

Wednesday, November 28, 2001 AG/IPC Search Committee

Date: 01/11/28

[Mrs. Tarchuk in the chair]

THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to call this meeting to order. Thank you for being here and, secondly, for accepting to serve on this committee. I'm sure the task at hand is going to prove to be both challenging and interesting, particularly because this group will be recommending applicants for two legislative offices, hence our very long committee name.

I'd like to introduce Karen Sawchuk. For those of you that haven't met Karen, she is the new committee clerk both to this committee and to Leg. Offices. Corinne Dacyshyn is also here to help us find our way. Thank you, Corinne. I would like to introduce Alayne Stewart, executive search manager of the personnel administration office. And we all know Louise Kamuchik, Clerk Assistant, who has had many years of experience working with search committees and I'm sure will be able to provide us much advice.

Everyone has received a binder for this morning's meeting which includes our agenda. Are there any additions? If not, could someone move that we . . . Mary.

MRS. O'NEILL: I so move.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favour? Motion carried.

Included in the binder just for your information is a copy of the mandate of the committee as introduced in the House, and that has been included in tab 3.

In reviewing past procedures for the most recent search committees, PAO has assisted in a whole variety of functions including timetables, advertisements, updating the position profiles, screening resumes, providing committee members with shortlists, and preparing committee members for interviews, et cetera. The deputy chair and I have spoken to Alayne, and she is prepared to assist the committee as required. For that we thank you, and in fact at this point I'd like to thank all of the support staff for the work that you've done to date and that you'll be doing in the future.

Tab 5 includes a tentative timetable and procedures that Alayne has prepared for us for discussion. Maybe at this point, Alayne, I could get you just to walk through the timetable. Obviously, we may have to adjust dates depending on how the search goes, but I think it gives us something to start from and a date to shoot for.

MS STEWART: Thank you. This timetable will definitely depend on the number of applicants and the process that you as a committee would like to go through based on that. So what we have done for an executive search is put together a tentative search schedule. It is open to adjustment, but it would give you an overview of the time commitment that would come into play.

First of all, the timing would depend on when we would initially advertise, and past practice has also been that the advertisement was out for a four-week period for individuals to respond and get back to us as to their interest. So you'll notice that on this schedule we use the date of December 15 just so that we would have a start to work back from.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should say at this point that I suggest that we toss out questions as we're going through all of the items in the binder. But, Alayne, do you think that four weeks, considering the holidays, is going to be reasonable?

MS STEWART: I don't think it would be unreasonable. We generally wouldn't advertise beyond December 15 when we were doing other searches. That just isn't the right timing for people to be interested in looking for appointments. I put the 15th as that would be the latest date that I would recommend we advertise in December. Four weeks is generally an acceptable time period, but that would be the call of the committee.

MS BLAKEMAN: Well, I'm wondering how long it takes you to put the ad together. We're meeting on the 28th. Is it a reasonable possibility that the ad could go in on the 1st and run until the 2nd or 3rd of January? I guess my suggestion is actually to run it to the end of that first week in January, in fact for five weeks.

My concern is that we're looking for executives, and Christmas is a time when, depending on the business you're in, executives take three weeks. They're gone, and we could be missing some people that should be seeing this. So I don't want to spend – my eyes popped out when I saw how much the advertising was per week, and I'm very conscious that we're spending taxpayer dollars here. I don't want to go to five or six weeks, but I think we have to deal with the fact that we've got Christmas in the way. If there were a way to start earlier and run a little bit later without breaking the bank, that would be my suggestion.

My other question is: is this schedule that you've put before us on the short side or on the long side? It's on the short side. Okay. That's what I wanted to check. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just for some clarification, I know we're hopping ahead here to talk about media, but there seems to be an assumption that we would be advertising for four or five weeks, and I think the norm is to advertise maybe for two weeks at the front end.

MS STEWART: That estimate you have is based on one insertion.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will get to that. Maybe we can stick to the discussion on the timetable here.

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, I was just going to comment on the advertising. My recollection was that we did one round of advertising, but the period of time for responses is what decides the compressed or elongated time for applications to come back.

MS STEWART: That's right.

MRS. O'NEILL: I would suggest that we, if possible, move the date earlier for the advertisements. That might capture those whom Laurie has referenced as possibly going on vacation or being away. But I like the idea of the competition closing on the 15th of January. I think that's quite appropriate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Actually, to go back to Laurie's question, the 1st is probably too soon because we've missed the deadline for the newspapers, but could we get in for the following . . .

