



Registrar's Report for Q4 and 2017 Annual Wrap-Up

November 30, 2017

Trends and issues

2017 Highlights

The Regulatory Outcome Scorecard

- At its December 2016 meeting, the HRPAs Board of Directors directed staff to develop measures of performance as a professional regulatory body. At its January 2017 meeting, the HRPAs Board of Directors approved a project plan that would see proposed measures of performance developed by September 30, 2017. The *“Measuring the performance of HRPAs as a professional regulatory body”* project was completed as per plan on September 30, 2017. Parts 1 and 2 reports were tabled at the January 2017 and March 2017 Board meetings respectively. The remaining reports are to be tabled at the December 2017 Board meeting. A set of outcome measures was proposed. This Scorecard will, in addition to other existing measures, allow HRPAs to get a more accurate picture of its performance as a professional regulatory body.
- It is difficult to get a complete picture of HRPAs present performance as a professional regulatory body because it simply has never collected the data that would allow it to make this assessment. The fact that this data was never collected, however, does say something in and of itself.
- The *strategy tracking indicators* currently in place are, for the most part, indicators that are appropriate for a professional association and not appropriate for a professional regulatory body.

Special report on compliance

- A common issue for professions which are new to regulation is compliance. Indeed, with the exception of compliance with the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) requirement for designated members, compliance rates are unacceptably low.
- A special report on the rates of compliance with obligations set out by HRPAs on the part of members and registered students was completed and tabled at the December Board meeting. This report informed the *Regulatory Outcome Scorecard*.
- The *Report* concluded that there is no easy fix for HRPAs compliance issues and that bringing HRPAs compliance rates to acceptable levels will require a concerted effort.

Complaint rate

- In 2017, the rate of complaints at HRPAs was .26 complaints per 1000 registrants. This is, by far, the lowest complaint rate among all professional regulatory bodies governed by public statute in Ontario. This is the third year for which the complaint rate was calculated. In 2016, the complaint rate at HRPAs was .39 and in 2015 the complaint rate at HRPAs was .23. In each of these previous years, the rate of complaints at HRPAs was the lowest complaint rate among all professional regulatory bodies governed by public statute in Ontario.
- The 2017 Complaints Benchmarking Report was completed and presented to Board at its May meeting.
- Because of its importance, an analysis of the low complaint rates was also completed and included as part of the *Measuring the performance of HRPAs as a professional regulatory body* project mentioned above. The conclusions of this *Report* were:
 - That although there are structural reasons why the rate of complaints may always be on the low side, it should nonetheless be higher than it is currently,
 - That the rate of complaints is low does not mean that the rate of misconduct is also low, and it remains HRPAs' duty as a professional regulatory body to promote and protect the public interest. The low rate of complaints should not be used as an excuse for inaction.
 - HRPAs should do what it can to remove any systemic barriers which may prevent or impede individuals from filing complaints.

Educational initiatives

- A significant threat to the HRPAs is the lack of understanding of professional regulation on the part of HRPAs members and students. Although there is no empirical data as to the level of understanding of professional regulation on the part of HRPAs members and students; anecdotally, this level of understanding seems quite low.
- The Office of the Registrar had two main initiatives to address this issue:
 - The OOTR continued with its two webinar series. The "*Understanding Professional Regulation*" webinar series and the "*How-to*" webinar series;
 - A series of articles was published simultaneously on LinkedIn and on the HRPAs website. There are now over fifty articles in the series.
- The webinar series continued to be popular with 6,139 participants in the *Understanding Professional Regulation* series and 1354 participants in the *How-to* series.
- The LinkedIn article series has also been very successful with over 3650 clicks.

Computer-based examinations

- Since January 1, 2017, all HRPAs certification exams have been delivered using computer-based testing (i.e., the Comprehensive Knowledge Exam 1, the Comprehensive Knowledge Exam 2, the CHRP Employment Law Exam, and the CHRL Employment Law Exam).
- 2026 exams were administered in 2017.
- The reliability and validity of the exams remain very high.

