviours that others would not consider ethical.

For instance, the compliance rate with the mandatory professional liability insurance requirement sits at about 38%. If one were to ask individuals in the 68% that are in non-compliance with the professional liability insurance requirement if they are ethical, most would likely say they are.

Similarly with the requirement to notify the Registrar of bankruptcies and insolvency events where the compliance rate sits at 1.7%. Again, if one were to ask individuals in the 98.3% that are in non-compliance with the professional liability insurance requirement if they are ethical, most would likely say they are.

Frankly, I think that the argument that Human Resources professionals are inherently more ethical than other professionals in other professions just doesn't fly. On what basis can we make that claim?

It is not uncommon for professional to think that they are not in need of regulation.

If we believe that Human Resources is not in need of regulation, why did we petition the Ontario Legislature to create a professional regulatory body for Human Resources?

AF: SL, good point. In a team of two HR professionals, there is also a fear of repercussions should one person report to HRPAs about the other team member's ethic and behaviours.

Unlike some other professions, HRPAs does not have a mandatory requirement to report misconduct of other professionals.

LF: I agree with MS, it had no impact.

BL: Myself as well whether there was a governing body or not I would maintain my professionalism and ethics.

The problem is that everyone feels like that. Although the majority of professionals are ethical, the issue is that the few that are not can do a lot of damage.

SC: Agreed

KB: I think HRPAs need to focus on elevating the HR profession rather than regulating it.

Let's get this right. This is not a choice. The Ontario Legislature has given professional regulation as our core mandate in law. Our Act reads: *"The objects of the Association are, (a) to promote and protect the public interest by governing and regulating the practice of members of the Association and firms in accordance with this Act and the by-laws."* What you are suggesting is that HRPAs disregard its statutory objects. The Ontario Legislature has given HRPAs a mission and the tools it deems necessary for HRPAs to accomplish this mission. We can't just disregard this mission and do whatever we want to do.

That doesn't mean that we can't work at elevating the profession—it just means we can't not regulate. It cannot be a 'rather' or 'instead of.'

Also, regulation does contribute to the reputation of the profession by ensuring high standards are maintained.

TS: I agree KB if elevating means inside and out- meaning in the eyes of others as well as for HRPAs members by providing developmental opportunities/services for its members

GH: I agree with KB

NV: Agree with KB

DDG: What would this promotion look like to you KB?

KB: Absolutely, TS. I don't find many people are aware of the HRPAs outside of HR. There are a lot of HR professionals that don't see value in joining either.

Again there is nothing wrong with making the public aware of the benefits of dealing with registered Human Resources professionals, it is just not something we can do at the expense of governing and regulating the practice of our members.

GH: It would be nice to see people recognize our designations similar status to professions like CAs

But if you think of it, what do all professions—physicians, lawyers, accountants, engineers, and so on—have in common? They all have a professional regulatory body which mandate is to promote and protect the public interest. Again, if we want the status and recognition of a true profession, but we are not willing to assume the costs and obligations that go with it, it just won't work.

TS: Completely agree, KB

EC: On this topic, I think that most members of any industry look to their regulatory body for regulatory measures and providing member services. Agree with KB -HRPAs need to look at enhancing the HR profession so that it receives more recognition in the market.

Again there is nothing wrong with making the public aware of the benefits of dealing with registered Human Resources professionals, and there is nothing wrong with 'enhancing the HR profession' such that the public is better served.

MS: Agreed, elevate, increase our knowledge, keep us up to date, more case studies, more legal cases. etc.

How about more accountability and practice inspections? Most professional regulatory bodies carry out inspections of one kind or another to ensure that high standards are met and maintained.

KB: ha yes that 's a broad statement, but there are a lot of aspects. Even from the job board point of view, you only see large companies for the most part posting HR jobs. It's not very accessible.

EC: and it is still viewed as an administrative requirement in most organizations - how do we move away from personnel management and towards strategic business initiatives.

DDG: I wonder if the motivation to obtain regulation status will elevate the profession to be more recognized.

We already have 'regulation status.' The question might then be whether this prods us to be more professional.

KO: Last week's webinar touched on this point, EC. It was interesting.

KB: Yes. They need innovate HR leaders to advocate on their behalf and get involved.

EC: thanks KB

EC: Who constructs and analyzes surveys for HRP A?

Depends on the survey. In most cases, the surveys are developed and analyzed by HRP A staff.

AN: If we were to focus on the development of HR Professionals, would that not be in the best interest of public protection.

What do you mean by 'focus'?—is that a way of saying 'instead of?'

Our Act states: The objects of the Association are, (a) to promote and protect the public interest by governing and regulating the practice of members of the Association and firms in accordance with this Act and the by-laws, including,

- i. establishing, maintaining, developing and enforcing standards of qualification,
- ii. establishing, maintaining, developing and enforcing standards of practice,
- iii. establishing, maintaining, developing and enforcing standards of professional ethics,
- iv. establishing, maintaining, developing and enforcing standards of knowledge, skill and proficiency, and

- v. regulating the practice, competence and professional conduct of members of the Association and firms

Note the word 'including'—these are things that HRPAs must do by law.

Object (b) states “to promote and increase the knowledge, skill and proficiency of members of the Association, firms and students”—so yes we can provide development for our members but not at the expense of doing what the Ontario Legislature specifically told us to do.

SC: Is it possible to get a summary of how HRPAs is addressing public interest concerns?

HRPA has not developed a list of public concerns in regards to the practice of Human Resources.

MS: My management team would be very interested in using HRPAs as a resource, if we could have more legal expertise from HRPAs. Organizations would appreciate this help.

HRPA does offer webinars and conferences on various legal topics. Having said that, HRPAs cannot cross the line of providing legal advice to its members.

EC: MS - I use lexology.com as a great legal resources - just an fyi

DL: thank you!

AR: Thank you

EP-S: thank you

JW: Thank you!

KWB: thank you

SC: thank you

NL: Thank you

SR: Thank you!

BL: Thank you!

VG: Thank you

HH: thank you

KN: Thank you

AG: Thank you everybody...it gets more and more interesting

TS: Thank you -

LW: Thank you.

AA: thank you

LW: Thank you.]

DW: Thanks!

CR: thanks

SM: Thank you

SB: Thank you

DDG: Thanks

AY: Thank you!