



**Regulation Matters:  
a CLEAR conversation**

## **Episode 102: Governing Through Legislative Reform – Culture, Communication, and Trust**

### **June 9, 2026**

**Line Dempsey:** Welcome back to our podcast, Regulation Matters: a CLEAR conversation. Once again, I'm your host, Line Dempsey. I'm currently the Chief Compliance Officer with Riccobene Associates Family Dentistry here in North Carolina, along with practices in South Carolina and Virginia. I've also been a board member and past president of CLEAR.

As many of you are aware, the Council on Licensure, Enforcement and Regulation, or CLEAR, is an association of individuals, agencies, and organizations that comprise the international community of professional and occupational regulation. This podcast is an opportunity for you to hear about important topics in our regulatory community.

Now, CLEAR recently hosted a regional symposium with the theme Regulating in a Political World, to explore how regulators are navigating increasingly complex political landscapes. With major legislative reforms, shifting government priorities, rising public expectations, and evolving societal debates, regulators are being asked to adapt rapidly while maintaining that public trust that they have been entrusted with.

The closing session of this symposium was a fireside conversation that focused on governing through change. Today, I'm joined by the leaders of that conversation. Tamara Richter, who is the Executive Officer of Business Services and Operational Integration at the College of LPNs and HCAs of Alberta, and Carin Plischke, who is the Registrar and CEO of the College of Complementary Health Professions of British Columbia. So, welcome, Tamara and Carin, and thank you for speaking with me today.

**Tamara Richter:** Glad to be here. Thanks, Line.

**Carin Plischke:** Thank you, Line. It's a pleasure to be here, and good to see everybody again. Thank you for the invite.

**Line:** Absolutely. Well, you know, the symposium brought up issues around political pressures, government relationships, and regulatory change. But your conversation reflected on what that actually looks like in practice. So, Tamara, let me start with this question. So, when legislative change first came into effect in your organization, what did that actually look like on the ground?

**Tamara:** I'll give a bit of a background on when legislation came into our organization. So, it was announced that our organization, which at the time was the College of Licensed Practical Nurses of Alberta, would be renamed the College of Licensed Practical Nurses and Healthcare Aides of Alberta, and that we'd be the regulator of healthcare aides. And so this happened in 2020. The regulation was proclaimed just last summer, in June, five years after the legislation was announced. Proclamation of our regulation was announced that we would come in to regulate this new profession on February 1st of this year, which is just three months ago. So, we had many conversations with government about the proclamation date. We planned to regulate healthcare aides in 2021. When that didn't happen, we planned for 2022, and that went on for five years until the proclamation was announced.

So, we are a bit different, I think, perhaps, than other regulated professions. Healthcare aides in our province did not have an association. Healthcare aides were part of a directory that was administered by our organization with grants that were supported by the government. The directory had a mandate for all publicly funded healthcare aides to be actively enrolled and to work as a healthcare aide in the province. Although it was open for all healthcare aides to enroll, so that we could also have the private sector involved, the directory had many aspects that were similar to regulation, such as we developed a framework for assessing substantial equivalents for healthcare aides that came from out of province. We developed and administered a provincial exam, and we also held annual renewal. So, healthcare aides were somewhat used to these processes, although there were many aspects of regulation that they were not aware of.

So we had a lot of work to do in communicating what regulation meant for healthcare aides and to stakeholders, and an extensive communication plan was created. We began from the beginning in creating videos of what it meant to be a regulated health profession under the Health Professions Act that is in place in Alberta. We built communications about why fees would be charged, about the requirements for purchasing liability insurance. There was no code of ethics in place, no standards of practice. All of the 'whys' in this had to be communicated.

So the directory wasn't regulation, but we transitioned everyone who met the regulatory requirements over to a regulated database, and on the day that regulation came into force. And none of these healthcare aides had to previously declare that they had their fitness to practice. They didn't have to provide a criminal record check. Therefore, we knew we needed to conduct a renewal to at

least have them declare some of these aspects. So our renewal just ended on April 30th. And we had over 42,000 healthcare aides that went through this process.

