CPHR British Columbia & Yukon

People Leading Business.™

30 November 2018

Honourable Harry Bains

Minister of Labour

c/o LRCReview@gov.bc.ca

Dear Minister,

Re: Labour Relations Code Review Panel Report: Comments from CPHRBC & Yukon

Re: CPHRBC & Yukon Submission on Labour Relations Code Review

On behalf of the Chartered Professionals Human Resources Association of B.C. & Yukon ("CPHRBC"), we are pleased to submit our comment on some of the proposed twenty-nine (29) recommendations in the August 31, 2018 report of the Labour Relations Code Review Panel. We attach for your information our submission to the Panel.

Background

CPHRBC represents over **5,800 human resource professionals and their service providers and advisors in B.C. and the Yukon**. Many of our members work every day in labour relations within the framework of the *Labour Relations Code* ("LRC") and so are not only directly affected by any changes to the LRC but offer a wealth of practical experience on the topics addressed below.

CPHRBC does not believe in taking an adversarial position on issues affecting the employer/union relationship. Like the Labour Relations Code Review Panel, we strive to be thoughtful in our approach to ensure that the needs of employers, employees and the impact on the economy are carefully considered.

In this regard, CPHRBC supports many of the recommendations forwarded by the Labour Relations Code Review Panel. Having said this, we also believe that several of the Panel recommendations require further consideration to fairly balance the needs of employers, unions and, on some issues, employees and third parties.

Scope of Submission

The "Need for Change"

The Mission of CPHR is to "keep people first in the decisions of leaders" which includes preserving employees' right to choose union representation and ensuring that any changes to the *Code* do not adversely affect BC's ability to attract and retain investment, talent and jobs.

One of the main reasons the Panel cites for needing changes to the *Code* is the gap in compensation between professional, scientific and technical business services versus the accommodation and food service sector, which they see being reduced by unionization. We believe most of this gap is due to the different education, experience and responsibility of the positions, as well as the fact that higher union wages only prevail in industries where employers are not subject to competition from lower wage cost competitors e.g. the public sector, some resource industries and utilities and other private firms with "market power".

Another important reason cited for the Panel's rationale for change was the declining rate of unionization, which is viewed as a negative trend. The Panel reasons that this means less effective representation of employees' interests. Human resources practitioners view declining unionization as reflecting workers' preferences to have a direct relationship with their employers without the need for third party representation, as well as the protections afforded them under other labour statutes such as the *Employment Standards Act, Human Rights Code, Workers Compensation Act* etc., which reduces the need for trade union representation.

Of the twenty-nine (29) *Labour Code* recommendations put forth by the Review Panel, CPHR BC will provide responses to those it considers most require further consideration.

1. Employer Communication with Employees (Panel Recommendation #3)

The current language in Sections 6(1) and 8 of the *Code* presently balances the needs of the Employer and the Employee. The result of amending the present language of the Code would unfairly advantage trade union drives, and result in employers not being able to communicate effectively with their employees. The recommended amendment would limit communication to a statement of fact or opinion "reasonably held", a standard which invites the Board to unduly restrict employers' communications about the merits of unionization using the Board member's view of what is "reasonable". Section 8, in its current form, already adequately prevents any communication that uses coercion or intimidation, which case law confirms includes outrageous threats or totally unfounded employer statements which may discourage unionization. Both employers and trade unions should have common broad rights to provide employees with their views, subject to Section 8 restraints. The proposed amendments to the *Code* would tip the balance of this issue in favor of trade unions, who in practice are almost never subject to sanctions for potentially untrue or "unreasonable" statements about the benefits of unionization.

2. Unfair Labour Practices and Mandating Remedial Certification (Panel Recommendation #4)

Our Association believes that the present language in 14(4)(f) satisfies the needs for both employers and employees. We believe that amending this article in the *Code* is unnecessary. Simply put, no change in the present language of the *Code* is required in this section. The present language in 14(4)(f) already considers the needs of employees and employers, by allowing the Board discretion to remedially certify in cases where egregious unfair labour practices occur affecting unionization and already requires that the Board assess the potential consequences to determine whether there is sufficient interference to affect the outcome of a vote. Overall, if there are unfair labour practices occurring, the Board should be addressing the inappropriate conduct directly with any employer or union not acting in "good faith." On this topic, any Board ordered interference with employee free choice through the secret ballot by Board ordered

remedial certification should be minimal given it infringes employee freedom of association.

