



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 27th Legislature
First Session

Select Special
Ethics Commissioner
Search Committee

Tuesday, June 3, 2008
5:48 p.m.

Transcript No. 27-1-1

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 27th Legislature
First Session**

Select Special Ethics Commissioner Search Committee

Campbell, Robin, West Yellowhead (PC), Chair
Marz, Richard, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (PC), Deputy Chair

Blakeman, Laurie, Edmonton-Centre (L)
Lukaszuk, Thomas A., Edmonton-Castle Downs (PC)
Lund, Ty, Rocky Mountain House (PC)
MacDonald, Hugh, Edmonton-Gold Bar (L)
Mitzel, Len, Cypress-Medicine Hat (PC)
Notley, Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP)
Webber, Len, Calgary-Foothills (PC)

Corporate Human Resources Participant

Alayne Stewart	Director, Executive Search
----------------	----------------------------

Support Staff

W.J. David McNeil	Clerk
Louise J. Kamuchik	Clerk Assistant/Director of House Services
Robert H. Reynolds, QC	Senior Parliamentary Counsel
Shannon Dean	Senior Parliamentary Counsel
Karen Sawchuk	Committee Clerk
Rhonda Sorensen	Manager of Communications Services
Melanie Friesacher	Communications Consultant
Tracey Sales	Communications Consultant
Liz Sim	Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

5:48 p.m.**Tuesday, June 3, 2008**

[Mr. Campbell in the chair]

The Chair: Welcome. I'd like to call the first meeting of the Select Special Ethics Commissioner Search Committee to order. I trust that everyone has a copy of the meeting agenda and the other meeting materials, which were posted on the committee website. Does anybody not have a copy of all the materials? Okay.

I'd ask that we introduce ourselves for the record before we get started with our agenda, and I'll start on my right.

Mr. Lund: Ty Lund, Rocky Mountain House.

Mr. Webber: Len Webber, Calgary-Foothills.

Mr. Marz: Richard Marz, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

Ms Sales: Tracey Sales, communications services.

Mr. MacDonald: Hugh MacDonald, Edmonton-Gold Bar.

Ms Blakeman: Laurie Blakeman, and I'd like to welcome you to a lovely, wonderful spring evening in my fabulous constituency of Edmonton-Centre.

Mr. Marz: It's like this every day here.

Ms Blakeman: Yes, it is. It's another day in paradise. What can I say?

Mr. Mitzel: Len Mitzel, Cypress-Medicine Hat.

Mr. Lukaszuk: Tom Lukaszuk, Edmonton-Castle Downs.

Ms Stewart: I'm Alayne Stewart from executive search.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Karen Sawchuk, committee clerk.

The Chair: Robin Campbell, West Yellowhead, and chair of the committee.

Would a member like to move that we adopt the agenda, please? Moved by Ty Lund. All in favour? Opposed? Motion carried.

The committee's mandate is set out in Government Motion 14, a copy of which is included in our meeting materials. This item is for information purposes only unless a member has any questions in this respect. Any questions? Okay.

The committee's budget estimates were approved by the Special Standing Committee on Members' Services at its December 2007 meeting. This document is also provided for information purposes only. I should note that the line item dealing with pay to members is no longer accurate based on the Members' Services Committee, which will be meeting again this week, and we will provide additional information in this respect once received. If members have any questions on that, Karen can answer them.

Moving right along, for the past five office searches the committees have utilized the services of executive search to assist with all aspects of the search process, and I'm pleased to welcome Alayne Stewart, who has taken on these duties for the five previous searches and will again assist our committee. I'll turn it over to Alayne to provide an overview of the expertise provided through executive search.

Alayne.

Ms Stewart: Thank you very much for the welcome. I guess, first of all, thank you for the invitation to come. I know I recognize some of you around the table. We've been on a few searches together.