Table 1: 2017 OOTR activity by the numbers

Activity	Count
Participants in OOTR webinars	7543
Revocations for non-payment of dues	2613
Number of exams administered	2026
Certificates issued	1036
Resignations processed	764
Candidates completing Job Ready program	692
Applications referred to Experience Assessment Committee	355
Number of courses reviewed by the Academic Standards Committee	98
Designation revocations due to CPD non-compliance	58
Referrals to CHRE Review Committee	40
Referrals to Appeal Committee	14 ¹
Referrals to Registration Committee	13
Referrals to Complaints Committee	7 ²
Referrals to Review Committee	6
Regulatory Newsletters issued	3
Number of CPD logs to be audited by CPD Committee	1
Referrals to Discipline Committee	0
Referrals to Capacity Committee	0

¹ 14 Appeals were filed with HRP A in 2017, one request for appeal that was filed in October of 2016, hearing held in November of 2017.

² Six complaints were registered with HRP A in 2017, one complaint whose proceedings were stayed in 2016, reopened in 2017, resulting in 7 complaints for 2017.

Table 2: Q4 2017 Regulatory Committee Activity Summary Table

	September 1, 2017 – November 30, 2017			
	Cases started before Sept 1, 2017	New cases for the period of Sept 1, 2017, to Nov 30, 2017	Cases disposed of in the period of Sept 1, 2017, to Nov 30, 2017	Cases outstanding as of Nov 30, 2017
Registration committee	0	2	2	2
Experience assessment committee	67	87	38	49
CPD committee - annual audit*	73	1	50	25
Academic standards committee	6	14	6	14
CHRE review committee	28	24	12	12*
Complaints committee	2	0	3	3
Discipline committee	0	0	0	0
Capacity committee	0	0	0	0
Review committee	2	4	2	12*
Appeal committee	14	5	6	4 ³

*The audit process was recently revised so the audit now occurs in the summer. Audit notifications were released early May 2017. 95 members have been selected for the audit. The first audit meeting occurred on June 28, 2017.

*3 Review Committee cases with decisions which requested additional information are included as outstanding.

*4 outstanding CHRE Phase II applications are ready for the panel, 4 are with the external Executive Assessment Expert and 4 are waiting to be sent to him.

³ One case is outstanding from an appeal that was filed in 2016 in which the hearing was held in Q4 of 2017. This case has not been disposed.

Public register

Tables 2 to 4 on the following pages detail the changes in registration in fiscal 2016-2017. Key points include:

- On November 30, 2017, HRPAs had 23,116 registrants. This is 39 fewer registrants than HRPAs had on November 30, 2016.
- The Student registration category showed the greatest decline at -7.3%.
- Turnover is high for Students (32.0%), Practitioners (29.7%), and Allied Professionals (44.0%), but is low for CHRPs (6.7%), CHRLs (4.5%), and CHREs (5.8%).
- Designated members comprise 71.9% of members and 63.7% of registrants; or putting it the other way around, 28.1% of members are non-designated and 36.3% of registrants are non-designated.
- The proportion of members who are designated (71.9%) has remained stable over the last 18 months.
- 98.3% of HRPAs registrants reside in Ontario; or putting it the other way around, 1.7% of HRPAs members reside outside of Ontario.
- The province with the highest number of registrants other than Ontario is Alberta with 147 registrants, followed by Quebec with 87 registrants.

An analysis of registration growth 2000-2017

The meaning and importance of registration numbers are quite different for professional regulatory bodies than it is for professional associations.

For a voluntary professional body, the most appropriate metric would be the proportion of professionals who are registered divided by the number of professionals that could meet the standard, given, of course, that the standard of qualification is established in the best interests of the public (and not some other interests). Presently, HRPAs has no estimate of what this number of professionals that could meet the standard is.

Table 3: Registration numbers have different meaning for professional associations and professional regulatory bodies

Professional Associations	Professional Regulatory Bodies
<p>For associations, size is important. The number of members is important in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since membership dues are still an important component of revenue, and dues revenue is directly impacted by the number of members • The bigger the number of members, the bigger the opportunity to up-sell additional products and services • The bigger the number of members, the more the Association can charge vendors for access to members • The bigger the number of members, the more influential the organization can be, the more clout the Association can have in lobbying government or in negotiating deals on behalf of its members • The number of members relative to competing associations is also important in that there are benefits which accrue from being the largest association in one's niche <p>Membership is seen as the ultimate measure of value. It is not surprising that many of the metrics used by associations revolve around membership numbers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of members • The growth in membership (year-over-year) • The retention rate • The penetration rate (market share) 	<p>The number of members is tracked, of course, but it is not as important as for associations. For a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under licensing regimes, which many professional regulatory bodies are, to be a practising professional is to be a member of the professional regulatory body • For professional regulatory bodies, bigger isn't better. It is more about quality than quantity. <p>In fact, there are two concerns often voiced by critics, (1) that professional regulatory bodies unnecessarily restrict entry into the profession to increase exclusivity and thus the remuneration of members, or that (2) that professional regulatory bodies reduce standards to allow more professionals into the profession.</p> <p>For the reasons above membership numbers tend not to be used performance targets for professional regulatory bodies.</p>