MS STEWART: We can get in for the 8th.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we could move it up a weekend, leave the closing on the 15th of January, and that would cover off everyone's concerns.

MS BLAKEMAN: Are we still talking about advertising for four weeks?

MR. DUCHARME: My understanding is that we would place one advertisement and also use the . . .

MS BLAKEMAN: And the response period? We're looking at five weeks?

MR. DUCHARME: Extending it to five weeks, yes. But with the use of the Internet I also believe that a lot of people are going to be looking there in terms of positions. Probably one of our most effective forms of advertising will be the Internet. Also, I believe that if there are people that are out there, we could also issue possibly a press release from this committee to get a little bit more exposure. When the motion was passed in the House, I don't think it was picked up by any of our media outlets that a search committee had been formed for these two positions, so I think it might be appropriate that some kind of press release be established also. We may get the opportunity of getting some free advertising across the country in that manner also.

THE CHAIRMAN: Agreed.
Raj?

DR. PANNU: Have we ever used headhunters for this kind of search?

MS KAMUCHIK: Yes, we have in the past, and my recollection is that they were not as effective as they could have been, should have been when they did their background searches. So we found that PAO has been very good, has provided very good service.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the other consideration is the cost factor, if I'm not mistaken.

MS KAMUCHIK: Of course. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: When we're looking for two positions, we would be getting close to \$100,000.

MS KAMUCHIK: If memory serves me right, for one search the cost was about \$25,000. So that does add on to the price tag quite a bit based on the number of applicants and the screening they do as well.

MR. FRIEDEL: If I could echo that, I was involved with one, and I agree. For the amount it cost, I was disappointed in the information, the quality of the work, not even reflecting on the quality of the candidates. It also watered down the committee's input. The headhunters seemed to want to do not only the searching but more of the digesting, and I think the committee felt in the past that we wanted to be a little bit more involved when it came down to eyeball-to-eyeball contact and things like that. So I don't think we were getting the extra value for the dollar out of the other process.

11:13

THE CHAIRMAN: Laurie.

MS BLAKEMAN: I'm sorry. This is probably more proper when we discuss the actual ad.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Are there any other questions about the timetable? Great.

Well, if we want to move on to tab 6, tab 6 includes the draft position profiles. Again Alayne has prepared the profiles, and I'll

ask her to walk us through these. I should also mention that the profiles, once they're approved, will be available on the Legislative Assembly web site, it's my understanding.

MS STEWART: As well as the ad.

THE CHAIRMAN: As well as the ad?

MS STEWART: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So why don't we start with the draft position profile of the Auditor General.

MS STEWART: For the Auditor General profile I've had more time and have had direct input from the office of the Auditor General. As you probably noticed, there were blanks in the other one. The Information and Privacy Commissioner was my skeleton draft based on thinking we were meeting next week. I have not got the information back from the Information and Privacy Commissioner, so you know why it's in the state that it's in.

On the position profile for the Auditor General I have taken pretty much the work that they presented and made some formatting changes, also revised a bit of the wording in some of the qualifications, skills, and abilities on that. Other than those areas, it's pretty much what they had sent from the office of the Auditor General.

MS BLAKEMAN: I think that's part of my concern. I'm wondering if it's possible or if you have the time or if it's reasonable for you to check some other descriptions of Auditors General, because this is like having the wonderful Mr. Valentine in front of me. The wording is so clearly his mandate and where he wanted to see the department go, and we may need to be moving to a different point in the services that our Auditor General is giving us. So I'm wondering, just as a double check, if you could find some other source documents describing maybe other provinces and just make sure that we're not getting too narrowly focused and that the choice of language that's used in here is used elsewhere, or use some of the language and descriptors from other documents so it's not too closely tied.

MS STEWART: We can do that.

MR. FRIEDEL: I have one question on that, Janis, if I might. Is this profile a document that has been approved? Has this received any official approval, or is it basically what Peter put together?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: I'm jumping in here, but my guess would be that former committees would look at this document, go through it and improve it, and make whatever changes the committee sees fit. I believe Alayne is just presenting this as a suggestion, a draft.