If you want to know what it looks like on the ground, it was busy. We worked with healthcare aides, communicating with them and their employers about regulation, adapting what we produce, assessing efficiencies, and again, adapting those again. So, before regulation came into force, we worked with staff closely, implemented and utilized change management principles. We focused on cultural sustainability and development. As an organization, we enhanced our data analytics and we continue to adapt those. Conduct had to adapt processes, streamline processes, and since the date of proclamation, we've received over 40 complaints, and we're seeing some patterns in those complaints already. Practice has been busy with discussions regarding medication assistance. And the change of having seniors age in place in the community has created some of these discussions, and so that's really a good overview of what has happened since legislation has come into our organization in the past three months.

**Line:** Well, I guess at the outset, did some things feel more clear or unclear during that time period?

**Tamara:** The regulation was clear, because our regulation really outlines the registration processes, so I think that was clear. I think unclear was some of the practice inquiries that we were having, and perhaps realizing that not all stakeholders were involved in some policy discussions that should have been prior to regulation. And so, you know, we're working through that process, at this time.

**Line:** Carin, anything from you?

**Carin:** Yeah, thanks, Line. I'll add a bit of context here. Similar to Tamara as well, what felt unclear to us at the onset was timelines, so similar of moving targets, of dates of the implementation of the legislation here in BC. I can provide a bit of additional context that's a bit different from Tamara's experience in Alberta. And I'll also just take a quick moment just to recognize that I'm joining today from the traditional and unceded territories of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Tooth nations. So, in BC, if you've been following our regulatory climate, some of this might not be new to some folks, but, what is unique about the College of Complementary Health Professionals of British Columbia is that we are one of the first, newly formed organizations as a regulator, in terms of multi-profession regulation. So we are a newly formed organization that came together in June of 2024. We now regulate over 14,000 licensees. That's a change from our amalgamation, where we merged four smaller colleges together. So we now regulate massage therapy, traditional Chinese medicine, an acupuncturist, doctor of chiropractors, and naturopathic physicians with just over 80 staff, and an operating budget now of about \$14 million. So, like I said, our journey is a little bit different.

We came to be with new legislation, which is now known as the Health Professions and Occupations Act, which just came into force on April 1st of 2026, so we're still working and actively implementing the new legislation. Our previous legislation was the Health Professions Act, the HPA. But our review was quite clear as to the reason why we were both amalgamating and why there was new legislation, I guess, in terms of your question, Line, in 2008 in BC, there was an inquiry into the performance of the College of Dental Surgeons of British Columbia, leaving us with a report that we all refer to as the Cayton Report. And that provided review of the governance, in particular, of the regulatory colleges in British Columbia, as well as a review and recommendations of the current legislation at that time. There were a number of recommendations that were made, and a focus on improving public safety and public trust, improving efficiencies, as well as public confidence. And there were really six large, broad recommendations, through that time. So, our legislation of the HPOA was approved by Cabinet in 2022. So it's actually been there for some time, with just coming into force on April 1st. So, we are very clear on the rationale and the reasons for the change and the need for change, which we support, with the change in legislation, but similar to Tamara, timelines moved. Change anxiety was created, through that time, just because of some of those ongoing uncertain things at the onset.

**Line:** That's great. So, I guess, for either of you, if one of you wanted to start with this. What changed the most quickly?

**Carin:** Sure, I can start with that, and then Tamara will jump in, I'm sure. For us, I think because we were a newly formed organization, we were learning how to be together, a culture of many to a culture of one. So we had some unique challenges and opportunities, actually, of coming together as small colleges. So we were learning how to build our foundations, how to come together as a new organization while simultaneously planning for the new legislation. So, there was a lot going on. And some things that changed most quickly for us in preparation of that was actually our organizational design, looking at roles and responsibilities and how to become a more formal regulator, with more formal structures. So that was a lot of what changed very quickly so that we would be able to effectively be planning to implement the legislation coming into effect now. So, yeah, org design, roles and responsibilities, and the structures look quite different from being very small colleges and regulators to be able to function more formally with communications teams, finance teams, merging of bank accounts, payroll systems. We had legacy licensee databases, you know, so we're actually now just merging data and our CRM processes into place. So a lot of opportunity to work through, and so I would say org structure to be able to effectively function was what was felt most, at the beginning of our process.