Table 4: Registration by category based on fiscal year (December 1, 2016, to November 30, 2017)

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	1-Dec-16	30-Nov-17	Registration Gain	Registration Loss	Net Growth	% Growth	Retention Rate	Turnover Rate
Students (registered but not members)	2848	2640	669	877	-208	-7.3%	69.2%	32.0%
Undesignated Members	5626	5759	1853	1720	133	2.4%	69.4%	30.2%
Practitioner	5417	5536	1744	1625	119	2.2%	70.0%	29.7%
Allied Professional	209	223	109	95	14	6.7%	54.5%	44.0%
Designated members	14681	14717	813	777	36	0.2%	94.7%	5.3%
Highest designation CHRP (including CHRP retired)	5141	5395	607	353	254	4.9%	93.1%	6.7%
Highest designation CHRL (including CHRL retired)	9289	9053	173	409	-236	-2.5%	95.6%	4.5%
Highest designation CHRE (including CHRE retired)	251	269	33	15	18	7.2%	94.0%	5.8%
Total members	20307	20476	2666	2497	169	0.8%	87.7%	12.2%
Total registrants	23155	23116	3335	3374	-39	-0.2%	85.4%	14.6%
Students as a proportion of registrants	12.3%	11.4%						
Designated members as a proportion of membership	72.3%	71.9%						
Designated members as a proportion of registration	63.4%	63.7%						

$$\text{NetGrowth} = B - A \quad \% \text{Growth} = \frac{B - A}{A} \times 100 \quad \text{RetentionRate} = 1 - \left[\frac{D}{A} \right] \times 100 \quad \text{Turnover Rate} = \frac{D}{\frac{A + B}{2}} \times 100$$

Table 5: Designated members and students as a proportion of registrants

	A	B	C	D
	1-Jun-16	1-Dec-16	31-May-17	30-Nov-17
Students (registered but not members)	2791	2848	3018	2640
Undesignated Members	6183	5626	6600	5759
Practitioner	5965	5417	6341	5536
Allied Professional	218	209	259	223
Designated members	15107	14681	14976	14717
Highest designation CHRP (including CHRP retired)	5178	5141	5365	5395
Highest designation CHRL (including CHRL retired)	9690	9289	9354	9053
Highest designation CHRE (including CHRE retired)	239	251	257	269
Total members	21296	20307	21576	20476
Total registrants	24087	23155	24594	23116
Designated members as a proportion of membership	70.9%	72.3%	69.4%	71.9%
Students as proportion of registrants	11.6%	12.3%	12.3%	11.4%

Table 6: Registration by province as of November 30, 2017

	Ontario	Alberta	Quebec	British Columbia	Nova Scotia	New Brunswick	Saskatchewan	Manitoba	Northwest Territories	Newfoundland and Labrador	Prince Edward Island	Nunavut	Yukon	All provinces
Students (registered but not members)	2570	48	9	3	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2635
Undesignated Members	5571	43	25	17	7	0	5	4	0	5	1	1	1	5680
Practitioner	5354	42	22	16	7	0	5	4	0	5	1	1	1	5458
Allied Professional	217	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
Designated members	14372	65	53	39	12	8	9	3	3	2	3	4	3	14576
Highest designation CHRP (incl. CHRP retired)	5296	21	11	16	4	2	3	2	2	1	3	0	2	5363
Highest designation CHRL (incl. CHRL retired)	8821	41	39	21	8	6	6	1	1	1	0	4	1	8950
Highest designation CHRE (incl. CHRE retired)	255	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	263
Total members	19943	108	78	56	19	8	14	7	3	7	4	5	4	20256
Total registrants	22513	156	87	59	20	8	17	8	3	7	4	5	4	22891
Students as a proportion of registrants	11.4%	30.8%	10.3%	5.1%	5.0%	0.0%	17.6%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.5%
Designated members as a proportion of membership	72.1%	60.2%	67.9%	69.6%	63.2%	100%	64.3%	42.9%	100%	28.6%	75.0%	80.0%	75.0%	72.0%
Designated members as a proportion of registration	63.8%	41.7%	60.9%	66.1%	60.0%	100%	52.9%	37.5%	100%	28.6%	75.0%	80.0%	75.0%	63.7%

