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**

None.

2016-1/2   <u>**QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**</u>

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 thinks 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 it 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, his 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:** Not decided.

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

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	VOTES
SANDARE/PERSAD moved to approve the agenda for May 17, 2016 as tabled.	7/0/0 - CARRIED
MAHAL/SANDARE moved to approve the minutes for April 25, 2016 as tabled.	6/0/1 - CARRIED
BANISTER/MAHAL moved to go in-camera.	7/0/0 - CARRIED
PERSAD/VIKTOROV moved to go ex-camera.	7/0/0 - CARRIED
BANISTER/SANDARE moved that Nominating Committee appoints Abby Rentz to the Health and Dental Plan Committee for 2016/2017.	7/0/0 - CARRIED
BANISTER/MAHAL moved that	7/0/0 - CARRIED

Nominating Committee appoints Michelle Kim to the Health and Dental Plan Committee for 2016/2017.	
BANISTER/SCOTT moved that Nominating Committee appoints Cole Goshulak to the Health and Dental Plan Committee for 2016/2017.	7/0/0 - CARRIED
BANISTER/PERSAD moved to adjourn the meeting.	7/0/0 - CARRIED