

**Title:** Tuesday, December 13, 2005 Chief Electoral Officer Search Committee  
**Date:** 05/12/13

**Time:** 3:12 p.m.

[Mrs. Tarchuk in the chair]

**The Chair:** Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to welcome the members and staff and ask that everyone introduce themselves for the record.

[The following members introduced themselves: Ms Blakeman, Mr. Ducharme, Mr. Lougheed, Mr. Marz, Mr. Strang, and Mrs. Tarchuk]

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** Karen Sawchuk, committee clerk.

**Ms Stewart:** Alayne Stewart.

**Ms Sorensen:** Rhonda Sorensen, communications with the Clerk's office.

**The Chair:** Great. Thank you.

I'll just note that the meeting packages were delivered to members last Thursday, December 8.

Now, you should all have a copy of the agenda, and I wonder if someone would like to move that the agenda be adopted as circulated.

**Mr. Marz:** I'll move, Madam Chairman.

**The Chair:** Any discussion? All those in favour? Okay. That motion is carried.

A copy of Government Motion 25 has been included in your meeting package, and you'll see that the motion sets out the committee membership, the mandate. It's just provided today for information purposes.

Since there was no anticipation of this committee being created at the time that the 2005-06 budgets were drafted, there is no budget estimate for 2005-06, just a forecast of costs to the end of '05-06. I think the simple way to describe all this information that Karen gave me is that the money is in our budget by default, and it's not there because we budgeted for it, but it's there because a committee that was anticipated has not gone ahead. So does that summarize that quite well?

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** I guess that's a fair enough way of putting it, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** Okay. So you all have a copy in your package of the budget estimates. Would someone like to move that the Select Special Chief Electoral Officer Search Committee adopts the 2006-07 summary of budget estimates as presented? Is someone willing to? Ivan. Are there any questions on that budget?

**Ms Blakeman:** The advertising is always the single largest cost for this committee, and I'm just wondering what consultation was done to reach the amount that's appearing in this budget, which is \$58,200, and is that in the opinion of the human resource specialists that are with us going to be enough?

**The Chair:** I wonder if I can make a suggestion. Actually, I thought this earlier, and I forgot to stick with my inclination here. I wonder if there's any reason why we don't deal with the budget after we've had a presentation by Alayne and the work that has been done to date, and then it would become clear. Is there any problem with that? Then it makes sense whether the budget is reflecting what it is that we just talked about.

**Ms Blakeman:** You want a motion to table it, and then we'll bring it back? Is there any rule?

**The Chair:** Ivan can just withdraw it.

**Mr. Strang:** I can withdraw it.

**The Chair:** That will take everyone's approval here.

**Ms Blakeman:** Okay. I think if you table it, you can't bring it back in the same meeting.

**The Chair:** Yeah. Why don't we do that? That's an obvious question and a good question, Laurie, and it's one that we will be talking about.

Well, Alayne has introduced herself, but I'd like to welcome her again. For the benefit of the members of the committee who have not had the wonderful experience of sitting on a Legislature search committee before, I think that for our previous four officer searches this committee has utilized the executive search branch of PAO to assist us. They've assisted with the screening of applicants, preparation of screening reports, preliminary and final interviews, and reference and credential checks. Alayne has been involved in I think all four of those and is now definitely an old hand at assisting the committee with this search process.

In your package you've got some tentative timetable procedures, communication plans, et cetera. I wonder if I could, Alayne, just pass it over to you now, and you can just kind of lead us over some of the work that you've done to date and speak to some of the practices that we've stuck to over the last couple of searches.

**Ms Stewart:** Sure. Thank you. It's nice to see some familiar faces around the table, and I'm pleased to meet some new members today.

Karen had called me to just have a quick look at what we've done in the past and also to put together a brief timetable. This tentative search schedule is definitely tentative. It'll give you an overview of the general time frame that we have taken. What comes into play here, of course, would be schedules: availability of our committees to meet, availability of candidates. Timing is certainly open and available to be adjusted.

What we did is pull up the previous ad. It does go back to 1998, and in looking at some of the information there, we certainly could use a bit of an update and a bit of streamlining. I think that since 1998 there may be a few changes in how we would like to see the advertising go out. It could come into play, but the information there was the copy from 1998. The only adjustments were adjustments in updating in numbers on the position profile. Karen, I believe you obtained that from the office.

What our office would do in relation to the advertisement is more working with colleagues down here in the Legislative Assembly. I understand that you have your own communications group, so a lot of the work was completed in your area for workups for the advertisement and the costing. I would hand that over to Rhonda to give you an overview on the advertising.