3. Card Check Certification (Panel Recommendation #5)

We are pleased to support the Panel's recommendation that encourages the continuance of maintaining the "Secret Ballot," as opposed to returning to a card certification system. The secret ballot vote should be retained because there are sufficient measures to ensure the exercise of employee choice is fully protected and, in case of egregious employer unfair labour practices, remediated in the event of unlawful interference. As noted in our submission to the Panel, card collection and certification is too vulnerable to both abuse and misunderstandings by employees of the consequences. The present process and system reduces the opportunity for interference, misrepresentation or intimidation by both unions and employers alike.

4. Timing of Certification Votes (Panel Recommendation #6)

CPHRBC does not agree with the Panel's recommendation to reduce the timeframe of the certification vote from ten (10) days to five (5) days. Once again, CPHR wants to ensure that both employees and employers have sufficient time to produce accurate, fact-based information for employees to consider prior to engaging in a certification vote. The reduction from 10 days to 5 days advantages potential trade union certification votes, and is unnecessarily detrimental to employers from being able to provide fact based information in a timely way. In many certifications, the employer only learns of the certification application when it receives notice from the Board and therefore only has a chance to exercise its right to communicate with employees about unionization during the window to the vote. The proposed amendment would deprive those employers of any practical right to communicate with employees, including, commonly, to dispel misconceptions and inaccurate information that may be circulating. In fact, such a short deadline may push employers to make statements in haste without the benefit of legal advice when a little more time might have allowed for better, more reasoned and balanced communications. In maintaining the present already short 10 day vote deadline in the *Code*, both employers and trade unions have an equal, fair and reasonable opportunity to provide accurate

information to their employees and potential members.

5. Access by Unions to Employee Contact Information

Our Association supports the Panel's recommendation that employee list "requests" not occur prior to an application for certification being filed. Nonetheless, there are still privacy concerns because employers are trustees of private employee contact information ("ECI") which, under Privacy Laws, may only be used by the employer for employment related purposes. As stated in our submission to the Panel, CPHR BC would support an approach with checks and balances to both protect employee privacy and prevent misuse of ECI. Some suggestions would be that:

a) the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of British Columbia be consulted prior to any consideration of amending the present language in the *Code*;

b) The LRB verify a minimum level of 45% card support and lack of other practical means of contacting employees before ordering union access to ECI from the employer;

c) We strongly recommend any ECI shared be limited to employee work emails and phone numbers, not personal emails, telephone numbers or addresses. The potential for employees to be very unhappy with union use of the latter is substantial;

d) Employers should, if the above tests are met, then seek consent of the affected employees to disclosure of their ECI;

e) Unions using ECI provided by the employer would be required to explain to employees contacted that the ECI was provided by statutory requirement, not volunteered by their employer;

f) Unions be required to both seek affirmative written consent to continue communicating with employees beyond the initial contact and provide an easy and effective means for

employees to terminate all further communications by a union e.g. an easy to use "unsubscribe" link on emails. This will prevent unwanted repetitive use of the contact information.

We believe these requirements reflect existing privacy and electronic communications (e.g. British Columbia Privacy Legislation as well as Canada's Anti-Spam Law aka "CASL") legislation, which requires consent of a recipient to such contact while still allowing unions to have an initial point of contact.

6. Validity of Membership extended to 6 Months (Panel Recommendation #8)

If the government is to accept the Panel's recommendation to extend the validity of union membership cards to 6 months from 90 days, this should be accompanied by an amendment to allow signatories with a formal right to revoke cards and be advised of that right by the union given how commonly employees change their mind about unionization.

