



University of Alberta Students' Union

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Friday, October 28, 2016

5:00 PM

SUB 6-06

AGENDA (NC 2016-03)

2016-03/1 INTRODUCTION

2016-03/1a **Call to Order**

2016-03/1b **Approval of Agenda**

2016-03/1c **Approval of Minutes**

Approval of May 17, 2016 meeting minutes as tabled.

Please see NC 16-03.01

2016-03/1d **Chair's Business**

2016-03/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2016-03/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2016-03/3a **Review and Select GFC Applicants**

2016-03/4 INFORMATION ITEMS

2016-03/5 ADJOURNMENT

2016-03/5a **Next Meeting: TBD**



University of Alberta Students' Union

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Monday, May 30, 2016

4:00 pm

SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT
Marina Banister (Chair)		Y
Ben Angus		Y
Habba Mahal		Y
Jason Wang	Nik Viktorov	Y
Michael Sandare		Y
Ryan Scott		Y

MINUTES (CAC 2016-02)

2016-02/1 **INTRODUCTION**

2016-02/1a **Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 16:10.

2016-02/1b **Approval of Agenda**

BANISTER/ ANGUS move to approve the Agenda as tabled.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-02/1c **Approval of Minutes**

2016-02/1d **Chair's Business**

2016-02/2 **QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**

2016-02/3 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

2016-02/3a Amendment to Standing Orders

The committee decided to put the new clause under Section 2 Power/Duties. The new clause reads:

- F. Have the power to ratify all appointments
- i. With the exception of General Faculties Council and the Senate;
 - ii. Or any other positions the committee deemed necessary.

MAHAL/SCOTT move to approve the Standing Orders as amended.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-02/3b Discussion of Advertising Techniques and Protocols

BANISTER shared how the committee operated in the past with committee members.

Advertising

BANISTER noted that the committee always receive responses from the same pool of people, and she wanted the committee to discuss how to advertise to a diverse body of people.

SCOTT suggested the FAs to involve in advertising by using their mailing list. VIKTOROV and ANGUS also suggested that councilor

should act as a bridge between the Council and FAs and student body.

BANISTER also asked the committee for ideas of advertising avenue besides social media. VIKTOROV suggested using the faculties' newsletter for advertisement. MAHAL suggested using something tangible, such as posters. SANDARE suggested using classroom talks as many students are interested. ANGUS suggested advertising what the committee does and values to stimulate students' interest.

BANISTER also asked how to improve job description. ANGUS suggested that it should be well-written to arouse students' interest.

BANISTER thinks that advertising is a good opportunity for the participants of Council Mentorship Programme to involve in the committees.

VIKTOROV suggested that the advertisement should be sent to student groups so that they can help spreading the news.

ANGUS suggested that Jobkin should be advertised to make it known to the student body.

Application

BANISTER asked the committee for ideas of what the application should include.

MAHAL thinks that it is good to include resume and SCOTT thinks that students should also include a short cover letter. SANDARE commented that the cover letter should be no more than 1 page.

ANGUS otherwise suggested making text boxes or questionnaire asking students specific questions instead of covering letter. SCOTT and BANISTER like the idea.

BANISTER continued to ask should the cover letter be open-ended or should it ask specific questions. ANGUS and MAHAL like the idea that students should answer the questions in their cover letter. SANDARE, however, feared that students will give stock answers in their cover letter.

BANISTER also asked the committee about how to select the candidate. Should the committee give opportunity to students new to governance? VIKTOROV and SCOTT commented that it should be

depend on the position. If the positions are less important and involve less duty, they can be given to new students. ANGUS suggested that experience is not very important if the committee is about general issue.

BANISTER asked the committee regarding the rubric of judging the candidates. SCOTT thinks that rubric will make the process more complicated as there is no way to grade cover letter. ANGUS and VIKTOROV think that it depends on different positions.

BANISTER also asked about diversifying the position. SANDARE agreed that it should be diversified. MAHAL suggested that it depends on the relevancy of the position. ANGUS and VIKTOROV think that it depends on the positions and should be reviewed case by case.

Interviewing

BANISTER asked the committee if all the position should be interviewed as it is time-consuming. SANDARE commented that the candidate for GFC and Senate should be interviewed. ANGUS agreed. VIKTOROV commented that interview might scare away people.

Training

BANISTER asked if it is the responsibility of the committee to provide training for the candidate. MAHAL thinks that it should be the candidate's responsibility to be familiarized about the operation. SANDARE suggested the committee can provide assistance on request.

2016-02/4

INFORMATION ITEMS

2016-02/5

ADJOURNMENT

2016-02/5a

Next Meeting: TBD

2016-02/5b

Meeting adjourned at 17:04.