**Ms Sorensen:** Thanks, Alayne. What we did with the advertising was that we looked at what's been done for previous search committees. Taking that information and the old text from the ad that was done in 1998 – was it? – we came up with two different ads. You should all have this sheet. Ad B is essentially following the same guidelines that have been followed in all of the rest of the ad campaigns. Ad A is the same information only with a little bit more design that we felt might have a bit more impact in giving some

recognition on a page full of ads. Also attached you'll find an action plan that outlines all of the different advertising options. We went through what has been done in the past and thought it was a wise move to advertise in all of the Alberta dailies as well as extending that to the western area of the *Globe and Mail*. The western area covers Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, B.C., Yukon, and Northwest Territories.

On the table in the action plan I've bolded all of the prices that match what the recommendation is, and you'll see that that actually comes well under budget if we use ad A in all Alberta dailies as well as the *Globe and Mail* west career section. We're coming in at \$24,024, so we're well under the \$55,000 budgeted. Of course, I've also included prices for the *National Post* and/or if you wanted to expand into the *Globe and Mail* full distribution. We'll also be doing a website that will have links to the chief electoral office. We'll have the job position profile as well as the ad on the website.

3:20

**The Chair:** Thanks, Rhonda.

I think Laurie has a question on this.

**Ms Blakeman:** I have two questions. This is a job for which we require someone with some level of expertise. Some expertise and experience is required, and you don't get that a lot. I'm thinking that anybody in Grande Prairie, Red Deer, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, or Fort McMurray, if they're looking for that level of job, is going to be looking in the major papers anyway. I mean, politically we may want to do that, but I don't think anyone that would be qualified for this job is only going to look in the *Lethbridge Herald* and not look at the same time in the *Globe and Mail* or the *Calgary Herald* or one of those. So I would tend to expand to the national *Globe and Mail* because I think there are other assistant chief electoral officers in nine other provinces and three territories and federally, and that's more likely where we're going to be drawing people from. It is a job that requires some experience, and there's a very limited pool of people we're going to pull from, so I would recommend going to the larger distribution through the *Globe and Mail*.

Also, what are we looking at for web opportunities? Some of the newspapers also will say: well, if you buy an ad in our paper, we'll also run it in our online version. Some of them actually subscribe to a service that it gets listed on that way. Is that included in what we're anticipating here, or is there another, you know, [getyourjobshere.com](http://getyourjobshere.com) website that we can be posting this on?

**Ms Sorensen:** May I?

**The Chair:** Yeah, go ahead, Rhonda.

**Ms Sorensen:** Okay. On your first question I would agree that for return on investment absolutely the *Herald*, the *Journal*, and the *Globe and Mail* are probably going to be where you're drawing your most qualified candidates for a position of this type. We did include the other Alberta dailies because traditionally that's been the direction of previous search committees, but of course it's up to this committee to decide what avenue they wish to take.

The *Globe and Mail* as well as a lot of the other dailies do offer for an additional fee of I believe \$199 to post the ad on Workopolis, which is a website. However, I've been told that sometimes you're not really getting the quality of applicant that you're hoping for on that either, and it can often lead to extensive administrative . . .

**Ms Blakeman:** Everybody working at the carpet place applies. Okay.

**Ms Sorensen:** Yeah. So generally I've been advised against going on Workopolis; however, it is an option if the committee chooses to go that way.

**Mr. Lougheed:** Just to follow up, certainly I have understood from talking to people from other provinces that they do know that there will be a search going on. They've already sort of got that information out there. Is a national advertisement the best way to go when there's already a lot of sensitivity to it, or is there some other mechanism through contacts or whatever? I think we should do something to get it across the country as well as just the west.

**Ms Stewart:** I can speak to that item. I requested a list of Conference of Canadian Election Officials and election finance officers from Elections Alberta and had suggested reviewing this option of forwarding the advertisement as well as a position profile to that list of contacts, more for them, as I think you had mentioned, getting the word out, letting other people know. A lot of it is word of mouth when you're looking at a more specialized area. I have gathered that mailing listing already if you'd like to look at that option of having something come out on behalf of your committee.

**Mr. Lougheed:** Sure.

**Ms Blakeman:** Yeah, I think it's a good idea.

**The Chair:** Any other comments on that?

How are we going to break this down? Do we need to deal with the motion first on the communication plan? So then, Rhonda, why don't you just tell us what you need to know from us?

**Ms Sorensen:** I guess what I first need to know from you is which ad you'd prefer to go with, A or B.

**The Chair:** Okay. Let's make this a visual vote.

**Hon. Members:** A.

**The Chair:** Okay. It looks like it's far more appealing than the one that we used to use.

**Ms Sorensen:** The other thing I need to know from the committee is which papers they do want it to go into. You can go with the recommendation and/or any variation of the costs that are outlined there.