MS STEWART: Well, I'll tell you what I had done also. I took the 1993 position profile from file and passed that on to the current Auditor General, and the revisions from the 1993 would have been reflected in the description that he presented to me. There weren't major changes from the 1993 document other than updating some of the services and some of the wording for some of the responsibilities, and I'm going from recall. But that was the base document that I had forwarded to the office, and that's what they had worked from. I did bring that 1993 copy with me, but I didn't make copies of it.

MR. FRIEDEL: It seems to me that at some point or another we've seen something like this. It must have been at one of our regular meetings, and whether we adopt that as an official profile or whether it's just there for information I wasn't sure. But if we change much from the existing, we'd have to be aware that it would take some time to approve that, and I'm not sure if we have time to do revisions in time to do the advertising. Now, if in that part of the process we want to amend some of this, whether it's in anticipation of a new Auditor General or after we hire one – and it may be to more personally suit the individual capabilities of that person – that might take a little more time than we have available right now.

MS BLAKEMAN: You're bringing this up in response to what I was suggesting?

MR. FRIEDEL: Yes.

MS BLAKEMAN: Okay. That's why I said: if she had time to do this. She's also telling me that, well, if he worked off the '93 source document under which he was found, then it makes sense why he was found. The language is very close. So you've already answered my question. This language has come from somewhere else, and it's just been adapted. That was all I was looking for, that it wasn't too distinctive to one person.

MS STEWART: Okay. I can pull up other jurisdictions. I have pulled up other jurisdictions on the information and privacy, which documents I haven't finished reviewing for that one, but they are readily available. I can pull some from other jurisdictions.

MRS. O'NEILL: I just wanted to say that it is familiar to me. Gary, I think that when you say you've seen it before, we have seen portions of this in the report that the Auditor General has brought to this committee, particularly for their budget considerations. I do find it, I think, well tailored to what I have observed as the role of the Auditor General. You know, I can appreciate what you're saying, Laurie, that it is something that you're looking at as perhaps his language, but for me it's the function of the position. I think it describes what I have observed and been told the Auditor General does.

DR. PANNU: I think these position profiles are important because they set the framework for advertising and for making judgment at the end, you know, with the selection. We need to give ourselves the opportunity to look at it more closely and see whether we want to add to it as a committee. That will require assessing what kind of time line we have and the work and time pressures there are. I notice that in the time lines presented here, March is the decision time, March 15 or so – is it? – if everything else goes according to schedule.

MS STEWART: That's right.

DR. PANNU: But if the committee decided to look at it later on, the revised version, or had the opportunity to determine that, that would push the whole process forward; wouldn't it? In a sense we won't be able to advertise, I guess, on the 7th or 8th.

MS STEWART: We can.

DR. PANNU: I'm exploring that. I want to make sure that we meet the time lines as required yet are able to do some homework, which

I think is important. It's only every eight years or so that we get this chance. It would be good to have a fairly thorough look at what's here and what we might correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that we can go ahead with the advertising, but obviously those that are considering applying will want to see a position profile, so I think that we're still under some very tight time lines.

Alayne, maybe you can add to that.

MS STEWART: I can. What we have done on a number of searches that we've been involved in – sometimes it's difficult to get the ad and the profile co-ordinated at the same time, gathering input from various players. We have gone forward with an advertisement prior to the profile being finalized. What we've looked at is ensuring that the profile is available to the candidates prior to the closing date. Some would like to have a look at the profile before they determine if they would like to apply, so that's been a gauge that we've used on the profile in the past.

MR. FRIEDEL: It might also be possible just to put that in. I'm assuming that this is going to be a web site document, not through the ad, and it might be appropriate to put in the document that this is subject to change, which the Leg. Offices Committee has the authority to do, possibly to consider changes that might be appropriate to a successful candidate. That gives us a little bit of a licence to do some tinkering, if you like, or adjustment if necessary.

11:23

THE CHAIRMAN: Sounds good.

Okay. If everyone's fine with that, should we move on to the draft profile for the FOIP Commissioner?

MS STEWART: The one area that I wouldn't mind having us spend more time on would be the knowledge and experience and any of the skills for the Auditor General just in case there may have been something missed. Was there anything that you noticed on there that jumped out?

MS BLAKEMAN: There's just one. It shows up in one place but not another, and that is under major responsibilities on page 3 under "Reports to management and, where appropriate, to the Legislative Assembly." There's a phrase you'll find somewhere else about pointing out failure to meet legal requirements, which is something that I've seen the Auditor General do a couple of times in my time on the Public Accounts Committee. That phrase I saw somewhere else in here when I was reading it or maybe I saw it in the AG's report, but that's part of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

DR. PANNU: I wish I could give you some advice on it, but I simply haven't had a chance . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I would suggest that over the next week or so you fax any problems you have to Alayne, and at the end of the day we'll make sure that we send out a final copy of what is going to be posted.