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	VOTES
BANISTER/ ANGUS move to approve the Agenda as tabled.	6/0/0 - CARRIED
MAHAL/SCOTT move to approve the Standing Orders as amended.	6/0/0 - CARRIED

NC 16-03.01



University of Alberta Students' Union

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Tuesday May 17, 2016

4:45 PM

SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT
Marina Banister (Chair)		Y
Bismillah Kiani	Dorsa Nahid	Y
Habba Mahal		Y
Jason Wang	Nik Viktorov	Y
Michael Sandare		Y
Neesha Persad		Y
Ryan Scott		Y

MINUTES (NC 2016-1)

2016-1/1 INTRODUCTION

2016-1/1a **Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 4:45 pm.

2016-1/1b **Approval of Agenda**

SANDARE/PERSAD moved to approve the agenda for May 17, 2016 as tabled.

Vote 7/0/0

CARRIED

2016-1/1c

Approval of Minutes

MAHAL/SANDARE moved to approve the minutes for April 25, 2016 as tabled.

Vote 6/0/1

CARRIED

2016-1/1d

Chair's Business

2016-1/2

QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

BANISTER: Before moving on to the Health and Dental Committee, we need to discuss the range of positions Nominating Committee wants to deal with. As the Vice-president Academic, I get many requests to fill positions in small committees. Sometimes, these requests are urgent. For example, they sometimes tell me that the position needs to be filled by next week. So, are you guys comfortable with me deciding on those kinds of committees? In a nutshell, what do you guys want to come to Nominating Committee?

Do you only want the important committees? Do you want to decide on all the committees?

SCOTT: We should take any position that gives us appropriate notice, and you could decide on a case by case basis. If they give sufficient notice, it doesn't really matter how important the committee is.

PERSAD: I agree.

SANDARE: So, are we looking at committees that give a notice of 1 week or over?

BANISTER: It's not very straightforward. Last week, somebody from Administration asked me to fill 1 student position for a committee called the "Canada 150 Committee". I emailed it out, and 1 person applied. I asked for a small resume. So, 1 person and 1 position. She looked capable, and I sent her name out. The whole thing was done within a week. I personally don't think that's a reasonable timeframe for the Nominating Committee. But, I also don't want positions to get filled while leaving Nominating Committee out of the loop. There are some committees which recur every year that we know of. Do you guys want to mainly deal with those? There are also the sporadic random committees that come up.

PERSAD: We can definitely do the recurring committees. For the sporadic ones, we can handle them as long as there is sufficient notice such as 2 weeks or so.

MAHAL: I agree with that. Without a 2 week time period, it'll be hard to even co-ordinate a meeting.

BANISTER: So, what I'm hearing is that you guys allow me to use my discretion?

SCOTT: Yes, as long as you summarize what you have done.

BANISTER: Would you like an update on the positions I have filled under my Chair's updates?

SCOTT: Yes.

PERSAD: What's the Canada 150 Committee anyway?

BANISTER: Canada's 150th bicentennial is coming up. It's a committee set up to plan celebrations and events for that.

BANISTER: The next discussion is about the range of positions filled by the Nominating Committee that should be ratified by Council. We can do it in 2 main ways. First, when we fill positions, we can just give the selected names out, and it'll be done. Second, we can choose the successful applicants and recommend that Council appoints these people. So, either Nominating Committee recommends to Council to appoint people or Nominating Committee decides without the further approval of Council. When going through Council, it's a bit more formal. Students can say that

they were appointed through Council, and it may give them more credibility. It's also another layer of oversight to make sure the applicants are suitable. Furthermore, going through Council keeps them in the loop of what we're doing. Those are the advantages. The major disadvantage is the time barrier. When getting something ratified by Council, it may take 2 full weeks. Moreover, I have never seen an occasion where the Council has not approved something the Nominating Committee has recommended. I'm sure it may happen, but not very often. So, is Council ratification just a rubber stamp which adds more of a time commitment? We have 3 options: 1) Nothing goes to Council, 2) Everything will go to Council for ratification, and 3) A mixture where some will go to Council for ratification.

NAHID: If there's a position that affects Council, or a bigger population then it should go to Council. Smaller things can get approved in this committee.

SANDARE: We should do it on a case by case basis. After we nominate someone, we can vote on whether we should bring it to Council.

SCOTT: I don't see any benefit of telling Council about every single position.

BANISTER: Nominating Committee has had a slight controversy surrounding it in the past. Some people are sensitive when they don't get a position. The only downside about doing it on a case by case basis is that our decisions may seem arbitrary. We don't want someone who didn't get a position to make a statement mentioning that we didn't even bring it to Council. I'm happy with doing it on a case by case basis, but we should more clearly define what we should bring to Council. Councillor Nahid mentioned that major things should go to Council. So, we should make a motion defining what constitutes "major".

PERSAD: I believe that things concerning the Students' Union should go through Council. Things that are more external aren't necessary.