**Line:** How about you, Tamara?

**Tamara:** What changed most quickly was the staff's ability to adapt and collaborate. There were many departments that worked together; they adapted to find solutions. Leading up to regulation, there definitely was change fatigue, although it did take us a time for the regulation to come into force. It did allow us to prepare in a large way, although I do think what we underestimated was the sheer volume of work that would happen. We went from an office that had one or two visitors a week, to having 10 visitors a day, and the office was closed to people coming in. We had a real cultural shift since the pandemic. The doors were closed, and now we had people coming to the door and wanting help because they weren't able to renew on their own. So, I think we underestimated the number of phone calls and the number of contacts. So really what changed most quickly is our staff's ability to adapt and find solutions during that time.

**Line:** But you bring up a great word, too, and so I'm going to bring this one to Carin then, what was underestimated from your perspective on what you guys did?

**Carin:** Similarly to Tamara's comment is change fatigue. I think some things that were underestimated was how much change is coming at us as a newly formed organization while preparing for the new legislation. And also a new way of working together. Similarly, it's not to be underestimated the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. We experienced a lot of different ways of our legacy colleges working very differently. And how to come together as a new organization and form teams and relationships and collaboration to build a new culture. So there was a lot of staff and colleges, some working 100% remotely, and others who had a mixture, and so how to even feel equitable, take the best of those processes to build new ways.

And that's a lot of change for staff on the heels of coming into a new, larger organization and building that change. So I believe what was underestimated is actually ensuring good people support, both in terms of human resources and formalities of being able to describe clearly new roles and responsibilities in the organization, and change management support. Both things a little bit differently, because I believe what we underestimated was the translation of roles and responsibilities with the new org design of being a larger college and organization. So, for example, managers and directors, even deputy registrars, were managers and directors of more of a function. You know, when a college is composed of perhaps six staff, everybody knows everything in their head; you are a manager or a director more of a task of licensure or quality assurance, and ensuring that task of that work is being completed, versus a translation of our role and responsibility of a manager or director is leading people in the organization. Now when you have a larger team of 40 people, how do you lead and think differently, in terms of roles and responsibilities, and adjusting? So I believe what we underestimated was the impact of new roles and responsibilities and formalized HR and people support from an HR function, as well as change management. So I would do those things sooner and a bit differently.

**Line:** That's good. Well, so, I know you're relatively new, as far as your boards there. Did this legislative reform have any change to how you had governance structures already in place, or how decisions get made, or was it still early enough that it didn't have as much effect?

**Carin:** That's a great question. There were changes in the new legislation of the Health Professions and Occupations Act for boards of the health regulatory colleges in BC, so all six regulators. What was new is that the boards are required to be 50% public representation and 50% of the professions. What else changed was the appointment process. So, elections by the professions themselves, the licensees, to be able to elect their other licensee colleagues onto the board was no longer. So we now have an oversight office in British Columbia as part of our change, that came into effect on April 1st. The boards are fully appointed by the superintendent's office - well, not appointed by the superintendent's office. They go through a recruitment process and make recommendations to the Minister of Health, who actually makes the appointments for every board member, regardless if it's a public member or a licensee member. We did take opportunity when we amalgamated the colleges to prepare for that change. So, our board was composed, going into April 1st new legislation, of 50% public and 50% of the professions. But when the superintendent's office came in, they redid that process, and so our board actually went through the entire process again. So I think that's another reflection. While we tried to be very proactive and minimize impact and ensure continuity of board members, we did experience some changes through that process.

I think the other impacts on the board, as well as actually the committee structure, for Licensee Committee as well as the Investigations Committee, was becoming a governance board versus more of an operational board. So, becoming a larger organization, when some of the colleges were small, the boards were involved more in the operations because the manpower, the size of the organization required more operational support, both from the board and committees, such as the Quality Assurance Committee, or the Licensee Committee, and what was formerly the Inquiry and Discipline Committees. So there was a lot of operational work, and it's been a shift and an ongoing change management process to shift into governance models. As well as moving away from volunteerism of committee members and really building the infrastructure internally to implement the legislation and all the work that staff are doing in the college. So that's been a shift for both board members as well as committee members through the legislation changes, which I believe are all excellent changes in the interest of the public. I think there has been some inherent conflicts of interest, for example, when licensees or the professions are a part of a quality assurance committee, and therefore making decisions on their own quality assurance program. So that has shifted, where that committee doesn't function any longer; it's run by staff with the opportunity to have advisors. So we're not working in isolation of the professions and ensuring that we're getting good feedback. We also work with the

public through a consultation process, as well as Indigenous communities. So we have those processes in place, but it has been a shift from volunteerism to ensuring staff are working in the public interest on those types of programs.

