



NOMINATING COMMITTEE MINUTES

2014 – 2015

Date: June 10th 2014

Time: 5.33 pm

In Attendance:

MARINA BANISTER (Chair)

NAVNEET KHINDA

KATHRYN ORYDZUK

MAHMOUD TARRABAIN (proxy)

Excused Absence:

Others in Attendance:

SACHITHA KUSALADHARMA

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by BANISTER at 5.33 pm.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA Taken as friendly.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES **ORYDZUK moved to approve the minutes as tabled.**
The motion was seconded by KHINDA.
Vote 2/0/2 (Abstentions by BANISTER and TARRABAIN)
CARRIED

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS None.

5. OLD BUSINESS None.

6. NEW BUSINESS Changes to Standing Orders

BANISTER: Would you like to go through the Standing Orders line by line?
The committee agrees.

1. Mandate/Purpose

ORYDZUK: This section seems to be ripped off from somewhere.

BANISTER: I don't think it's ripped off. There seem to be quite a few mistakes. The word "council" in 1 (b) should be capitalized.

KHINDA: There's also a space between 1 (d) and 1 (e).

For 1 (d), can we add "unless otherwise noted"?

BANISTER: Yes. At the same time, it would be our authority to determine if we use the pre-specified criteria.

ORYDZUK: You may add a 1 (d) i) saying that "should the decision come into conflict with Council Standing Orders, the Standing Orders will prevail", or just leave it.

BANISTER: Let's just leave it.

BANISTER: With 1 (c), I feel more comfortable saying "... when seats remain vacant after a by-election".

BANISTER: I find point 1 (e) confusing.

ORYDZUK: We may add something like what is said at Student Union (SU) job interviews. It says something like the SU doesn't select candidates based on gender, minority etc. I'll search for the exact wording.

BANISTER: It'll be good to have that. Can we substitute that for point (e)?

I feel that it should be in here. If there's a poorly run Nominating Committee in the future, there should be something to point at them.

KHINDA: We can say something like "shall reflect the principle of diversity when selecting candidates".

BANISTER: I feel that what Vice-president Orydzuk said sounds better. I feel that the best candidate is always the best candidate, and the best people may not be diverse.

So I'll add that statement to 1 (e). Where should I find that?

ORYDZUK: Discover Governance (DG) would be the place to find it.

2. Powers/Duties

BANISTER: Part 2 (a) i) is garbage. I remember Rebecca saying that it will always go through Discover Governance.

KHINDA: What if we don't say anything?

BANISTER: We can say "All requests must be sent to the chair of the Nominating Committee".

KHINDA: That's good.

KHINDA: Does clause 2 (a) ii) have to be in there?

BANISTER: What he's trying to say is that everything has to be done

promptly.

KHINDA: I don't think we need that. It's up to the committee to figure out.

ORYDZUK: I don't feel strongly about this either.

BANISTER: OK. Let's remove this.

BANISTER: For 2 (a) iii), I feel that we can keep this but reword it. It says that in the meeting taking place 2 weeks after the request, you must decide on the application process and the deadline.

KHINDA: We can say that "The first order of business upon receiving a new request is deciding on the application process and timelines".

BANISTER: That'll be good.

BANISTER: Are people comfortable with the first sentence of 2 (b)?

KHINDA: Yes.

ORYDZUK: The General Faculties Council Standing Committees are filled by many people, not just undergraduates. So we should change it to "... General Faculties Council undergraduate seats are filled".

BANISTER: OK.

BANISTER: For part 2 (b) i), I want it to be after the by-election. I still feel it's a bit redundant. It's only relevant to the General Faculties Council, and not the Standing Committees. I also think it's stated in part 1-Mandate/Purpose. So, I'll remove 2 (b) i).

BANISTER: We have already decided on 2 (b) ii). It's redundant. So is 2 (b) iii).

BANISTER: I don't know whether we need 2 (b) iv).

KHINDA: I don't think we do.

ORYDZUK: Why March 1? Governance terms end in July 30.

BANISTER: I'll remove this.

ORYDZUK: For (b) can we have "ensure" instead of "make sure"?

BANISTER: Sure.

BANISTER: I feel that 1-Mandate/Purpose is too close to 2-Powers/Duties.

ORYDZUK: I agree.

BANISTER: I will be comfortable with making the mandate really simple and putting all the other terms of reference under Powers/Duties. I also like the word "mandate" better than "purpose".

ORYDZUK: That would be good.

KHINDA: Yes. Let's have it as "Ensure that undergraduate student representation on campus is maximized".

BANISTER: We'll put all the other stuff of the mandate in 2-Powers/Duties.

I really don't like those 2 words. I guess we don't need both.

ORYDZUK: All the other ones have both.

BANISTER: OK. Let's have both.

KHINDA: I think we can have (a) and (e) under part 2, and get rid of the rest.
BANISTER: Yes. Currently, under 1-Mandate/Purpose, (a) and (b) are pretty much saying the same thing. I'll be comfortable combining them. I like what we talked before for 2-Powers/Duties. So let's add that. Part 2 (c) and 2 (c) i) should be scratched. Clause 2 (c) ii) seems relevant.

BANISTER: How do you feel about 2 (d) i)?

KHINDA: It's weird.