7. Successor Union and Collective Agreements (Panel Recommendation #11)

The proposed amendments in regards to successorship are unnecessary and will be problematic for many employers, particularly the many situations where a new service provider is truly planning to use its own existing or a newly hired workforce to do the contracted work. The Panel points to certain sectors such as care sector food and housekeeping where "re-contracting out" has had unfair results for employees who end up working for the new contractor but with lesser wages etc. However, this could be addressed by special rules where the new contractor takes over a majority of the incumbent's workers. The broad proposed form of extended successorship would, as our submission to the Panel noted, unfairly impact industries where true competition amongst contracted service providers prevails and employers with separate workforces compete for major service contracts. The current successorship provision, which does capture "re-contracting out" where more than just the services are transferred provides sufficient protection. Alternatively, any broader successorship should depend on the re-hire of incumbent employees.

8. Extension of Statutory Freeze of Terms and Conditions after Certification (Recommendation #14)

The Panel has indicated that they believe that four (4) months is insufficient time for parties to negotiate the terms and conditions of a first collective agreement. However, the recommendation to extend this time period to twelve (12) months is unreasonable as it extends the period of uncertainty for both employers and employees. The critical economic freedom of employers and their HR professionals to make changes to meet often pressing business needs (e.g. to cut costs to save a company from insolvency) should not be curtailed any longer than necessary by the statutory freeze. The Panel's own research determined that, "The 1998 Section 3 Committee recommended the freeze period reflect the average amount of time required to negotiate a first collective agreement, which they concluded was eight months." Consequently, we encourage any changes to 45 (1) (b) be limited to the *1998 Section 3 Committee* recommendations of eight (8) months.

9. Secondary Picketing and Replacement Workers (Panel Recommendation #20)

Picketing, strikes and lockouts are fundamental Canadian labour rights. However, in the case of picketing, both primary and secondary, there are potentially major impacts on third parties such as the public, customers, suppliers and non-unionized workers etc. which need to be carefully considered. The proposed amendment by the Panel does not provide the clarity required to ensure balance for employers' businesses and employees' rights. Specifically, there are issues with the recommendation of the wording "and a similar act at such place that has an equivalent purpose, but does not include lawful consumer leafleting that **does not unduly impede access or egress or prevent employees working** at or from the site." The Panel does not appear to have given full consideration to the interests of third parties. Certainly access and egress considerations for these groups, for legitimate business rationales, is essential and may affect their own right to earn a living. Board and judicial decisions have already protected reasonably informational picketing rights of individuals and unions. The "balance" that the Panel says it is striving for is problematic with the added language. The words "unduly impede access or egress"

could be improved with the inclusion of a quantitative measure to ensure "unduly" is not too liberally interpreted by the Board with onerous results for the third parties affected. Otherwise, the Board (and courts) may well see such revised wording as a mandate to allow much more disruptive picketing.

10. Education as an Essential Service (Panel Recommendation #21)

We reiterate our submission to the Panel that education should be maintained as an Essential Service. In the modern economy, the availability of schools to educate and supervise children is absolutely critical to the attendance of workers, particularly to women who are often the primary caregiver/guardian to children. Removing education's designation as an Essential Service will result in major economic and social burdens for a huge number of employees across the workforce with school age children and their employers when teachers undertake work action and strikes—something which has repeatedly occurred in the past. There are approximately 600,000 public school students and even more affected parents/caregivers that must be considered.

In the modern economy, most union or non-union households, including the many single parent households, do not have a person at home (or elsewhere) able to look after children who cannot attend school during a strike. They depend on the education system to provide both education and care for their children. Without it, they are unable to work or are forced to make difficult last minute decisions about childcare to keep their jobs, including potentially exposing their children to unsafe or unsupportive care arrangements out of necessity. This issue is further complicated because employers would certainly be required to consider their employees' absences due to childcare necessities. These situations would certainly require human rights considerations. By contrast, education workers, who are highly unionized, still enjoy strong advantage in collective bargaining even under the current rules. Further, students in the graduation program (grades 10, 11, and12) rely upon their education and grades for their futures. During K-12 labour disruptions, graduation program students in particular suffer the consequences of union/employee job action by risking students' university and trade school acceptance, as well

as missing potential employment opportunities. This is a specific sector with many considerations that need to be taken into consideration prior to merely returning it to a system where teacher and support staff unions can unfairly influence a bargaining mandate with the majority of the Province negatively impacted.