**Line:** Well, that's very helpful. Thank you for that. Tamara, how about for you guys? Did you see a lot of change to your governance structures, or, like, even how decisions get made through this process, too?

**Tamara:** So when legislation was announced in 2020 that we would be regulating another profession, the Council needed to decide at that time what would be the practice statement of the profession, and also if we were going to change our name. So the Council had to make that decision, so it was made six years ago, and so we had time. So that had occurred, and then, of course, it took a time for the legislation to be proclaimed, so Future Us had time to define our governance structure, including how we would incorporate healthcare aids into the different governance structures, so the Council had made a decision.

And meanwhile, there was also legislation that came in that made a shift in how the council was structured. 50% public, 50% profession, so the council made the decision that one member of each profession would be on the board, and, you know, however many that would be, whether it was healthcare aids or LPNs, would fill those roles. And so we also, at that time, had shifted away from elections, and we now appoint by a competency-based structure that's in place. So that gave us time to do that, and it wasn't actually just about regulating a different profession. It was because of best practices that were introduced in regulation, and why our organization had shifted away from that. It did take us a bit of time to get public members, which I think a lot of us have experienced. It does take time sometimes to get those structures in place, but we now have a full complement 50% public members that are appointed from the government, and then 50% that are from the profession. So we currently are in the process of including different governance committees and appointing those and looking for health care aides to participate in that. Also, in conduct hearings and such, we'll have to have some health care aides on those, so that's some of the work that we're still in the process of enacting.

**Line:** Did either of you feel like there was, for lack of a better term, tension, maybe, with maybe even, like, the profession itself going from elected peers, if you would, to now appointed positions. Was there much feedback that you got from the professions?

**Tamara:** I think elections are... who you know... who knows somebody, how they would get elected in. We also used to look at the geographical area of the province and try to fill pieces of the council from thinking, let's have it based on a geographical area that's in your province, which, if part of your province only has a very small population, it's very hard to fill those positions. And so it was really

difficult to have coverage across the whole province, and then to have regulated members represented in that way. I think it was a good change, and I think the Council recognized that was a good change, to look at the competencies of the board members, and not look for where you lived, but to change in a different structure. So, I know a lot of regulators have had to make these changes in the past few years, just because it makes sense of how you would have your board structured. So, was there some animosity? Probably some... There always is, because you're changing, you know; you're losing a piece of what was history. Legacy changes are hard to make, but it really has become quite the norm of what we do now, so, it was animosity at first, but it was a good change.

**Carin:** I would say we heard probably not so much concern from the licensees themselves on the change, but we did hear quite a lot from the associations. So, would I call it a loose tension, perhaps, of change, as Tamara indicated, of previous ways of probably influencing election processes. Of course, there's always a political lens to some of this. So I'd say overall, the licensees have been really good and part of the process and the public, as well. I think where we've seen some change management communication, and having to work through some of that relationship change very intentionally, has been with the associations, and ensuring the understanding of why the change came and who was responsible for the change as well. So I think those were important aspects that we've worked through with our partners and colleagues at the associations. So that's been a good process to work through.

**Line:** So, I guess, what were the biggest challenges in bringing new professions together, or expanding your mandate, that you faced?

**Carin:** Some of the larger challenges we faced at bringing the new professions together was that feeling of professional identity. You know, often when you meet somebody new on the street or an introduction, we quite often ask people, 'what do you do for a living?' You know, and they'll say, 'oh, I'm a chiropractor,' or 'I'm an acupuncturist,' and so people really identify with their profession. And a change for us bringing together the professions and the colleges is our name change, actually. The College of Complementary Health Professionals of BC versus the College of Massage Therapists of British Columbia. So this identification of being grouped together without a clear title of the profession was a challenge. Even as we were starting the amalgamation process, etc, there was a lot of discussion and workshops to decide names, and ultimately it was the Ministry's decision on the name for the college. But that was a significant area to go through.