F

Table 7: Registration numbers 2000-2017

Year	Registration	Gain	% Gain
2000	10028	---	---
2001	11013	985	9.8%
2002	12077	1064	9.7%
2003	13247	1170	9.7%
2004	14000	753	5.7%
2005	15094	1094	7.8%
2006	16000	906	6.0%
2007	16400	400	2.5%
2008	17073	673	4.1%
2009	18407	1334	7.8%
2010	19026	619	3.4%
2011	19441	415	2.2%
2012	19617	176	0.9%
2013	20403	786	4.0%
2014	20874	471	2.3%
2015	22372	1498	7.2%
2016	23155	783	3.5%
2017	23116	-39	-0.2%

Figure 1: Registration numbers by year 2000-2017






Figure 2: Percent registration growth by year 2000-2017




Function-by-function Review



Policy development

- There was no activity in policy development in Q4 2017.



Registration and certification

Registration Committee

Chair: Frank Tancredi

- There were no referrals to the Registration Committee between September 1, 2017, and November 30, 2017. There were two decisions rendered between September 1, 2017, and November 30, 2017, both applications were approved for registration.
- In total, between December 1, 2016, and November 30, 2017, 13 applications were referred to the Registration Committee. 15 cases were disposed of between December 1, 2016, and November 30, 2017 (two of those cases were carried over from 2016).

Approved for registration	11
Approved but with conditions	3
Not approved	1
Total	13

- Seven applications were reviewed and approved by the Registrar. Overall, 22 applications were disposed of in 2017.
- There are two cases currently in the information gathering stage of the process and therefore a decision has not yet been rendered.

Experience Assessment Committee

Chair: Mark Seymour

- Between September 1, 2017, and November 30, 2017, 87 Validation of Experience and Alternate Route applications were received and processed in total. Thirty-four Validation of Experience applications were processed — 19 candidates were successful for a pass rate of 55.88 %. Forty-three applications are currently under review.

Validation of experience application successful	19	55.88%
Validation of experience application unsuccessful	15	44.12%
Total	34	100.0%

- Between September 1, 2017, and November 30, 2017, 10 Alternate Route applications were received. Four applications have been processed and so far 0 have been successful. Six applications are currently under review.

Academic Standards Diploma Committee

Chair: John Hardisty

- There were no course approval applications for schools or students referred to the Academic Standards Diploma Committee between September 1, 2017, and November 30, 2017.

Academic Standards Degree Committee

Chair: Gary Gannon

- Between September 1, 2017, and November 30, 2017, two course approval applications for schools were received and are currently under review. Between September 1, 2017, and November 30, 2017, six course approval applications for students were processed and 12 course approval applications for students were received and are currently under review.

CHRE Review Committee

Chair: Bob Canuel

- The number of CHREs currently stands at 269. No target has currently been set for 2018.
- Between September 1, 2017, and November 30, 2017, 12 Phase II CHRE applications were reviewed by the CHRE Review Committee. Out of the 12 applicants, 1 was granted the CHRE designation.
- 14 invitational route candidates became CHRE's in 2017.

Challenge Exams

- Challenge exams were held in February, May and September 2017
- There were a total of 173 challenge exam writers in 2017

Breakdown by month

Month	Registrants	Pass	Pass Rate
February 2017	52	37	71.2%
May 2017	58	28	48.3%
September 2017	63	40	63.5%
Total	173	105	61%

Breakdown by subject

Subject	Registrants	Pass	Pass Rate
Training and Development	21	4	19%
Compensation	23	14	60.9%
Organizational Behaviour	27	17	63%
Finance and Accounting	24	12	50%
Recruitment and Selection	12	7	58.3%
Human Resources Management	27	23	85.2%
Human Resources Planning	11	8	72.7%
Occupational Health and Safety	12	11	91.7%
Labour Relations	16	9	56.3%
Total	173	105	

Certification Exams

Comprehensive Knowledge Exam 1 (CKE 1)	Candidates	Pass	Pass Rate	Reliability
Feb/March 2017	91	45	50.55%	.89
June 2017	180	122	67.78%	.89
October 2017	233	138	59.23%	.90
Total 2017	504	305	60.51%	

Comprehensive Knowledge Exam 2 (CKE 2)	Candidates	Pass	Pass Rate	Reliability
March 2017	106	63	59.43%	.928
June/July 2017	249	173	69.47%	.928
October 2017	287	198	68.99%	.919
Total 2017	642	434	67.60%	