11. Arbitration & Expedited Arbitration (Panel Recommendation #23 & #24)

CPHRBC supports the Panel's recommendations in these two areas. The Panel's recommendations appear to take into consideration "Arbitrations are no longer expeditious, efficient, or inexpensive." The changes put forth by the Panel appear to be "more realistic time limits and procedures to ensure a more expeditious process." These recommendations will allow the opportunity for employers and trade unions the necessary means to address labour issues in a timelier manner along with the anticipation of curtailing increasingly excessive legal costs.

Closing

In closing, CPHR BC and its Public Policy Committee are pleased to have the opportunity to make this submission to the Honorable Minister Bains for due consideration. Any questions should be directed to the Chair of the Public Policy Committee, J. Geoffrey Howard, ghoward@meplaw.ca 604-891-1184.

Sincerely,

J. Geoffrey Howard

CPHR BC Director and Chair,

Policy Committee

Mark Jefferson

CPHR, Chair Labour Relations Working Group

"Sue Ryan"

Sue Ryan, Chair, Board of CPHR

c.c. Anthony Ariganello, CEO, CPHR BC

VIA EMAIL

August 3, 2018

Michael Fleming
4052 Trinity Street
Burnaby, BC V5C 1N8

Attention: Michael Fleming – (mike.fleming.arb@gmail.com)

Dear Mr. Fleming:

Re: Submission of Chartered Professionals in Human Resources B.C. and Yukon re Labour Relations Code Review

I enclose a self-explanatory submission to your Panel on behalf of CPHR BC and Yukon.

Yours truly,

Michael, Evrensel & Pawar LLP
Per:

J. Geoffrey Howard*

+1 (604) 891-1184
ghoward@meplaw.ca
meplaw.ca

*Denotes a law corporation

J. Geoffrey Howard*
Counsel

JGH/nm
Encs.

cc: S. Ryan, A Ariganello, B Gill, CPHR BC
S. Banister
B. Dong

CPHR British Columbia & Yukon

People Leading Business.™

VIA EMAIL

3 August 2018

URGENT AND CONFIDENTIAL (but subject to public disclosure requirements)

To: Labour Relations Code Review Panel c/o Michael Fleming - Chair of Panel
From: CPHR BC & Yukon

Re: CPHR BC & Yukon Submission on Labour Relations Code Review

On behalf of the Chartered Professionals in Human Resources Association of B.C. & Yukon ("CPHR BC"), we are pleased to make this late submission to your panel.

CPHR BC only first formed a Public Policy Committee to address public policy topics affecting human resource professionals in July, 2018. This submission was thus drafted in great haste in hopes of receiving consideration by the panel, who we understand are drafting their report to the Minister. We appreciate that we missed the formal deadline for submissions by affected and interested parties to your panel. That was simply due to our organization having no experience participating in such consultations, nor any framework such as the Public Policy Committee for doing so. We therefore hope you will nonetheless give consideration to our submission below given our Association represents over **5,800 human resource professionals and their service providers and advisors in B.C**. Many of our members work every day in labour relations within the framework of the Labour Relations Code ("LRC") and so are not only directly affected by any changes to the LRC but offer a wealth of practical experience on the topics addressed below.

We attach as Appendix A a more complete summary of CPHR BC as an organization.

Scope of Submission

Given the tight timing, the Public Policy Committee decided to concentrate on a total of 7 substantive areas of possible reform, as well as 2 procedural ones and to limit ourselves to a short summary of the Association's views.

Our members, while typically working for an employer, play a unique mediating role, often serving as a trusted intermediary between both individual employees and their unions and management. We have tried to stay true to this unique perspective in the submissions which follow.