The other big change for us was the committees. How do we bring together multi-profession committees for discipline and inquiry and/or quality assurance? And working through that change management and understanding with the committee members of: this is a complaint that is about a chiropractor; how could a massage therapist be knowledgeable to provide input into that? However,

you know, it's a different mind. It's a new lens of curiosity and asking questions. And really, the processes for the professions aren't that different. If you're going through an inquiry or investigation process, the process is the same. You're looking at the risk,; you're looking at the rationale; you're looking at the evidence and asking really good questions. Same with licensees. The process really isn't that different of professions. You may need some different certifications or different levels based on scope, but everybody needs a criminal record check. Everybody has to provide those evidences, etc. So, working through, actually, where we are more similar than different, and we are way more similar in our functions as regulators than there are differences. And so, just still working through those conversations of the function of being a regulator versus a function of the profession.

The other thing that has been helpful for us is we have created harmonized professional standards, so consent, for example. And so what the public have told us is that their expectation from professions is to have a similar experience. So it's very common now to have multi-profession clinics where you have a chiropractor, a physio, a psychologist, and a massage therapist working together. What the member of the public tells us, or that patient, is I don't want to experience having to do different consent forms that look different. My code of ethics and what I experience should be the same, and I don't want to repeat my story five different times. And so, the harmonized standards is now starting to set that expectation that the public are seeking for consistency, for safety. And so that's been our exciting opportunity that we have is to move the needle, you know, in terms of public safety and consistency and taking that public and patient voice into consideration for our standards. So that's been really good work. It continues to roll out, and educate, and it won't change immediately, but I think it is in the right direction.

**Line:** That's great. Now, Tamara, what kind of challenges did you face as well? I saw you nodding earlier on some of this, so something was resonating there, for sure.

**Tamara:** So when integration or change is introduced, people worry about losing influence, losing visibility, so when everyone supports the broader goal, even then, there still could be concern about whether their profession will continue to be understood and represented appropriately. But as Carin said, I think regulation is regulation. We know both of the professions that we're regulating, so bringing these two professions together was really not that difficult. As Carin says, they have to do criminal record checks; they need to do all of the different declarations to get through. And we always had the principle that each profession was unique, so we didn't always have that as a focus forward. We utilized economies of scale, figured out where we could harmonize as much as possible, you know, one database, utilizing a lot of the expertise within the organization to consider how could we come together to regulate both of these groups in efficient way. So, of course, I think our challenge was the volume of work. There was a significant amount of work that needed to be done in communicating with a brand new profession. This group was different. They'd never been regulated before, so there

was a lot more work that needed to be done in what that meant, and even though employers may employ nurses, or OTs, or PTs, or whatever, whoever they may employ, they're regulated, but the way that this profession was brand new regulated, it was like we had to provide information even to employers on what this meant. So, staff and leadership were often managing significant operational change. And so we tried to support external stakeholders through whatever uncertainty that occurred, and different teams naturally had different priorities, but we worked together and tried to help as much as possible to explain what this all meant for them regulating another profession.

**Line:** Well, you know, we often talk about the importance of creating a culture of communication and trust, right? Yeah. So, how did you maintain that trust, both internally and externally through all this to garner that trust?

**Tamara:** As we had many delays in the proclamation of regulation, five years as I've indicated, we did budgets each year with the intent that we would regulate that year. It required extensive communication with staff and with our council to ensure that we maintained trust. We didn't communicate with healthcare aides right away. We found externally, trust had to be maintained by being clear, timely, realistic, so we tried to avoid communicating anything that we didn't absolutely know to reassure in the short term. Instead, we focused on being honest about what we knew, and what was still evolving, and what stakeholders could expect next. So, the predictability helped to build credibility as an organization.

Internally, we brought together a small group of leaders, and they were part of the planning group. Then we expanded to include all departments, and we regularly came together. One of the most important things was creating alignment. Before communicating outward in the complex, high-pressure situations, staff and leadership needed to have a shared understanding of the issue, the risks, the rationale behind decisions. A big focus was making sure teams had the context, felt informed and understood, just not that decisions were being made, but they also wanted to know the why. So we took a collaborative and a collective problem-solving approach. And then when something arose, we were able to work together through it. We're still meeting and working through specific aspects of work that come up, and, you know, really, the basis is public protection and what we're doing. So, we're able to focus on that and move whatever we need ahead with that in mind.