CHRP Employment Law Exam	Candidates	Pass	Pass Rate	Reliability
January 2017	147	139	94.6%	.80
May 2017	132	125	94.7%	.79
September 2017	135	129	95.56%	.81
Total	414	393	94.92%	

CHRL Employment Law Exam	Candidates	Pass	Pass Rate	Reliability
January 2017	143	116	81.1%	.78
May 2017	162	146	90.12	.76
September 2017	161	143	88.82%	.82
Total	466	405	89.90%	


Job Ready Program

Between September 1, 2017, and November 30, 2017, 217 registrants completed the Job Ready Program and were granted the CHRP designation.

Designation certificates

Certificates are issued for all three levels of designation: CHRP, CHRL, and CHRE. A certificate issuance commenced in November, and members were scheduled to receive their certificates by mid-December. An email went out to 284 members in November notifying them that they could expect to receive their certificates during this issuance.

	CHRP	CHRL	CHRE	Total
February 2017	127	42	1	170
May 2017	237	65	3	305
August 2017	208	64	5	277
November 2017	207	65	12	284
Total	779	236	21	1036



Quality assurance and compliance verification

Compliance	2017
Proportion of members and registered students with complete and accurate contact information (compliance with requirement to keep contact information up to date)	Unknown
Proportion of members and registered students that have promptly and accurately the occurrence of events listed under self-reporting obligations	Unknown
Compliance rate for requirement to notify Registrar of bankruptcies and insolvency events set out in <i>Act</i> ¹	1.7%
Compliance rate for professional liability insurance requirement as enabled in the <i>Act</i> and set out in <i>By-laws</i> ²	38.3%
Proportion of resignations as a proportion of non-renewals (compliance with requirement to resign as opposed to just not paying one's dues)	28.3%
Compliance rate with Continuing Professional Development (CPD) requirement as set out in the <i>By-laws</i>	97.4%

Continuing Professional Development


Chair: Vito Montesano

- There were 3204 designated members due to submit their CPD Log by May 31, 2017. Of those, 2805 designated members submitted their CPD log as of November 30, 2017.
- Calculation of the compliance rate for the CPD requirement involves making some assumptions. Some members will not comply with the CPD requirement because they no longer intent to renew their membership in HRP (and will resign or be revoked), others, knowing that they have not kept up with their CPD requirement, will not renew their membership in HRP. It is not possible to tell which is which.

- Of the 3204 designated members for which a CPD log was due on May 31, 2017, 366 either resigned, or were revoked, or applied for and were granted retired status, and 63 members were re-categorized to the Practitioner category.
- This gives two ways of calculating the CPD compliance rate. Setting aside those members who resigned, were revoked, or applied for and were granted retired status, the CPD compliance rate is 97.8%. Including those members who resigned, were revoked, or applied for and were granted retired status, the CPD compliance rate is 87.5%. The first value is likely to be an overestimate, of the true compliance rate, but the second value is likely to be an underestimate of the true compliance rate.

$$\text{CPD compliance} = \left[1 - \frac{63}{3204 - 366} \right] = 97.8\%$$

$$\text{CPD compliance} = \left[\frac{2805}{3204} \right] \times 100 = 87.5\%$$



Complaints and discipline (including capacity and review)

Complaints Committee

Chair: Rahim Shamji

While there were no complaints filed in Q4 2017, there were three complaints disposed of in Q4. Two complaints were dismissed with no referral to discipline and for one complaint, the member was issued a caution. Details can be found below. Overall, between December 1, 2016, and November 30, 2017, six complaints were registered and one complaint re-opened from 2016, which was stayed due to a parallel tribunal proceeding. This is down from nine in 2016.

The complaint rate per 1000 registrants at HRP in 2017 was .26.

$$\text{2017 Complaint rate per 1000 members} = \frac{6}{\frac{23155 + 23116}{2}} \times 1000 = .26$$

Year	Complaint Rate
2015	.23 per 1000 registrants
2016	.39 per 1000 registrants
2017	.26 per 1000 registrants

Comparator group (excluding HRPAs)	2015			2016		
	n	Mean	Median	n	Mean	Median
All professions regulated by public act in Ontario	34	19.08	5.37	37	11.82	5.36
Non-health professions	11	17.33	3.59	11	14.29	2.49
Professions that do not have a separate member association	5	13.59	3.59	5	7.33	2.49