ORYDZUK: At the University Nominating Committee, they look at people who are eligible. After that they select someone and let him/her know.

KHINDA: We can keep it.

TARRABAIN: How do we know who is eligible?

ORYDZUK: It could be any undergraduate. Pretend that there are 5 seats. Four people applied by themselves and 1 was recommended by a professor.

TARRABAIN: OK. I think it's good.

BANISTER: Cool. Should we keep 2 (d) as a whole or just keep the sub point (d) i)?

ORYDZUK: We should just keep that sub point. It will become (d) now. The sub point 2 (d) ii) seems redundant too.

BANISTER: What do you think about 2 (e)?

KHINDA: It seems common sense.

ORYDZUK: That makes sense. Although it's common sense, I don't trust anyone.

BANISTER: I think we can reword this.

ORYDZUK: Let's have it as "Preference shall be given to the committees that meet first"?

TARRABAIN: Although this is common sense, not everyone has common sense! We can come back to the wording later.

3. Membership

BANISTER: The formatting of this is wrong. These are not separate points. Anyway, there was chatter on having a student-at-large position on this.

ORYDZUK: Who nominates that position?

BANISTER: I guess it's the previous year's committee. Let's put it on the recommendations for next year if we need a student-at-large position.

Let's scratch the points and directly say "The committee will have ...".

Do you have any comments on the membership? As vice-presidents, do you think it's relevant for you to be here?

ORYDZUK: Yes.

4/5. Meetings

KHINDA: What's the beginning of the year mean in 5 (a)?

BANISTER: Do we need to even have this?

ORYDZUK: Let's look at the Bylaw Committee's Standing Orders for an insight. They are good.

Orydzuk reads out the relevant section from Bylaw Committee's Standing Orders.

BANISTER: Let's take those.

BANISTER: What do you think about 5 (b)?

KHINDA: That should be under powers/duties. If point 4 is meetings, why is it necessary to have points 5, 6, 7, and 8?

BANISTER: It's because the formatting is bad. I feel comfortable leaving (b) here as it's more of an administration thing.

BANISTER: I'll copy the stuff about startup meetings from Bylaw Committee's Standing Orders.

ORYDZUK: As a side note, Councilor Peak's name is not listed in the website as a committee member.

BANISTER: What do you think about 5 (c)?

ORYDZUK: I would like to have it under the power of the chair rather than any member.

BANISTER: Part 5 (d) seems pretty standard. Let's keep that.

6.

BANISTER: The quorum seems to be fine.

7.

BANISTER: This is pretty standard too.

8.

BANISTER: None of the sub points of 8 (a) should be there. I think we can just have it as "The chair shall ensure there is an agenda for each meeting".

ORYDZUK: Would there ever be a situation where there is a new chair and he/she is at a loss to figure out what goes in the agenda?

BANISTER: Do you want to have a point saying that the agenda needs to be sent out prior to a certain number of days?

ORYDZUK: Not really. But, if there's a big item that needs to be discussed, it should be sent a week before.

BANISTER: So, would the stuff under 8 (chair) go under meetings? I think we should have it under administration.

KHINDA: I'm good with that.

KHINDA: You can delete all of 8 (b). It's clear that the chair submits a report to Students' Council. If we change Standing Orders, it will be in the report.

BANISTER: Can we get rid of the reporting?

KHINDA: No. It's the same in other committees. It's just a regular report. We can say "Any motions made at the committee must be reported to Council".

BANISTER: Is 8 (c) necessary?

KHINDA: I don't think it's necessary.

BANISTER: Part 8 (d) doesn't need to be there either because Nicole takes care of that.

BANISTER: For 8 (e), do we need to say that we can go by Robert's Rules? Aren't we supposed to adhere to that anyway?

KHINDA: You don't have to do that.

BANISTER: OK. I'll just remove that.

BANISTER: I think we should remove 8 (f).

ORYDZUK: I feel we should leave it. We were talking about the chair receiving applications. We never talked about what the chair did with it next.

BANISTER: I'm still not comfortable with the wording though.

KHINDA: We should say "The chair shall share applications and requests with the committee".

BANISTER: With that, 8 (g) is now redundant. So, let's remove that.

9.

BANISTER: Part (a) says all members are required to attend all meetings. I don't think we can have that. It should be removed. 9 (b) seems okay. Also, I think that should go under "Membership".

ORYDZUK: That's fine.

10.

BANISTER: This seems fair enough.

11.

BANISTER: This makes sense too.

BANISTER: I would also like to add 2 points. First, are we allowed to change our own Standing Orders? We should check that and add it.

KHINDA: It should say something in Council Standing Orders.

BANISTER: Can you check that? Second, debate about resumes and applications shouldn't be disclosed to the public.

KHINDA: That's the same as 11.

BANISTER: I feel we should add it to 11. It's better to specify it.

KHINDA: Can we table this to the next meeting?

TARRABAIN: We were supposed to come back to 2 (e) as well.

BANISTER: At the next meeting, we will revisit these points. Furthermore, we will have the new draft.

7. CLOSED SESSION *NIL*

8. NEXT MEETING *June 24, 2014 at 5.30 pm.*

9. ADJOURNMENT **BANISTER moved to adjourn the meeting.**
The motion was seconded by ORYDZUK.
Vote 4/0/0
CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned by BANISTER at 6.28 pm.