Substantive Areas of Reform

1. Proposed Card Check Certification

Our Association feels the current promptly held secret certification vote system works effectively and do not support a move to "card check" certification. Other organizations, including the International Labour Organization, have pointed out the many reasons why the secret ballot is widely considered the best and fairest method of certification in a "monopoly representation" model of union representations like we have in B.C. (i.e. Wagner Act model of union representation where once certified a union enjoys monopoly powers of representation). We feel that card check certification would be to open to several potential risks which could lead to certification that does not reflect majority employee preferences, including the following:

a) Some employees signing cards not appreciating the consequences, including due to language barriers in some cases. A more formal LRB-supervised vote conveys the importance of the decision to unionize by voting, as opposed to the less self-evident implications of signing a card, much more clearly;

b) Employees who have signed cards changing their minds, in some cases after receiving more information on unionization, but not being able to make, knowing how to take the

formal steps or effort to cancel their card in a valid manner to remove the card from the count;

c) Employees being subject to "peer pressure" from others supporting unionization and signing a card to "get along" or "fit in";

d) Employees being induced into signing a card based on either misunderstandings of the role and powers of a union or, in a few cases, outright misrepresentations by organizers (see below).

We also believe a formal vote, in which substantially all potentially impacted employees get to "have their say" gives more legitimacy to the outcome, both for the employees and the employer, than the more informal card collection drive approach. Under a secret ballot, each employee has a confidential opportunity to express their preference on certification, whereas a card drive may not even reach some employees who are nonetheless then forced into the union.

As the LRC allows very short and infrequent windows of a month or two every few years, employees seeking to change their minds and decertify, face a daunting process under the LRC. Given the barriers to decertification, it is critical that the fundamental and de facto quasi-permanent decision to be certified to a union, with all the limits it places on individual employees' economic freedom to contract for their own terms of employment, be made based on a LRB supervised secret ballot.

2. Union Access to Employee Contact Information

Our Association understand that with the more distributed modern workforce, it can be very challenging for unions to even contact workers to organize them. However, as the guardians of the privacy of employees' personal information, including contact information, HR professionals are reluctant to grant a blanket right of union access to employee contact information ("ECI"). CPHR BC would support an approach with checks and balances to both protect employee privacy and prevent misuse of ECI. Some suggestions would be that:

a) The LRB verify a minimum level of support (e.g. 20%) and lack of other practical means of contacting employees before ordering union access to ECI from the employer;

b) ECI provided by the employer to be limited to work emails and phone numbers only. Unions would almost certainly prefer to use "non-work" contact but can use the work contact information to obtain that from willing employees;

c) Unions using ECI provided by the employer would be required to explain to employees contacted that the ECI was provided by statutory requirement, not volunteered by their employer;

d) Unions be required to both seek affirmative written consent to continue communicating with employees beyond the initial contact and provide an easy and effective means for employees to terminate all further communications by a union e.g. an easy to use "unsubscribe" link on emails. This will prevent unwanted repetitive use of the contact information.

We believe these requirements reflect existing privacy and electronic communications (e.g. Canada's Anti-Spam Law aka "CASL") legislation which requires consent of a recipient to such contact while still allowing unions to have an initial point of contact.

3. Employer Rights of Expression During Organization

We understand some may be pushing for further curtailment of the current limited employer rights to communicate employer views on unionization under the LRC. Our Association does not support change to the current regime on this topic. We believe the current rules, which allow the LRB to strike a balance between the employer's constitutional right and critical economic interest in communicating its views on proposed unionization, as well as explanatory information on the impact of unionization and bargaining powers of unions and "coercive" employer communications. The existing case law strikes the appropriate balance in CPHR BC's view. We

question whether any further curtailment of employers' rights to communicate would be contrary to Charter freedom of expression rights of employers.

4. Sanctions for Union Misrepresentations

While not in any way suggesting that all or even most union organization drives succeed because of misrepresentations by union supporters and organizers, this is a common problem often made worse by language barriers and a general lack of knowledge amongst employees of how our labour relations system works e.g. by way of examples only: how difficult it is to decertify, the impact of monopoly union representation on employer and employee rights to set their own terms of employment.

One employer reported that after a recent certification drive was successful after a vote, a significant number of employees who were recent immigrants showed up at the HR office asking the employer to grant or facilitate granting immigration visas for family members overseas. They stated to HR that they been given the impression that unionization would empower the employer to grant such visas or facilitate them when this was simply not true. They may well have voted for the union based on such a fundamental misrepresentation/misunderstanding. This case demonstrates the need for controls on such misrepresentations that are rarely challenged or remedied under the current law.