MS STEWART: We can delay the profile till a certain date when everyone wants to get back to me. That's fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Did you want to make any more comments on the Information and Privacy Commissioner?

MS STEWART: It is a skeleton profile. Most of the information that you will see in here has been pulled from their web site information or from the annual report, so not direct input from the office. I may have missed some areas that are more current than some of those documents.

MR. FRIEDEL: Could I make one suggestion, and that's at the very beginning when we talk about the position summary. The reference is made that "effective September 1," et cetera, the two offices "became separate." You may want to perhaps start out, because someone hasn't been familiar with our operation, by saying that until September 1 the two were a combined position.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. FRIEDEL: Otherwise, someone reading this without any background would wonder what we're talking about.

MS STEWART: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I know that you'll all want to write down this fax number. If you have any comments or changes, the fax number to use would be 427-5688.

MS BLAKEMAN: That's Alayne's fax number?

THE CHAIRMAN: This is ours. We'll get it to Alayne.

MS BLAKEMAN: There is another source document for you, but it's daunting, and that's the enabling legislation itself.

MS STEWART: I pulled up the legislation on the hiring component of the commission. I think it's 58 pages; is it?

MS BLAKEMAN: It's daunting, I agree, but it is the enabling legislation that establishes this, so it's a good check for you to see if what the legislation is requiring is reflected in the description.

MS STEWART: Thanks.

MS BLAKEMAN: But you have my sympathy.

MS STEWART: The other component that I had missed initially was the introduction of the Health Information Act. I had an annual report that was prior to that coming in. I understand about 40 percent of the time is now spent on that particular act, so my skeleton profile hasn't reflected some of those functions.

MS BLAKEMAN: Well, I think a major part of why it's now a full-time position is because it's responsible for that. It's at least 40 percent of the job.

MR. FRIEDEL: If I could throw my two bits' worth in there as well, again, the advantage of this being a web site document is that all you'd have to do is put a link to the actual legislation if you want, and if someone wanted to read it in that level of detail, they could.

THE CHAIRMAN: If they want the position.

MS BLAKEMAN: They'll have to read it sooner or later.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anyway, as we fill out this position profile, we will send it out to members.

DR. PANNU: That might be a requirement, actually, for the applicant, that they must read that document.

MRS. O'NEILL: Janis, I just wanted to say with respect to the position summary at the very beginning – I can appreciate, Alayne, that what you've done is cut and paste statements, but it doesn't flow for an immediate understanding of what the position does. If you don't mind my making the suggestion, I think a bit of background, as Gary suggested, then speaking about the broad range of responsibilities, and then just in formatting even if you pulled in the last four paragraphs there and itemized the areas of responsibility. It's just that it doesn't flow. So that would be my only suggestion there.

MS STEWART: Good. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. At this time I suggest that the committee move in camera to discuss number 7, which is Salary Ranges, as we will be talking about some confidential personnel and compensation issues. So is anyone willing to make that motion?

MR. DUCHARME: Sure. I so move.

THE CHAIRMAN: Denis. All in favour?

MS BLAKEMAN: Can we debate it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MS BLAKEMAN: We're not talking about an individual here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we may in fact be talking about individuals when we're considering the ranges.

MS BLAKEMAN: I have to admit that I'm uneasy with the number of times that this committee goes in camera. I understand it's because we're talking about individuals, but when the public looks to us and says, "What did you do, and why did you make these decisions?" the more of this that's done in camera, the more difficult the position that we're all placed in because we can't prove why we made those decisions. So I'm just checking here that if we're not going to talk about an individual, then I would rather that we didn't go in camera and that certainly when we do go in camera, as a matter of process we mark when we went in and when we came out. I think that's already done. I'm just double-checking that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is. I think everyone would agree with you.

Any other comments? All those in favour? Motion carried.

[The committee met in camera from 11:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.]

MR. FRIEDEL: I'll move that

in the advertisements the salary for the Auditor General be set at the rate of the current incumbent and that for the Information Commissioner it would be set in the range of \$105,619 to \$141,960.

That's my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried.