What I guess my role is is to help manage the process for you. We've had a lot of experience working with government ministries, agencies, boards, and commissions as well as your committees, and we're pleased to provide a service for you there. One of the things that we've done in the past is work very closely with Karen Sawchuk as well as the communications group here. They do a great job for all of you, and we do the behind-the-scenes work in gathering the applications from Karen. We have a process that we, you know, do up an applicant listing for you to have a look at. We do a one-page candidate summary for all of the applications that are received so it's a little easier for you to review the applications after the competition is closed and provide you all the information for you to make the best decisions on the candidates.

There are a couple of options. I'm not quite sure how you want to go through a bit of the information on that, but there are a couple of options that we present when we work with search committees. One is whether you would like to go through a process and interview a number of candidates as a search committee or whether you'd like our executive search group to do a preliminary interview with candidates and then present one-page interview reports for you to determine who you'd like to shortlist to come and meet with the committee. In some of the materials you'll notice that there's an option 1 and an option 2, and the option for us to do preliminary interviews and interview reports would add to the time in completing the search. If you walk through the timeline, you have a bit of an idea as to why one option would take a bit longer than the other.

The Chair: Let's maybe talk about if there are any questions or any comments on how we would like to do option 1 or option 2. Option 1 is that preliminary interviews are to be completed by executive search, and then the reports are given to the committee. Option 2 is that the search committee conducts interviews with no preliminary interviews. Any thoughts on that?

Ms Blakeman: I think executive search has been very helpful to this committee in the past. Given the number of other committees that we're all sitting on now, we would never leave this room, and we would all look like Chinese food after a while because that's all we would be eating while we stayed in this room for the next several months. So I think we should take advantage of the professionals that are available to assist the committee and go with the option that has – because we have enough opportunities throughout the process to intervene and request that someone be added to a list if we wish. There are lots of opportunities for us to sort of do a course correction as we go along. But they've saved us a lot of time in the past, and they're professionals, so we can certainly take advantage of their expertise.

5:55

Mr. Marz: Just two points, Mr. Chair. I agree with what Laurie said. We'd better be prepared to bring our pyjamas and maybe change the scheduling of when we get this done because there could be upwards of 300 applications for something like this. So we would be here for a very, very long time. There might be. I've been part of the process before where I've been one of 350 applicants to a similar type of position. I do trust the executive search, and I think that by allowing the executive search to do the preliminary, it also depoliticizes this to a degree.

Mr. Lund: Well, this is my first time on this type of committee. I'm

not interested in us having 300 people come before us. That would be totally unwieldy. But in option 1, when you shortlist candidates, I'm not sure of the number that you're referring to there. I actually would prefer to see another step in there: the executive search committee to narrow it down to – I don't know what the number might be – 20 or so. Then if we had the opportunity to read your assessment of those and then narrow it down to five or six to interview, that's the process that I would like to see happen.

The Chair: The only problem we might have is that, I mean, we're all thinking that we might get a lot of applicants. Say that we only get 20 applicants. How many do we want to interview? I think we have to look at both ends of the spectrum.

Mr. Lund: Right. My suggestion was that no matter how many we get, if we see the bios and a bit of information from about 20, then we can narrow it down to, whatever, six or five or four to interview.

Ms Stewart: Perhaps I could give you a little more information about what would happen. For example, on the previous Ethics Commissioner competition we had 129 applicants. What we did is that each committee member got a binder that had all of the information of all the applicants so you knew who applied, and we broke it down into categories A, B, C. We would look at the resumés based on the advertisement that you've approved and the position profile that you've approved and then bring that forward for you to determine who out of that group you'd like us to interview. We take the whole 129, do a one-page candidate summary sheet for you on all of them, and then present them to you in an A, B, C category to decide who you'd like interviewed.

Mr. Mitzel: I think that would be good given that the A category would have only 20 in it.

Ms Stewart: Last time we had 12.

Mr. Mitzel: And B would have only so many in it, and you can see them all, so you know who's in there, but B and C are gone. Then, of course, we have an opportunity to look at the short list. I agree with Ty to actually shortlist that to five, and then once we agree that those are the ones, then of course we can do the interviews on the five.

The Chair: Thomas.