Summary of complaints activity in 2017

	2016	2017				2017
	Total	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total
Number of complaints filed	9	0	5	1	0	6
Number of complaints closed	7	2	0	3	3	8
Average time to dispose of complaint(s) (days)	116	170	0	103	161	145

Complaints disposed of in Q4 2017

Case	Date complaint filed	Nature of allegations	Date of disposition of complaint and decision of Complaints Committee
C-2017-2	April 4, 2017	The member was alleged to have engaged in harassing behaviour and deliberately sabotaging the complainant's role, which led to the termination of the complainant's employment.	November 6, 2017 - No referral to Discipline, no evidence to support professional misconduct.
C-2017-5	April 21, 2017	The member was alleged to have acted in a manner that is hostile and unprofessional. The member is alleged to have slandered the complainant's name to other employees within the same office.	November 8, 2017 – Although there was no referral to discipline, the Panel provided advice to the member to keep in mind that the member should maintain a neutral disposition when dealing with employee challenges in the workplace. It's advisable to refrain from overt emotional expressions of embarrassment in the face of inappropriate conduct exhibited by employees.
C-2017-6	August 21, 2017	The member allegedly refused to conduct an investigation after an employee reported a case of workplace sexual harassment.	October 25, 2017 – the complainant withdrew the complaint, which was subsequently accepted by the Complaints Committee.

Average number of days to dispose of a complaint

C-2017-2 was disposed of in 216 days. C-2017-5 was disposed of in 202 days and C-2017-6 was disposed of in 66 days. C2 and C5 took longer than the average 150-day disposition. This was attributed to the time of year the investigation took place (over the summer months, vacation of volunteers) as well as the fact that several witnesses were contacted during the course of the panel's investigations.

Discipline Committee

Chair: Stephanie Izzard

There were no new referrals to the Discipline Committee in Q4.

Capacity Committee

Chair: Stephanie Izzard

There were no new referrals to the Capacity Committee in Q4.

Review Committee


Chair: Susan Bryson

There were six referrals to the Review Committee in Q4 with an additional nine cases waiting to be referred. An additional five cases have not submitted proper documentation to be referred to a panel. These five cases notified the Office of the Registrar of an insolvency event between April and May of 2017. The members have received a deadline of either December 15, 2017, or December 20, 2017, as to the submission of documents to avoid disciplinary measures.

On October 16, 2017, two referrals went before a panel resulting in one request for additional information and one finding of taking no action. The request for more information was met by the panel's deadline. On November 9, 2017, two referrals went before a panel resulting in one request for more information and one decision yet to be completed. The request for more information was not met by the panel's deadline and is still outstanding. On November 30, 2017, two referrals went before a panel resulting in one finding of taking no action, and one request for additional information.

In summary:

- Two cases have been resolved with findings of taking no action,
- Three cases are awaiting additional information for the panel to make a decision,
- One is awaiting a decision from the panel,
- Nine cases are awaiting referral to a panel, and
- Five have not yet submitted proper documentation to be referred to a panel.



Stakeholder relations

***Regulatory Affairs* newsletter**

The *Regulatory Affairs* newsletter is published pursuant to By-laws 13.08, 13.13, 13.18, and 13.19.

As set out in the By-laws, the Regulatory newsletter shall include but not be limited to:

- (a) Notices of annual meetings;
- (b) Election results; and
- (c) All information as set out in Section 13.08 and Section 13.13 with respect to discipline or review proceedings. Where there is a dissenting opinion prepared by a member of the panel and the decision, finding or order of the Discipline Committee or the Review Committee is to be published, in detail or summary, any publication will include the dissenting opinion.

Currently, three issues for volume two of the Regulatory Affairs newsletter have been published in 2017, with the fourth newsletter scheduled to be published on December 11, 2017.

Q4 Office of the Registrar Webinars

HRPA's Office of the Registrar offers two series of webinars:

- The *Understanding Professional Regulation* series explores various topics relating to HRPA's mandate as a professional regulatory body. These webinars are approved for CPD credit.
- The *How-To* series guides candidates through various Office of the Registrar processes and applications. These webinars are not approved for CPD credit.

The webinars conducted in Q4 were both part of the "understanding professional regulation" and "how-to" series.

How-to Series:

1. Validation of Experience Requirement Explained

Wednesday, September 13, 2017

This webinar is for individuals looking to earn the CHRL designation, have three years of professional level HR experience and have not yet applied for the Validation of Experience. It will focus on the experience requirement for the CHRL designation and will outline the Validation of Experience application process including evaluation guidelines, tips, fees and more.