**Carin:** Yeah, I think it's such an important part of the changes we've gone through, is that culture of communication. So I spoke before about the org design, coming together as the new college. So that was one of the very early org design structures, was a communications team and formalized structure in the organization. Of course, it didn't exist in the smaller colleges; there were consultants, etc. So that's been one of the strongest successes in terms of your question, Line, for maintaining that trust is the formalization, consistent messaging, strong leadership, and engaged employees who are really

enjoying connecting, both internally and externally on communication. So it's been very intentional - through websites or webinars, or reaching out to licensees with newsletters that many of us do. But also just really with our staff as well, regular staff meetings, team meetings monthly with updates across the organization, but also being very realistic of where we are, and not trying to over-deliver and over-promise, just be realistic of where we are. Recognize it's not perfect; we're learning together, we're going through these changes. And being calm through it all. We have a lot of amazing, resilient staff who continue to go through this journey with us, and the communication team being very embedded into the operations has really assisted us in internal and external communication. We've also had a lot of intentional meetings over the last two years coming up to the new legislation with the associations. So, of course, we have a number of associations, because we have a number of professions. So we meet, collectively with them all together, so they're all hearing the message. They're consistent in messaging, and then we have some individual meetings as well, but we've held regular, consistent meetings, minimally quarterly, to ensure that the associations have been part of this journey with us and a partner and collaborator as we've been working through this change. So that has lent us in good stead, as well.

**Line:** Well, Carin, were there moments when you felt like the trust was at risk, you know, among the different groups that we deal with. I mean, you're talking about licensees, registrants, the government, the public in general. Were there moments when you felt like it was at risk?

**Carin:** The moments where I felt it was at risk was coming close to the April 1st implementation date of the new legislation. Part of that is because our regulations also changed, so it wasn't just the legislation changing, but our regulation changed as well. And that was very political, in terms of now one set of regulation for the college, even though there are different parts of the regulation that are very profession-specific, but there were changes within the regulation coming up to the implementation of April 1st for removal of restricted activities, for example. And, what does it mean in terms of other professions can perhaps do this now? It's more open, the public needs more access to services, and so there was definitely working through with the associations on their mandate, you know, for advocacy of the profession. You know, a lot of media attention, etc. So it was a maneuvering to ensure the correct parties were working together as the regulation is directed by the ministry, not the college. And so it took some maneuvering to get the right parties communicating and having good communications coming out for the public, as well as the licensees, from the appropriate decision maker. So I think that was our biggest risk that we went through in terms of communication or barriers working against us.

**Line:** Tamara, same question to you. Were there moments like that? And, you know, what worked or didn't work for you guys when you addressed it?

**Tamara:** Well, there were definitely moments where trust felt at risk, especially when stakeholders wanted immediate answers, and we were still working through decisions or working through evolving information. So in those situations, there's a delicate balance. If you communicate too slowly, people assume you're withholding information. If you're communicating too early, you're creating risk and confusion. So we were similar with Carin. We're not exactly the same with legislation and regulation, but we needed to have standards of practice and code of ethics in place for this new profession that we were regulating. They did not get approved until less than a month before the proclamation date, so where there is some risk in that process, and so we couldn't regulate them without knowing exactly what was in these documents. Well, somewhat you could guess somewhat what was in the document, so we were able to do some work, but really having them in place was an important aspect of the regulations, so we were able to share some of the information within them, you know, informally, so that was good. But it felt a little risky and even a bit out of control. It's sometimes within the organization, waiting for government to approve these documents are going through the system to be approved. So, what worked well, though, was being transparent and consistent. So, even though, like we said before, we didn't have the answers, we could communicate what we could. And, you know, we had to also consider that the audiences we had to be able to communicate to and how we would do that. I think it reinforced that trust is built through consistency, for me, transparency, follow-through. People are usually willing to accept complexity and uncertainty if they feel like they're being communicated to.

**Line:** Well, now that you guys have both had some time to reflect on things as we move forward, I think it's always good we can look back and see what were the challenges, or hiccups, or things that you would do differently if you could go back and do it again. So, we'll start right back with you, Tamara. Like, if you could go back and change one thing, or do one thing differently, what would it be?