Okay. If we move on to tab 8. Tab 8 consists of the draft advertisements and, second, the media that we should consider using.

Alayne, if we could maybe just start with the advertisement for the position of Auditor General. I think what Karen is handing out here is what the actual ad looks like, even though the text is the same. Am I correct?

MS STEWART: Is the Auditor General one attached there?

MRS. DACYSHYN: It's in the binder, unless it's changed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Does anyone have any comments or questions regarding the advertisement?

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, I was going to throw out something a little different. Because all this is going to be widely available on the Internet, would it be possible to have an ad that has less detail in it but more of the catchy things? You know, whether or not it would even need to be as big – it might be even a budget consideration. If you had the name, province, something like the salary in bigger letters, and a few things like that, would we possibly get more bang for our dollar with that kind of an ad, or is this too dramatic a change from what we always did?

MS STEWART: It's interesting that you raise that, because I did go and have a look on the site for the Auditor General of British Columbia. They advertised in the past year I think; wasn't it? Theirs was shorter. I did look at some other jurisdictions too and at what they've done recently, and some are twice as long. So it really is a preference of your committee, too, as to whether you'd like a little change to the normal one.

MR. FRIEDEL: These are a little bit of a throwback to the time when what you see is what you get. Access to the Internet or other ways of getting that information wasn't that readily available, or, you know, even if the technology was there, not everybody had the same access. Nowadays certainly anybody with the capability to apply for this job is most certainly going to have access, and the level of detail that you want in the ad would be to get their attention. Could we snag more people with the first hook by doing that? Then those that are truly interested and qualified can get whatever level of detail they want, up to reading the act.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're also advertising the access to the position profile too.

MR. DUCHARME: I'd have one concern though. If you try to make the size of the ad a little bit too small, it may get lost on those pages in a newspaper.

MR. FRIEDEL: I didn't mean the business card size. If you put the words big enough on an ad half this size – if you open the *Journal* or whatever it is, how much of this ad do you read except the name? I mean, you've got four inches by about two inches that you read. If you had the name twice as big and the salary below it, everybody is going to see it.

MRS. O'NEILL: I would just say, though, that a good number of people whom you wouldn't necessarily want to apply for it would in those circumstances. This is quite consistent, for instance, with executive positions, as you've seen, for universities, et cetera. I think that you want the person who sees the title to have as much information underneath. I don't have a problem with the size and the amount of copy in the ad.

MR. FRIEDEL: I wasn't suggesting it mainly for size. I was suggesting it more for effect. Our job is to weed out those that aren't qualified.

MR. DUCHARME: I guess I looked at trying to make the comparison back to an automobile ad, where you don't put in so much, you know, \$149 a month or whatever. I think I'd agree with Mary. I don't think that's the type of clientele that we're trying to attract in terms of the type of position. I think I like the format that we've got now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

MRS. O'NEILL: I do have one. Alayne, if you could help me out here with the understanding. Let's take the Information and Privacy Commissioner. The first two paragraphs are descriptors. The fourth one is directive, but in the middle we go to, "Ideally your background." Tell me why we do that, just from a wording perspective.

MS STEWART: We wanted to move them into seeing themselves in the role. So you've read what the job is about, and then that paragraph that you're referring to is talking about the candidate's qualifications that we're looking at. So we're trying to, then, engage them to hopefully determine whether they meet the qualifications. That was the thought process.

MRS. O'NEILL: Yes. I was more curious than critical.

MS BLAKEMAN: This is what I've been saving. In looking at where it's expected to run these ads, I'm wondering why we're not considering running the ads in the trade papers, running the Auditor General's ad in the chartered accounts' magazine. Now, those are not monthlies necessarily, so we might have missed something there, but maybe it's possible to get a stapled insert into it if we were too late to get into the text. They all read those.

MS STEWART: I did check that. Thank you for raising that. I did check that out. The next publication is February.

MS BLAKEMAN: Okay. For FOIP as well?

MS STEWART: I didn't have that information.

MS BLAKEMAN: There's an American one that comes out that I'm sure they're reading somewhere. But I'm also wondering about running in the universities. It's *Folio* here. What is it that the professors all read?

MRS. O'NEILL: It's *Folio*.

DR. PANNU: Well, that's the local one, but there's *University Affairs*, which is a national one. It comes out every month.

MS STEWART: Well, going back to the Auditor General one, I

have received a number of calls from individuals in the professional associations.