2. HRPA: Information for Internationally Educated Professionals (IEPs)

Tuesday, September 19, 2017

This webinar is intended for Internationally Educated Professionals (IEPs) who are interested in becoming members of the HRPA, pursue a designation and would like to learn more. This webinar will provide an overview of the HRPA, will further discuss the HRPA's certification framework, the requirements to meet to pursue the CHRP or CHRL designations, the benefits of membership and more.

3. Maintaining your Designation through CPD

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Do you have questions about maintaining your CHRP, CHRL or CHRE designation through Continuing Professional Development (CPD)? This webinar will clarify what kinds of activities do (and don't) count

towards the CPD requirement and provide information about how to complete and submit your CPD log, and the steps to take if you are unable to meet your CPD requirement during your CPD cycle.

4. Exam Scoring Explained

Thursday 12 October 2017, 12:00 PM - 01:00 PM

This webinar will provide an overview of how the Comprehensive Knowledge exams (CKE1 and CKE2) and the CHRP and CHRL Employment Law exams are developed and scored. The webinar will be co-facilitated by Kelly Morris, HRPAs and John Wickett of Wickett Measurement Systems. Topics included in this webinar are test development process, test specifications and exam blueprint, compensatory and non-compensatory scoring and how it is applied, post-exam review/analysis and final scoring of the exam.

Understanding Regulation Series:

1. The mission and mandate of the HRPAs

Thursday, October 26, 2017

It is important for all organizations to understand their mission and mandate—everything follows from the mission and mandate. As it turns out, HRPAs's mission and the mandate were set out in the *Registered Human Resources Professionals Act, 2013*. This webinar will explore the topic of HRPAs's mission and mandate—who set HRPAs's mission and mandate? What was the process used to establish HRPAs's mission and mandate? And what are the implications of HRPAs's mission and mandate? Plenty of time will be set aside for questions.

2. Licensure for HR: What's the scoop?

Wednesday, November 8, 2017

If there is one topic that always comes up in any discussion of the regulation of Human Resources, it's *licensure*. What most members think about when they think of licensure is that only certified human resources professionals would be authorized to practice human resources, but in reality, licensure is somewhat more complex than that, and there are different variations on the concept of licensure. Some may be surprised to learn that a limited form of licensure has already come to human resources and that this may be a model for the future.

3. The transition from unregulated profession to regulated profession

Thursday, November 30, 2017

The human resources profession in Ontario is at the beginning of a transition from being an unregulated profession to being a regulated profession. The passage of the *Registered Human Resources Professionals Act, 2013*, was really just the beginning of the transition. So what does this transition entail? To be somewhat simplistic about it, members are going to have to get used to being regulated, and HRPAs is going to learn how to govern and regulate a profession. This webinar will consider various dimensions of this transition.


The LinkedIn series of articles



	Title	Date	Clicks
9	Regulatory capture: The Achilles' heel of professional self-regulation	June 14, 2017	201
21	The transition from unregulated profession to regulated profession	July 25, 2017	181
43	An important difference between professional associations and professional regulatory bodies	October 23, 2017	130
39	Defining professional regulation	September 26, 2017	128
47	Five misconceptions about HRPAs	November 14, 2017	126

OOTR Webinars 2017

	Date	Topic	Registration	Attendance
OOTR Understanding Professional Regulation webinar series				
1.	February 15, 2017	Discipline: How Does it Work? (with Rebecca Durcan)	1272	780
2.	February 23, 2017	Appeals: How Do They Work	939	539
3.	March 15, 2017	The Professional Liability Insurance Requirement Explained	949	539
4.	March 30, 2017	Investigations: A Conversation with Dean Benard	1186	519
5.	April 6, 2017	Update on the new CHRP, CHRL, and CHRE Certification Process	1288	500
6.	April 20, 2017	Renewal, Resignation, Suspension, Revocation, Reinstatement and Re-achievement	1050	482
7.	June 1, 2017	HRPA's Meta Strategy	574	348
8.	June 8, 2017	Decoding HRPA's Objects	543	331
9.	June 15, 2017	The big debate: Business Partner v. Professional Role	857	468
10.	June 22, 2017	What members have to say: Results from the 2017 HRPA Member Survey	587	314
11.	June 29, 2017	Bankruptcy and Insolvency	447	241
12.	July 6, 2017	Designation Update	798	362
13.	October 26, 2017	The Mission and Mandate of HRPA	244	142
14.	November 8, 2017	Licensure for HR: What's the scoop?	462	272
15.	November 30, 2017	The transition from unregulated profession to regulated profession	667	352
Understanding professional Regulation series total			11863	6189
How-to webinar series				
1.	April 26, 2017	The Coursework Requirement Explained	187	98
2.	May 16, 2017	The CPD Requirement Explained	483	283
3.	May 24, 2017	The Validation of Experience Requirement	465	236
4.	May 30, 2017	The CHRE Requirement	233	121
5.	September 13, 2017	The Validation of Experience Requirement	398	212
6.	September 19, 2017	Information for Internationally Educated Professionals	46	25
7.	September 28, 2017	The CPD Requirement Explained	541	261
8.	October 12, 2017	Exam Scoring Explained	269	118
How-to webinar series total			2622	1354
Both series total			14485	7543