We therefore suggest that the LRC be amended to include specific provisions prohibiting misrepresentations as union Unfair Labour Practises. Breach would allow the LRB to provide remedies, from mandating corrective communications through to holding a second certification vote or even denial of certification in cases of material misrepresentations such as described above.

5. Secondary Picketing

CPHR BC understands unions are asking for expansion of existing rights to engage in secondary picketing and related tactics. We consider the current regime, which we note also bans

replacement workers, a key trade-off in the area of employer options to mitigate the impact of a strike, strikes the right balance between union and employer, as well as third party suppliers/business partners interests and generally reasonably protects third parties from being the incidental victims of strike action by a union. We are not aware of any compelling evidence to show that employers are abusing the current rules.

6. Education as an Essential Service

Feedback from members indicates support for our Association's view that favouring no change to the current regime under which elementary and secondary education is deemed an "essential service" and thus teachers and support staff may be subject to mandatory minimum staffing requirements during strikes. In the modern economy, most union or non-union households, including the many single parent households, do not have a person at home (or elsewhere) able to look after children who cannot go to school during a strike. They depend on the education system to provide both education and care for their children. Without it, they are unable to work or are forced to make difficult last minute decisions about child care to keep their jobs, including potentially exposing their children to unsafe or unsupportive care arrangements out of necessity. By contrast, education workers, who are highly unionized, still enjoy strong leverage in collective bargaining even under the current rules.

7. Successorship on "Contracting/Recontracting Out"

We understand the labour movement is pressing for automatic certification of new employers taking over the provisions of contracted out services. Given the increasing prevalence of contracted services, such as for food and housekeeping in the health and residential care sectors but also elsewhere (e.g. building services, contract mining services), this is understandable. However, CPHR BC does not support a blanket approach to full traditional successor employer obligations in all contracting out or "recontracting" situations.

On first time contracting out, where the contracting out is permitted by the collective agreement and keeping in mind that as many unions negotiate for limits on contracting out, those without them must be deemed to implicitly accept some contracting out risk. We therefore see no need to amend the LRC "successor employer" provisions on this point, as they have generally been applied in a practical way in such cases by the LRB. Moreover, contracting/recontracting out is often done for competitive costing reasons and forcing a new service provider to adopt a prior service provider's collective agreement may fundamentally undermine any potential for such competitive efficiencies in labour costs, which are commonly a very high portion of total service provider costs.

Furthermore, any automatic successorship on contracting/recontracting out undermines the fundamental (and constitutional) right of the actual affected employees to choose union representation or not so exceptions to a secret vote should be rare.

In cases of "recontracting", i.e. an employer obtaining a new service provider to provide the already contracted out services, there may be situations where the new service provider should be required to recognize the certification only, but not be bound by the collective agreement and the full range of traditional "successor employer" obligations, which extends to being liable for pending grievances etc. The test for such "mandatory recognition" should be a flexible one but based primarily on whether the new provider has hired all or most of the existing unionized workforce.

Procedural Issues

8. Expanded Availability of Interest Arbitration to Resolve Bargaining Impasse

Feedback from some members leads us to support considering modestly expanded rights in select cases of both employers and employees to seek binding arbitration to set collective agreement terms after impasse, but only on strict conditions which must include:

a) A finding by the LRB that the requesting party (and possibly the other party as well) has fully complied with the duty to bargain in good faith, with a remedial power to require further efforts be made before arbitration is ordered by the LRB; and

b) In most cases, the arbitrator must use a "final offer" or similar type of term-setting approach to the award to force the parties to really table their bottom line fairest offer rather than just digging in on a position in bargaining to then access arbitration in hopes that an arbitrator will award more than they have been able to bargain for.

9. Mandatory Pre-Hearing Mediation Rights

We understand some groups have suggested that a broader formalized role for mediation be included in the LRC. Although mediation is already a very popular and common form of dispute resolution both at the LRB and in arbitration, CPHR BC would support the right, analogous to the right of litigants in BC Supreme Court actions, of one party to require the other party to engage in a speedy mediation prior to an LRB or grievance arbitration hearing. Given the LRB already offers such mediation on request in LRB proceedings and that some leading arbitrators push or offer to the parties to mediate before commencing an arbitration hearing on the merits, we see formalizing a right of one party to require mediation as only a small further step. Such a non-consensual mediation will rarely be sought given the risk that an unwilling party may prove inflexible at an involuntary mediation, but may nonetheless be helpful in some cases. However, parties requiring urgent relief should not face further material delay due to an opponent's request to mediate. Thus we recommend some general timeliness requirements for completion of the mediation be included to protect against this risk.