MRS. DACYSHYN: The Institute of Chartered Accountants of Alberta.

MS STEWART: Yes, the Institute of Chartered Accountants. I've had also the institute of – there's another institute. I'm sorry; it's on the profile. I'll have to reference the name. The gentleman phoned me yesterday and indicated that they'd be more than willing to do word-of-mouth discussions with any of their members. So there is an interest there.

In terms of the cost element, I don't know if that would be something that we would have to pay for versus more of a marketing from the heads of the institutes. But I can check the publications also that they do have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I just interject here for a second? Before we get ahead of ourselves, we need to pass motions that the advertisements look the way that we want them to look. So why don't we just wrap that up, and then we'll go into all of our options regarding media.

MS DACYSHYN: I just wanted to say – and I think this is probably just a matter of the speed with which all of this was prepared. I see on the ad for the Information and Privacy Commissioner that you just handed out this morning that at the bottom we've actually changed the contact information to be the chair of the committee at our address rather than the personnel administration office. So what you have in your binder at the bottom is correct. That was just an oversight, I'm sure, but I just wanted to point that out.

MS STEWART: No. The ad was sent to the ad agency before we talked.

MS DACYSHYN: And they put it in before we made that change?

MS STEWART: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So is there any other discussion on the actual advertisements for both positions? If not, I'm just wondering if someone could move that we are sticking with this copy here.

MS STEWART: I did have one question though. On the Information and Privacy Commissioner one there's quite a bit of information in there. I did have the opportunity to review this with their office. It looked rather lengthy, so I didn't know whether that would be something that your committee would be comfortable with or whether you would prefer that I do a little editing there.

12:10

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, that was the purpose of my original comment. I thought there was too much fine print here. Incidentally, I stand to be corrected, but I don't see the reference to the web site.

MS STEWART: On the actual copy that came from the ad agency, it is not in the right format. That was sent prior to making some adjustments to include that.

MR. FRIEDEL: Okay. I see it here.

MS BLAKEMAN: E-mail to executivesearch@gov.ab.ca.

MS STEWART: But that has been changed to coming to the Assembly.

MS BLAKEMAN: I just had one question about legalities. Is the first paragraph on this Information and Privacy Commissioner ad correct? Is that exactly the process?

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean about the Lieutenant Governor?

MS BLAKEMAN: Yeah.

MS STEWART: She does the appointment.

MS BLAKEMAN: So this position is appointed by cabinet on the recommendation of this committee but thereafter is accountable to the Legislative Assembly. I'm just double-checking that that's it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So is someone willing to move that the advertisement for the position of the Auditor General with the amendment as agreed to by our committee be accepted? That would include the salary clause.

MRS. O'NEILL: I so move.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favour? Okay. That motion is carried.

Then a second motion:

to approve the advertisement for the position of Information and Privacy Commissioner with amendments as agreed to by the search committee.

MR. DUCHARME: I so move.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? All those in favour? Okay.

Now we can take a look at the options for media coverage. Have we passed out the update? Okay.

I assume that the difference between the \$19,000 and going up to \$21,000 is the number of words that we used in the advertisement. Is that correct?

MS DACYSHYN: That's what Alayne said.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next to the cost of the various newspapers you can see that we've put into the binder the history of advertising with the past couple of searches just so we have that as reference.

MRS. O'NEILL: I'm sorry, Madam Chairman, but just to go back for a moment. On the vote that we just took, it's my understanding that the advertisement for the Information and Privacy Commissioner is as per what we have there, not as per this, because this is absent something.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, maybe we should clarify. I understand that between now and the actual insertion not every word is necessarily what's here. If it's going to reflect the discussion, there could be some minor changes. We talked about salaries and that.

MS STEWART: Some editing. But the editing is on this document that's in your binder. You're right.

MRS. O'NEILL: Well, there's more information in the second

paragraph in the binder copy than there is on here.

MR. FRIEDEL: But we're not approving verbatim what we have in either document in front of us.

MS BLAKEMAN: I'm curious, because I'm obviously missing something. When I look at the media insertion order, it comes out at \$21,000. That's for one ad, so let's call this one for the Auditor General.

Then we'd be paying the same amount again for the FOIP one. But when I look under the budget for this committee, it's listing \$75,000 in advertising for the AG and \$50,000 for advertising for the Information and Privacy Commissioner. That's why I thought you were running it four times. When I looked at this figure, the \$19,000, and I looked at this figure before, I went: those aren't the same; they must be running them more than once.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Corinne, if you could speak to that, because I know that you and Louise had done some work on the budget.