Mr. Lukaszuk: Thanks, Chair. I'm just not sure that we need to worry about classifying candidates into group A, B, or C not knowing how many applications we're going to get to begin with. I'm not sure when the last search was for the Ethics Commissioner, but I think that economic changes in Alberta will dictate that the numbers will be different from the last time. Maybe once we're past the deadline for applications and we know exactly how many we have to deal with, we make that decision. If we only get 20 applicants, we may want to interview them all. If we get 500, then we'll devise a process to deal with that.

The Chair: Any other comments on search committee requests?

Ms Notley: I just wanted to follow up on the explanation that we were getting before. Just to confirm, what you're currently proposing is that we would get a list with a one- or two-sentence description of everybody who had applied.

Ms Blakeman: Plus their resumés if you want to read it yourself.

Ms Notley: Right. Then with that, you're also recommending the short list, but we're seeing the whole thing.

The Chair: Right. That's correct.

Ms Blakeman: In the past members argued to move people from a B list to an A list and had to convince their colleagues to accept that movement. I'm trying to think: I think we might have also done the reverse, which was take someone off the A list and move them down. That's what I meant by there being an opportunity for course correction if you feel that. We all have all the resumés if you want to read them all.

The Chair: So do we have consensus that we follow that, where we'll let executive search take all the applications? They'll put them together in a binder for us. If you want the resumés, you can have them, and we'll put them in A, B, and C categories and go from there. Agreed to that?

Mrs. Sawchuk: We need a motion to adopt the search schedule and process as set out.

The Chair: Okay. So we do need a motion to accept the use of executive search and then a motion to accept the draft search timetable process.

Mr. Mitzel: Does that timetable give us enough time?

The Chair: Well, we have to have this in. We're looking at having this done by the fall sitting, so there is an urgency to get this done, especially with the Ethics Commissioner retiring.

Mrs. Sawchuk: He has retired. Officially his last day was May 28.

The Chair: Yeah. We're basically without an Ethics Commissioner, so I think there is an urgency to get this done.

Go ahead, Karen.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Mr. Chair, just so that members are aware who haven't sat on a search committee previously, we've without fail finished within four to five months in all cases for the previous five searches that we've done. I can't speak for anything before that, but for the last five we've kind of managed to keep it within that timeline.

The Chair: Okay. So we need a motion that the Select Special Ethics Commissioner Search Committee adopt the search timetable as distributed.

Moved by Len Mitzel. Any discussion? All in favour? Carried.

Okay. We'll move on to the draft position profile. The profile was updated with the assistance of the office of the Ethics Commissioner. A few other revisions may be required, in part to address the issue of salary and position status, full-time versus part-time.

The Ethics Commissioner provided a letter in which he suggested that the position could be considered 60 to 80 per cent full-time or the committee's consideration. Sixty to 80 per cent is a pretty wide range, for myself, to be full-time/part-time, but I'll be interested in what you have to say about that.

The salary and position status are addressed in the profile, and reference is also made to this in the advertisement for the Ethics Commissioner. I'd suggest that the committee accept this letter for

information purposes and forward it to the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices, to be addressed during their next meeting on June 9, 2008.

Mr. Marz: I'd like to know what changed in the Ethics Commissioner's position to lead us to believe that it is more of a three-quarter time position now when not too many years ago it was handled by the Information and Privacy Commissioner, and the Privacy Commissioner is now a full-time job.

The Chair: Well, like I say, we have the letter from the commissioner, and he's saying that it's 60 to 80 per cent of a full-time officer position and that you have to be quite flexible in your scheduling to do the job.

Mr. Lund: Once the lobby registry is up and running, I think it's intended to be housed with this . . .

Mrs. Sawchuk: He's addressed that in his correspondence, as well, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lund: Oh, okay.

The Chair: Any other questions or comments on the draft position profile?

6:05

Mrs. Sawchuk: Mr. Chair, I think I should add about the issue about the position's salary and the position's status; i.e., full-time, part-time. We will take that forward to the Leg. Offices Committee. What we need is something that acknowledges the fact that there might have to be changes, even with the motion.

The Chair: Yeah.