**Tamara:** Oh, one thing. I think...

**Line:** It sounds like there's multiple things. Let's just pick one thing.

**Tamara:** Okay, I'll pick one thing. I do think that we could have done maybe broader focus groups with external employers and maybe post-secondary institutions to discuss the new profession that we were bringing into regulation. I think we did a lot, but we maybe could have done more. Maybe that'd be one thing I'd say.

**Line:** Alright, how about you, Carin?

**Carin:** One thing... I would focus on bringing in formalized human resources support very early on the org structure. Our roles and responsibilities, whether it's committee or staff, remain our largest energy

and focus, and still feels abstract at times in the organization, so I would have brought in that support for change management much sooner, and in a more formal and organized way.

**Line:** I think that's very helpful, and I think, you know, especially, we've probably got some regulators that are maybe going to go through a similar change, so that's going to be helpful for them. What advice would you also supplement with things that you would have done differently, but what advice would you give another regulator that was maybe getting ready to go through this same kind of task?

**Carin:** I would say have fun. You know, I've looked at this as an opportunity in once in my lifetime to do something different. I think, it's the way of the future, multi-profession. The public want simple access to professions. So I would say embrace the change. You know, I think, letting egos through the process of changes, because there's going to be different job losses, you know. For myself, we had a number of registrars; we [now] have less registrars - there's changes, and there's shifts. So, I would say the biggest thing is to embrace the change and think of these changes as new opportunities to do things differently and to reimagine. Have fun, think about the change as an opportunity to be modern. You know, we have a very small piece of a healthcare system overall, but I think it's important to remain modern and embrace the changes that are occurring around us in a bigger sector. So yeah, I would just say go for it.

**Line:** Well said. How about you, Tamara?

**Tamara:** I agree with Carin. It was a very unique opportunity. I don't know that it would happen again. It was a very long process that started that we were considering regulating them as far back as 12 years ago, so now that it's all come forth that we've been regulating, it's been a bit of a challenge and a puzzle, but it's been really good to build the building blocks and to see it all out in operations now. I would say being collaborative, being flexible, considering the bigger picture is really an important aspect to consider. Collaborative relationships will get you very far in what you need to do in this process. And, you know, we're all human. Project plans change, and it's important to be adaptable, because if you're not adaptable, then well, you might just run into some issues, and you really just need to be able to figure out what the challenge is and what the solution is to meet that challenge.

**Line:** Perfect. Well, this has really been excellent. These have been some really great examples in practice of how regulatory organizations can remain responsive, resilient, and effective amid political change. And so, thank you, Tamara and Carin, for sharing this conversation with us today.

**Carin:** Thank you, Line. It's been a pleasure to be here, and a pleasure to be presenting with my colleague Tamara again. So, thank you for the opportunity. It's been a great morning and a lot of fun, so look forward to doing it again.

**Tamara:** Yes, thank you, Line, for the invitation and participation. It was great to have a conversation with Carin once again, and appreciate the opportunity.

**Line:** Well, it's definitely been a pleasure. And, you know, we'd also like to continue this conversation with our members on the [CLEAR Regulatory Network](#). This podcast episode will be posted there, along with some questions for our members to consider, such as... What strategies have been most effective in maintaining trust with the public, registrants and licensees, and government during periods of significant change? And, how is your organization preparing for the next wave of political or societal pressures on regulation?

We greatly appreciate and thank our members for your discussion and feedback in the CLEAR Regulatory Network. If you haven't already, we invite and encourage you to join and take part in those online discussions.

I also want to thank our listeners for tuning in for this episode. We'll be back with another episode of Regulation Matters: a CLEAR conversation very soon. If you're new to the CLEAR podcast, please subscribe to us. You can find us on Podbean or any of your favorite podcast services. And if you've enjoyed this podcast episode, please leave a rating or comment in the app. Those reviews help us to improve our ranking and make it easier for new listeners to find us.

Feel free to visit us at our website at [www.clearhq.org](http://www.clearhq.org) for additional resources and a calendar of our upcoming events and programs. Finally, I'd also like to thank our CLEAR staff, specifically Stephanie Thompson. She is our content coordinator and editor for this program. Once again, I'm Line Dempsey, and I hope to be speaking to you again very soon.

*The audio version of this podcast episode is available at [https://podcast.clearhq.org/e/governing\\_change/](https://podcast.clearhq.org/e/governing_change/).*