MS DACYSHYN: Right. That budget was developed, obviously, without the input of the committee prior to this meeting. We weren't sure what the committee would want. Obviously if you were going to run this ad twice, you'd be looking at \$80,000, which is still less than the \$125,000 projected. Obviously if you make a decision in this meeting to advertise elsewhere, other than what's in these suggestions, you could very well be at the \$125,000. So we basically took a range based on an ad we placed advertising a meeting of the heritage committee a couple of weeks back. We didn't spend \$125,000, but we sort of used a range based on the size of an ad and how many times it ran. So if you decide to do other advertising or less, it could be more or less than that.

MS BLAKEMAN: I really appreciate the work that you've done. It's very helpful to get this in context. It also helps me make decisions around this. I would be very uncomfortable going back to my constituents and trying to justify \$125,000 on advertising. My people are homeless. This is not responsible. So I really appreciate the work that you've done, Corinne. That helps me understand what we're working with here.

MR. DUCHARME: I'd like to speak, looking at the draft, as to the media insertion order. I question our need of having to go to a national newspaper such as the *Globe and Mail*. As I had mentioned earlier, I think we have our newspapers across the province of Alberta. We have the Internet that's there. It's also been indicated that there have been some calls that have already come in. So the industry, the people that are involved in this field of employment, already have somewhat of an indication that these job openings are here. I'm just wondering. At just a little under \$8,500 per insertion to go to the *Globe and Mail*, as has been identified here, I'd like to have a little bit of a discussion on that, if you feel that it's warranted to go up to that extent. Yeah, they may be a national newspaper, but it's a big pile of money in terms of going out to spend it for an advertisement when I think people may find out in other senses of media rather than going through that expensive ad.

MRS. O'NEILL: The strength of putting it into the *Globe and Mail* is that you may catch the interest of someone who is – I was going to say living abroad – outside the province of Alberta. I know we will have the Internet advertising; it will be there. However, there are those who scrutinize the career sections of the *Globe and Mail*,

and I think for the catchment group it's worth it there. At the risk of offending someone, I would say: then why do we need to have it in both Edmonton newspapers and both Calgary papers? We could save some money there. I don't mean to offend anybody, but I don't know of people who go to the *Sun* looking for career advertisements, and I do know people who go to the *Journal*. Now, that's only my limited experience.

DR. PANNU: I want to, I guess, echo what Mary has just said. I think the *Globe* is an important national paper, and we should extend our search beyond provincial boundaries as these are very important positions. As we were talking, the prominence of these positions in addition to just the money is such that we should look for the best, and certainly we should advertise nationally. For similar positions at universities, for example, universities go out internationally, not just nationally. Therefore, I think we should at least go nationally on this, and the *Globe and Mail* is a good vehicle for it.

The other point that Mary makes is that the *Sun* is not usually a newspaper that attracts, I guess, the attention of those who are looking for this level of position. It's more a sort of popular paper. So we could save some money perhaps there, other than if we want to be evenhanded, we would want to include the *Sun* in it. But I think we could save some money by not putting this ad in the *Sun* newspapers and go nationally.

MS BLAKEMAN: I agree.

THE CHAIRMAN: Alayne, I noticed, when I was glancing as this, that at the last search committee the same discussion came up, and when they were talking about the *Globe and Mail*, someone had mentioned that they thought you couldn't just put one ad in, that you had to run it for two weeks. Do you know if that's . . .

MS STEWART: One ad gives you three insertion dates.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, for example, the Auditor General estimate you have here of \$7,000 gives you three insertion dates. That's important to know.

MS BLAKEMAN: I figured it couldn't be one day.

12:20

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there any other discussion?

MR. FRIEDEL: But we're talking about the list as it is now. Denis had raised the concern about the \$8,000 being almost the equivalent of our four dailies put together, but if there's a strong feeling about that . . . Raj mentioned that probably one of the reasons we do this is to be evenhanded. I think likewise you would extend that to the smaller dailies. I mean, that is the catchment area in the smaller cities, and if we don't do that, we don't cover the province very thoroughly either. You know, a little of what we do is that we're the government of the total province of Alberta, not selectively the newspapers we want to favour. If we didn't want to do that, then we may as well go back to my original suggestion to use the car sales ad, but I think the discussion said we're going to put ourselves slightly above that.