Any other comments? Discussion?

Ms Blakeman: The flow chart that was mentioned in the letter: was it distributed?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Mr. Chair, it wasn't. We had received a copy that was sent as an attachment, and it didn't come through properly, and I did have a call in. We'll follow up with that. From what I could tell, it was just basically broken down into months: these months we usually do this kind of thing; this month we do this kind of thing.

Ms Blakeman: I'd still like to see it. If you can get it for me, that would be good.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Definitely. Yes. We will get a clear copy for members.

Ms Blakeman: Thank you.

The Chair: Do we have agreement, then, that we accept the letter for information purposes and will forward it to the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices to be addressed at the next meeting on June 9, 2008?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Okay.

Is it agreed that the staff could make the appropriate changes to the salary provisions, status provisions once they're decided on by the Legislative Offices Committee? If so, I would need a motion to

adopt the position profile with the referenced changes once it's received. Moved by Ty. Any discussion? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Okay. We also have Tracey Sales from our LAO communications branch with us this evening to address the draft advertising plan. Tracey has completed a draft advertising plan for the committee's consideration, and a revised draft is being handed out by Karen right now.

Mrs. Sawchuk: I just finished that, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: You just did that. That's awesome.

I'll turn it over to Tracey to lead us through the plan.

Ms Sales: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll just quickly walk you through the proposed advertising plan. Basically we're recommending a combination of national and local advertising as well as utilizing the web.

The first recommendation is advertising multiple times in the major dailies, both locally and nationally. That would include advertising in the career sections of the *Edmonton Journal*, the *Calgary Herald*, and the *National Post* twice and advertising in the *Globe and Mail*'s national career section three times. Based on a black and white ad about seven by seven inches, it would be around \$50,000.

The second recommendation. Because it is an Alberta-based position, we thought we should make sure we cover all of our bases, so we're also recommending that we advertise in the other five dailies, those being Grande Prairie, Fort McMurray, Red Deer, Lethbridge, and Medicine Hat. Again, based on a black and white ad about seven by seven inches in size, it would be \$5,000.

The third recommendation is that in addition to newspaper advertisements we include a posting which would contain a copy of the advertisement and the job profile for the Ethics Commissioner position on the Ethics Commissioner Search Committee website and then also include links to the posting on the Legislative Assembly website, the government of Alberta website, and the Ethics Commissioner website.

As well, many of the newspaper publications offer the option of online postings for free or for little charge, so we can also look into that. The estimated total cost of the campaign would be \$55,000. At the end we do have the actual draft ad for your review as well if you'd like to take a look at that.

The Chair: Thomas.

Mr. Lukaszuk: Thank you. Good stuff. I just looked at the ad. If indeed this is to be a 60 to 80 per cent part-time position, perhaps that should be somewhere mentioned in the content of the ad because that would be something that someone would take into consideration.

The Chair: It will be mentioned.

Mr. Lukaszuk: The second thing. You may want to solicit an independent opinion, but I'm not sure if it will be appropriate to post that ad on the government of Alberta website; on the LAO definitely but on the government of Alberta I'm not so sure.

The Chair: Ms Sales.

Ms Sales: Thank you. Maybe I should clarify. We were just considering a link on the government site to the actual Ethics

Commissioner Search Committee site, but if you don't think that that would be acceptable.

Mrs. Sawchuk: I think, Mr. Chair, what often happens is that when somebody hears about a position, they assume it's the government. It's more of a convenience so that if somebody is searching the web and they're just trying to find it, if they go onto the government site, there's a link. If they go onto the Assembly site, there's a link. We also have a search committee website dedicated just to whatever the search committee is doing. It makes it easier for people. That's really it. There's no tie-in. It doesn't show up as a job posting on the job board, or however it's referred to, with the government website at all. It's just kind of a sidebar thing. Am I right, Alayne? Is that a good way of putting it? Yeah. It's convenience.

Mr. Lund: On page 2, under recommendation 1, the note: "If National exposure is not necessary, the ad could run in the *Globe and Mail* Western Edition" and then underneath that \$9,396. Is that the total cost? In the right-hand column you've got \$17,144.