SCOTT: Things like the Senate are external, but are more contested.

SANDARE: Yes, that's why I said we should do it on a case by case basis. Passing a motion may make it too restrictive. The important

ones are the bigger things which affect more people. It's not necessarily about how many people apply, but more about what the position entails.

SCOTT: What if we do consider how many people apply? Nobody would contest if there are 3 applicants for 3 positions, and all get selected.

NAHID: We can make a rule saying that we don't bring it to Council if it's 1 to 1. If it's higher, we can do it on a case by case basis taking into account how important the position is.

BANISTER: From my experience, people from the outside looking in want to see a clearly defined process. It appears fairer for the external viewer. People who don't get a position may say that the decisions we make are arbitrary. That's what I'm trying to avoid this year. Let's take the Health and Dental Committee for example. Do we want this ratified by Council? Under Councillor Nahid's criteria, this is an internal Students' Union thing, and it will be affecting a broad audience. The disadvantage is that we cannot get this on the agenda tonight. It will have to be brought up in the next Council meeting 2 weeks from now. But, the names are needed sooner than that. This committee decides on the Students' Union's Health and Dental Plan. Every year, there are 3 student appointees, and they provide their feedback to this committee. I will provide a brief overview of each committee from next time onwards. Last year's Nominating committee ratified everything through Council. But, there were some issues because they didn't meet the deadlines. Also, their processes were sometimes viewed as arbitrary.

SCOTT: So, they're under criticism from both sides then.

BANISTER: Yes. To avoid that, we should have a firmer definition on what will and will not go to Council. In my personal opinion, the only necessary things to go to Council are GFC and Senate.

SANDARE: I think a possible metric could be committees that deal with increases or decreases to our budget of over \$5,000 that are contested by more than 1 person, and which have certain stakeholders such as higher level administration, board of governance, or the government. Those committees should be ratified by Council.

BANISTER: If I were to make that broader, we can say that GFC and

Senate must be ratified by Council and everything else would be decided as the committee sees fit. We can put your metrics into that too if the committee agrees. That would give us a firmer foothold. Do you guys agree?

SCOTT: When we do decide on whether something does or doesn't go to Council, can we include it in the minutes explaining why?

BANISTER: For sure. I would be comfortable with doing the Health and Dental Committee at the committee level. Do you guys agree?

PERSAD: Yes. We might as well because the deadline is before 2 weeks.

BANISTER: So, how about putting all these criteria in our Standing Orders?

SCOTT: That's a good idea. The people next year would be informed about them too.

BANISTER: Great. I'll come back next meeting with a motion to add those criteria to our Standing Orders.

2016-1/3

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2016-1/3a

Health and Dental Plan Committee

BANISTER/MAHAL moved to go in-camera.

Vote 7/0/0

CARRIED

PERSAD/VIKTOROV moved to go ex-camera.

Vote 7/0/0

CARRIED

BANISTER/SANDARE moved that Nominating Committee appoints Abby Rentz to the Health and Dental Plan Committee for 2016/2017.

Vote 7/0/0

CARRIED

BANISTER/MAHAL moved that Nominating Committee appoints Michelle Kim to the Health and Dental Plan Committee for 2016/2017.

Vote 7/0/0

CARRIED

BANISTER/SCOTT moved that Nominating Committee appoints Cole Goshulak to the Health and Dental Plan Committee for 2016/2017.

Vote 7/0/0

CARRIED

2016-1/4 INFORMATION ITEMS

2016-1/5 ADJOURNMENT

BANISTER/PERSAD moved to adjourn the meeting.

Vote 7/0/0

CARRIED

2016-1/5a Next Meeting: TBD

2016-1/5b Meeting adjourned at 5:33 PM.

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	VOTES
<i>SANDARE/PERSAD moved to approve the agenda for May 17, 2016 as tabled.</i>	7/0/0 - CARRIED
<i>MAHAL/SANDARE moved to approve the minutes for April 25, 2016 as tabled.</i>	6/0/1 - CARRIED

<i>BANISTER/MAHAL moved to go in-camera.</i>	7/0/0 - CARRIED
<i>PERSAD/VIKTOROV moved to go ex-camera.</i>	7/0/0 - CARRIED
<i>BANISTER/SANDARE moved that Nominating Committee appoints Abby Rentz to the Health and Dental Plan Committee for 2016/2017.</i>	7/0/0 - CARRIED
<i>BANISTER/MAHAL moved that Nominating Committee appoints Michelle Kim to the Health and Dental Plan Committee for 2016/2017.</i>	7/0/0 - CARRIED
<i>BANISTER/SCOTT moved that Nominating Committee appoints Cole Goshulak to the Health and Dental Plan Committee for 2016/2017.</i>	7/0/0 - CARRIED
<i>BANISTER/PERSAD moved to adjourn the meeting.</i>	7/0/0 - CARRIED