Appeals

Appeals Committee

Chair: Kim Pepper

Committee Composition – One member of the appeal committee whose status was unknown in Q3, returned to the committee in Q4.

In Q4, two appeals were filed with HRP. One decision of the Experience Assessment Committee and One decision of the CHRE Committee. One request has been withdrawn and the appellant has chosen to re-submit her application and the other request is currently with the Chair.

In Q4, an appeal that was originally filed in October of 2016 held a hearing on November 21 and 24, 2017. This case has not yet been disposed of as the decision is currently being written with a release date in early 2018.

In Q4 the appeal committee disposed of two appeals: one CHRE Committee decision and one Experience Assessment Committee decision.

Overall, between December 1, 2016, and November 30, 2017, there were 14 appeals filed with HRP.

The Appeal Committee's volume has seen an increase over last year's volume with more complex cases which require additional resources. Some of those additional resources have included more consultation with Independent Legal Counsel (ILC).

	Date Appeal Filed	The nature of the appeal	The outcome of the appeal
A-2017-10	September 25, 2017	The decision of the Experience Assessment Committee (EAC). Claims documentation that was submitted was not reviewed as job class codes were included	Appeal is withdrawn – resubmitting application for Validation of Experience (VOE)
A-2017-11	October 4, 2017	The decision of the EAC regarding alternate route results – claims flaws in the process and that 2 positions were not considered.	Appeal withdrew December 4, 2017. Chosen to resubmit the application for the alternate route as the application did not include documentation for 2 positions that the applicant would like to be considered.
A-2017-12	November 6, 2017	Decision of the CHRE Committee	Currently with the Chair
A-2017-13	November 15, 2017	Decision of the CHRE Committee	Appeal is withdrawn – resubmitting application
A-2018-14	November 16, 2017	Decision of the CHRE Committee	Appeal is withdrawn – resubmitting application

Analysis of appeal decisions

Outcomes	
Total number of requests for appeal received between September 1, 2017, and November 31, 2017	5
Total number of final appeal decisions released between September 1, 2017, and November 31, 2017	2
Decisions for HRPAs	2
Decisions against HRPAs	0
Requests for appeal withdrawn by Appellant	4
Association not contesting the appeal	0

Below are the reasons for the decisions that were released in Q3:

1. *The Appeal committee upheld the decision of the Experience Assessment Committee (EAC) regarding a Validation of Experience (VOE) Application.*

The appellant appealed the decision of the EAC that concluded she did not currently meet the criteria for the experience requirement and awarded her 0 of the 36 months. The appellant claimed there was a strong emphasis on the administrative and transactional work that was listed in the job description that led to the denial of the validation of experience. The Appeal Committee upheld the decision of the EAC and dismissed the appeal. The Appeal Committee found no information to suggest that the EAC did not follow the policies and processes in their review of the appellant’s experience.

2. *The Appeal Committee upheld a decision of the CHRE Review Committee regarding a CHRE application.*

The appellant appealed 2 decisions issued by two differently constituted panels of the CHRE Review Committee regarding his Phase II CHRE application. Both decisions concluded that he did not currently meet the criteria for the CHRE designation. The appellant claims that the CHRE Review Committee assessed his application in a manner which was not consistent with the published CHRE Evaluation Grid, and further felt that both applied subjective considerations which were not referenced in the Grid. The Appeal Committee concludes that the evidence does not support a finding that either CHRE Review panel erred in the process followed in evaluating the appellant’s application and as such, there is no basis upon which to find that the original decisions of the review panels cannot stand.