Ms Sales: I can speak to that. That is actually not the updated version. However, we did look into other possible options for the committee. We're recommending that the ad be placed in the national *Globe and Mail* for national exposure. Another option would be that it could run in just the western edition, which would be B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, for the cost of the \$9,396. That was just further information. But we are recommending that it be placed in the national. As well, we're recommending that it run for the three days in the national.

Mr. Lund: Well, I'm not sure that I am in agreement with going to the national. I think that there are probably umpteen dozen qualified people in western Canada that can handle this position quite well.

Ms Blakeman: I'm cognizant of the labour market that we're dealing with right now. We don't know how many people are loose out there at the moment or over the time period we're talking about. I hate the costs of these ads – it just makes me crazy: 50 grand for advertising – but I think we do need to do a national search, so I think we do unfortunately need to use the *National Post*. You know, there may well be umpteen people available in the western provinces and they've all got jobs they really like right now and they don't apply, so we need to be able to cast that net a little further.

Mr. Lund: I'm not convinced.

The Chair: Mr. Lund is not convinced.

Ms Notley: Well, remember that you're advertising over the summer, too, so a lot of folks who might be considering this may well be on vacation in other parts of the country. I know that it's hard to imagine people going to other parts of the country when they're on vacation.

Ms Blakeman: Stratford. They go to Stratford to see the Shakespeare.

Ms Notley: For instance. Or they're going to some hockey museum somewhere in Ontario.

Mr. Marz: Well, the ads are expensive. If you go nationally, then these people that want to apply, if they get shortlisted, they are going to want expenses to come for an interview. That's going to cost more money.

The Chair: We budget for that, though.

Mr. Marz: I don't care if we budgeted or not. It's going to cost more money. I think that we're going to be successful in attracting somebody just in the western provinces and a little bit more in tune with western philosophies. I think I'd be more apt to lean towards just the western editions.

The Chair: So you're talking the western edition of the *Globe and Mail*?

Mr. Marz: Yeah.

The Chair: Ty, you're talking the western edition of the *Globe and Mail*?

Mr. Lund: That's right.

Mr. Lukaszuk: Is the *National Post* going nationally? There is no western edition of the *National Post*, is there?

Ms Sales: Yes. We're referring to the reach of it. It would just be circulated in the papers that would cover off western Canada. It wouldn't actually be circulated to the east. The ad would just reach the editions that would go to B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. That would be the *Globe and Mail*. That's what we're discussing here.

6:15

Mr. Lukaszuk: What about the *National Post*?

Ms Sales: The *National Post* is different. The *National Post* that we're suggesting is actually a package through the *Calgary Herald* and the *National Post*. With that package we can receive a double run for the \$16,292.08. That package actually allows us quite a lot of savings as compared to running the two ads separately.

Mr. Lukaszuk: But is that one coast-to-coast?

Ms Sales: That one would be the national.

Mr. Lukaszuk: So then we could go one western, and the other one will reach national, correct?

Ms Sales: You could conceivably do that. The only caution that I would make is that as far as a national paper the *Globe and Mail* has a far better readership coast-to-coast, and that is including specifically western Canada. The *Globe and Mail* has a larger readership than the *National Post*, so if we're wanting to reach your target, the national edition of the *Globe and Mail* might be a better fit.

The Chair: Any other comments? Rachel.

Ms Notley: Yeah. I mean, I just think, you know, we sat around here and talked about salary the last time we were here, and we did so comparing ourselves across the country. Presumably the idea is that we want to be able to attract the best people from across the country, and I know that the *Globe* is the one that is read by the vast majority of people. The *National Post* isn't. And I don't mean this facetiously, but because you're advertising in the summer, a lot of folks aren't around where they normally are in the summer. A lot of people I know are going out to Halifax for a month to visit relatives, and they just won't see it. You're looking for a very high-qualified,

high-calibre person, and it makes very little sense to shortchange yourself in terms of the pool of candidates.