DR. PANNU: I think two considerations obviously are at play here. One is being evenhanded, and the other is coverage; you know, comprehensive coverage at least of the province. I think I wouldn't want to exclude advertising in Grande Prairie and Red Deer and Medicine Hat, but for Edmonton and Calgary we have two widely read papers, the *Herald* and the *Journal*. I think we could save some

money by excluding the other two. We are being comprehensive and making some compromises on the evenhanded, I guess, in the case of the two cities. I think we should save some money, to save – how much? – close to \$5,000 I guess.

MR. FRIEDEL: I'm going to disagree with you, Raj. If we want to save money, let's cut out the *Globe and Mail*. If we're not about saving money, then let's be fair.

DR. PANNU: No. I think saving money on advertising is not good saving. We want the best persons to apply.

THE CHAIRMAN: Alayne, do we have any tracking or any recording of knowing how people found out about positions in the past? Do we know the value of using all of these newspapers, some going nationally?

MS STEWART: We've just looked at our searches that we've done, and the only thing that you can base it on is the numbers that apply after reading the various newspapers, if they indicate it to you. Generally speaking, we haven't had a large response from the *Globe and Mail*, though, in comparison to our other means of advertising. But, you know, these are a little different level of job, so you really have to weigh it out too. And looking at the number of Albertans that read the *Globe and Mail*, that is sometimes their preferred newspaper.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did I see your hand, Laurie?

MS BLAKEMAN: Yeah, you did.

If this is the price we're looking at, I can live with that the way it is. It is fair, and the *Sun* can't get mad at us because we didn't, you know, put something in there. But I absolutely, positively insist that we advertise in the *Globe and Mail*. It's wrong to be advertising a position of this level and not go beyond Alberta. I think that would be very shortsighted and, frankly, provincial. You know, we want to get the best out there, and to assume that they wouldn't be outside of Alberta I think is really cutting us off. The *Globe and Mail* has got to be there. I'm okay with the rest of the list and with that money.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other comments, questions?

MRS. O'NEILL: Is this taking into consideration that we are going to have a press release, as Denis mentioned? Do we want to bring that into the discussion now?

MR. FRIEDEL: We'd better. That's free advertising.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's free advertising. That's easy enough for this committee to do.

Does someone want to go ahead and make a motion?

MR. FRIEDEL: I'll move.

THE CHAIRMAN: And what are you moving?

MR. FRIEDEL: I'm moving that
we use the existing proposed list.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So all dailies including the *Globe and*

Mail?

MR. FRIEDEL: Yeah.

THE CHAIRMAN: For both positions?

MR. FRIEDEL: Both positions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? All those in favour? Any opposed? Motion carried. Okay.

Under tab 9 we're taking a look at the budget estimate. Corinne, do you have any more comments to make about the budget? Does anyone have questions as to what's here?

MR. FRIEDEL: I'm presuming that we're going to adjust the budget to reflect the advertisement we just approved?

MS DACYSHYN: If that's what the committee would like, we can do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: We can either adjust the budget or be permitted to return, of course, every last dollar that we don't spend.

MRS. DACYSHYN: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN: The one thing that I think we will want to ensure is that we have some flexibility. We have some other categories here that are the bare minimum. If you take a look at travel expenses for candidates, we don't know how many candidates we'll be asking to fly in for interviews. So just to toss that out, that that has to be a consideration, and I'd suggest that we not take too much flexibility out of this budget. We can certainly move between categories, but it's very difficult to eliminate dollars and then have to go after some more if we find that we've miscalculated some part of it.

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, as long as we made reference to the fact that we realize that the amounts for advertising are substantially higher than what we expect to spend and that it is not our anticipation to spend to that level.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Would someone be willing to go ahead and move the budget?

MRS. O'NEILL: I would move
the budget as indicated, with the consideration for the flexibility of
it and then the assumption that if there is any that is not used, it will
be returned.
Is that what you wanted?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Any discussion? All those in favour?

Okay. Motion carried.

We didn't have any other business?

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. If we could have a motion to adjourn.
Raj. All those in favour?

MR. FRIEDEL: No big party for the committee members with the leftovers?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that we agree to hold the date of the next meeting until we have the call of the chair, if that's okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Carried.

[The committee adjourned at 12:28 p.m.]

DR. PANNU: Yeah, that's fine.