Closing

In closing, CPHR BC and its Public Policy Committee are pleased to make this submission and hope the submissions above are helpful to the panel. Any questions should be directed to the Chair of the Public Policy Committee, J. Geoffrey Howard, ghoward@meplaw.ca 604-891-1184.

Sincerely,

J. Geoffrey Howard
CPHR BC Director and Chair, Public Policy Committee

Susan J. Ryan
Chair, CPHR BC Board of Directors

c.c. Anthony Ariganello, CEO, CPHR BC
Baldev Gill, COO

CPHR BC & Yukon

CPHR BC & Yukon is the voice of the HR profession in B.C. and the Yukon. It possesses a solid membership base, good governance practices and demonstrated expertise in setting standards of professional practice. It is the sole grantor of the CPHR designation in the province.

Founded in 1942, CPHR BC & Yukon today has more than 5,800 members encompassing CEOs, directors of HR, consultants, educators, students, HR generalists, and small-business owners. The mission of CPHR BC & Yukon is "to advance professional people practices that enhance organizational performance." About 60% of members hold the CPHR designation with that number growing annually.

CPHR BC & Yukon is a not-for-profit organization incorporated in British Columbia governed by a 14-member volunteer Board of Directors elected by the membership. The Board oversees the work of 20 plus professional staff located in downtown Vancouver.

CPHR BC & Yukon is divided into eight geographical areas to maximize its ability to address the regional needs of membership and to create an efficient and effective model to offer services and networking opportunities. Reflecting the make-up of the BC economy, about 70% of members are the Mainland/Fraser Valley region. In 2013, CPHR BC & Yukon welcomed HR professionals from the Yukon as full members.

Membership in the association has grown 10% over the past five years. The 2014-member survey demonstrated strong overall satisfaction for the services CPHR BC & Yukon provides as 80% of respondents indicated that they found their membership valuable.

CPHR BC & Yukon is funded largely through member dues, courses and sponsorship. It receives no funding from government.

CPHR BC & Yukon is by far the largest body representing human resources professionals and is the leading voice for workplace related issues in British Columbia. Other associations represent specialized aspects of the human resources role comprised of individuals working directly or indirectly in the human resources field.

A number of key criteria are inherent for an occupation to be considered a profession, such as the existence of a community of practitioners or professional association, common standards of entry and performance, legal protection, an ethical code of conduct, a distinct body of knowledge and set of core competencies, and a requirement for training and certification. CPHR BC & Yukon meets each of these criteria currently, with the exception of the legal right to self-regulate.

Members voluntarily join CPHR BC & Yukon and adhere to an ethical code of conduct with regard to professional conduct. The certification process for the CPHR designation draws upon an established body of knowledge and a set of enabling professional competencies. Attainment of the designation requires a bachelor's degree, practical experience in the field and a commitment to continuing professional development. CPHR BC & Yukon also operates a Complaints, Investigation and Discipline Committee to investigate allegations of misconduct on the part of its members holding a CPHR designation. CPHR BC & Yukon also advances the HR profession by regularly updating and enhancing standards for HR practice. In this regard, CPHR BC & Yukon operates in a similar capacity to other professional bodies in British Columbia.

CPHR
British Columbia
& Yukon

About CPHR BC & Yukon

Keep people first in the decision of leaders

- Founded in 1942
- 5800 members
- Sole grantor of the CPHR designation—a nationally recognized credential
- CPHR BC & Yukon requires continuous professional development to keep current with business concerns such as legislation regarding workplace safety, violence, discrimination and employment standards

CPHR
British Columbia
& Yukon

HR Professionals Play Key Roles

- Timely and efficiently recruit the right employees
- Retain high performing employees
- Talent management
- Leadership development
- Manage change and cultural transformation
- Oversee statutory obligations (workplace law and regulations)

These roles are getting tougher!