Mr. Webber: If we just go with the western editions of the papers and we feel that there are not enough qualified individuals who've applied, can we then perhaps send out another ad and go nationally, or is this is a one-time thing?

The Chair: I think you could do that, but I think that would send a pretty damaging message to people about the search and about the quality of people. I mean, we're going to spend the money. You can talk what you want about it, but we've got to spend the money. I think that we should be doing a cross-Canada search. You know, we've always said we want the best qualified people. That's not to say that there might be somebody in Newfoundland that's an Albertan who decides he wants to come back to Alberta. I think that it makes a lot of sense to advertise across the country. We've got a budget of \$55,000. This is within the budget, and it gives us national exposure and gives us the ability to, I think, bring the best quality candidate that we can find in the country to the province of Alberta to work as the Ethics Commissioner. I think that's what the search is all about.

Ms Blakeman: I'm moving on to a different topic. I don't want to curtail this discussion, but if we're ready to move on.

The Chair: Well, we have to decide if we're going to accept the draft advertising plan as submitted.

Ms Blakeman: Oh, I'm in that realm. Sorry. What I was looking for is dates because one of the things we discovered last time when we looked at the dates that were scheduled to actually run the ads is that we somehow got crossing over and running on long weekends and things, so we had to choose to run one more time or one less time to deal with that. Can we just cross-check our dates, or can I ask you guys to cross-check the dates to know when we're running the ads? Do you have that now? Because I notice in the mock-up that we're dealing with Saturday, January 7.

Ms Sales: I'm sorry. That was an error. I apologize. That isn't the revised one.

Mrs. Sawchuk: The one that I handed out as members were coming in is the correct one.

The Chair: That's the one that's asking for resumés by July 25?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Yes.

Ms Blakeman: Yeah, but this is not giving the whole plan, again, and it's not giving the dates.

Mrs. Sawchuk: The dates are on the ad.

Ms Blakeman: No, no, the dates you run the ad, not the day that it's due. When are you running the ads? Are you're going to run it July 1?

The Chair: Tracey, do you have any suggestions on when you're going to run the ads?

Ms Sales: Well, I understand what you're getting at. Definitely we will make sure that we aren't running on a long weekend. I haven't

set any dates because I thought that that might be premature as far as the specific dates that the ads would run. However, I think Karen might be able to speak to something more concrete.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Mr. Chair, what we had operated on or the kind of direction I had provided to the staff who were working on the plans was that we wanted to have the advertising completed before the end of June. So we're looking at the third week of June for advertising, and then we would have the closing date for the competition, which is in the search timetable that committees dealt with, for July 25. It gives a little bit of extra time for exactly the reason that Ms Notley was referring to, that a lot of people aren't around. We've gone that route before, and we literally get a lot of applications right at the end. So that's kind of what we were operating on. You know, a few of the other issues aren't out, so we can get the ads updated and the notices in.

Mr. Marz: I think it's important to get the advertising out in June before people start migrating to their vacation sites.

The Chair: Well, if we can agree on the draft advertising plan, we have a good shot of having that happen.

Mr. Marz: Well, I was hoping everybody would agree with what I said.

The Chair: Do we have agreement that we go with the draft advertising plan as submitted?

Mr. Lukaszuk: Sure. I move that.

The Chair: Moved by Thomas. Any other discussion on it? All in favour?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Mr. Chair, for the record that is the revised one that was handed out at the meeting.

The Chair: The revised one. Yes.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Thank you.

The Chair: Against? Carried.

We should look at future meeting dates. Under the schedule we're looking at meeting August 11 to 15. Is that correct?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Yes. Again, dependent on the numbers of applications, that kind of thing. Yeah.

The Chair: Okay.

We're looking at June that the advertising will go out. We're looking at applications being received and acknowledged by July 25. July 25 the competition closes. July and August executive search will go through the screening process and prepare a report for us, hopefully between August 11 and 15. What I'd ask is that you leave your calendars sort of free the week of August 11.

Rachel, that's not good?

Mr. Marz: Too late.

The Chair: Too late for you, too?

Mr. Marz: Yeah. Too late to leave the second and third week of August open because it's already closed.

The Chair: Well, I'm just asking for four days.

Mr. Marz: They're all closed. I'm gone.

Mr. Lund: We're going to run into problems.

The Chair: Yeah, exactly.

Mrs. Sawchuk: So we might move it down a bit.

The Chair: Yeah, we could move it.

Ms Blakeman: You know, the only thing I would say is important – and I've now done all five positions, so I'm starting over again – is that we agree that people stay all the way through the interview process. I think what's harmful is if you have someone that's here for two or three of the interviews and then they miss a couple of them and they're holding an equally weighted vote. It gets very skewed. So if we miss someone for when we're choosing our short list, that's fine, but I think it's important that everybody that's in on the actual interviews makes a choice: you're either in or out. If you miss a couple, you're out because it really skews it.

The Chair: Well, I would suggest that we still stick to the week of August 11 to 15 to get through the initial process and then we look at September 29 to October 3 that the search committee will do the reference checks on the finalists and then October 6 to 10 we'll meet and finalize our recommendations. The report will be tabled in the House sometime between October 14 and 24.

Ms Blakeman: Well, haven't we skipped something? Aren't we still meeting to actually interview the short list?

The Chair: Yes.

Ms Blakeman: That's the week of September 15 to 19? So we want to make sure we set that aside.

The Chair: Oh, sorry. Yeah. Right.
Richard.

6:25

Mr. Marz: Yeah. I'm not around from August 9 to 23, so any time from the 23rd. That's life, that's the way it goes. I'm that busy.

The Chair: Well, we'll just have to . . .

Mr. Marz: For the interviews.

The Chair: Yeah, for the first one. You're not around in August?

Mr. Marz: On the 23rd I'll be around.

The Chair: Okay. That's getting a little late, though. We're probably under the wire. I think we have to look at between the 11th and the 20th. I think we have a two-week window when we have to get that first part done.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Yes. Mr. Chair, I mean, there will always be times

when we'll have to adjust things. The way we came up with these dates – and, I mean, poor Alayne didn't even have a lot of input into this – we were operating more on the basis that the Ethics Commissioner has already advised that he won't be here past October. We're unsure whether that means the beginning of October or the end of October, which means now that we're going to have to look at someone acting, and that office is very small. So we were trying to keep this timeline in line with that, knowing that we have enough time. You know, there might be instances when we have to switch things.

Mr. Marz: The schedule for the committee to do interviews is September 8 to 26, so that shouldn't be a problem for anybody.

Mrs. Sawchuk: This was if we were going with the committee conducting interviews totally, without preliminary interviews. If executive search is doing all the preliminary interviews and bringing you the short list, and you've shortened it down to five that you want to bring in to interview, you don't need that time. That was if you were going to interview everybody. If you had 20 candidates that you were happy with and you wanted to interview all 20, then you'd need all that.

The Chair: The week of September 15 to 19 is the week that we'll do the interviews of the short list of candidates. That's probably a really important time frame.

Mr. Lukaszuk: That's September, you said?

The Chair: Yeah, September 15 to 19.

Mr. Marz: That shouldn't be a problem for anybody.

Mr. Lukaszuk: It's the month of August that could be problematic.

Mr. Marz: We're not going to do interviews in August, are we?

The Chair: No. In August we'll just be shortlisting. We have agreed with option 1, so in August you'll be getting your binder.

Mr. Marz: So if you're not here for the short list, you can still scrutinize whoever is on the short list.

The Chair: Yeah, that's right.

Okay. Any other business now that we've talked about future meeting dates? We're going to meet at least once in August, and then we've got that time frame in September. Like I say, our objective is to be done the week of October 14 to 24 so that we can table a report in the Assembly and have an Ethics Commissioner onboard hopefully before the other one leaves.

Any other items for discussion? A quiet group, just the way I like it.

Okay. I'll call for a motion to adjourn. Moved by Thomas. All in favour? Adjourned.

Thanks very much for coming.

[The committee adjourned at 6:28 p.m.]