**Mr. Marz:** Well, I would suggest or move if you so wish that we go with the *Globe and Mail* across Canada as well as the Edmonton and Calgary papers: the *Journal*, the *Herald*, and both *Suns*. I think we'd get just as good mileage out of that.

**The Chair:** Any comments on that?

**Ms Blakeman:** I second and agree, and let's go.

**The Chair:** I'm guessing by the shake of heads that there is agreement on that.

**Mr. Ducharme:** Do we add in the mail-out, or do we do that as a separate motion?

**The Chair:** Well, let's add it in. That's communication.

**Mr. Marz:** The across Canada *Mail* and the *Herald* and the *Suns* and the *Journal*.

**Ms Stewart:** So the mail-out is to the Canadian election officials and election finance officers?

**Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Ms Sorensen:** Can I just clarify that we're going to forgo the other Alberta dailies in Medicine Hat and whatnot?

**The Chair:** It appears that way.

**Ms Blakeman:** According to what you've given us, he's doing 1, except for it's across Canada, numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5.

**Ms Sorensen:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Great. All those in favour?

**Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** So we've approved that communication plan. Anything else, Rhonda?

**Ms Blakeman:** What we didn't do: we didn't settle on the Workopolis.

**Ms Sorensen:** If you wish to go that way, it is I believe \$200 for 30 days. It's posted from the time that your ad goes into the *Globe and Mail*. So if the ad goes in on January 7, it will be there until February 7. But, again, as I mentioned, I guess there are quite a few administrative things to consider on the other end.

**The Chair:** I see a lot of shaking of heads here. No one feels strongly that we take that route?

**Ms Blakeman:** Well, the problem is that it's a good idea, but what's happening is that everybody who is working as a waiter, in order to qualify for whatever, ends up having to put these resumés in. They just plow through stuff like Workopolis, and they're nowhere near qualified.

**Mr. Ducharme:** I'd like to agree with that. I remember a lot of different applicants that came in some of the searches. How on earth they ever thought they qualified to be an Auditor General, I don't know. To me that Workopolis website sounds like somewhere you'd probably get at an employment centre as a website to go to, and I don't think that's the calibre of people that we're after.

**The Chair:** Okay. Rhonda, I think we can take strong direction from that. Is there anything else, Laurie.

**Ms Blakeman:** Well, I'm just saying that if we could look and see if maybe there was an executive version of that that's out there. Workopolis we know about because it's offered as an extra through the newspapers, but maybe there is an association of executives in Canada or something that we could post on a website that's a bit more in the range of experience and education that we would be expecting for this position.

**The Chair:** Okay. Well, I see by looking that Alayne and Rhonda apparently aren't aware of any.

**Ms Stewart:** I'm not familiar with any. I would agree with Denis that with our executive opportunities there have been times when we haven't had the option of whether we would be able to not use Workopolis or whatever the newspaper version of it is, and it just increased the volume versus the quality.

**Ms Blakeman:** Okay. All right. If there's nothing better, then let's leave that one alone.

**Ms Stewart:** I can do a check on that.

**Ms Blakeman:** Well, if it's there, but otherwise no.

**Ms Stewart:** I will do that for you.

**Mr. Marz:** I'm not sure we need anything else besides the papers that we just agreed on because they also have websites. So those that don't actually physically buy the newspaper still check the newspapers through their computers, and everybody has got those newspapers on the computer. I think we've got it amply covered with just the papers we've already agreed to. That's my view anyways.

3:30

**The Chair:** It's a valuable one at that. Rhonda, do you need to know anything else?

**Ms Sorensen:** No. I'm good. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Alayne, why don't you walk us through anything that you need to get direction or confirmation on?

**Ms Stewart:** The next piece of information would then be the ad copy, whether you would be okay with us revising or just streamlining the ad copy a bit to bring it a little more up to date. That is the 1998 copy.

**Ms Blakeman:** Yeah. Can you update it a bit? This is an opinion. It doesn't seem to reflect the seriousness and seniority of this position. So, yes, I would update it.

**Ms Stewart:** Okay. Are there other areas that you'd like us to focus on?

**Ms Blakeman:** Well, it's an increasingly complex area, highly technological now, and increasingly diverse in that whole issue about access to security buildings. I mean, it just gets more complicated, not easier. That's sort of not reflected here.

**The Chair:** It reflects managing complex human and financial resources. Do you have anything specific? Do we want it to be much wordier than this?

**Ms Stewart:** I think we can stay within the size but really focus on your needs to bring it up to date. You're right. I thought there were a few things that have transpired since 1998 that we might want to have a look at. I didn't feel comfortable going in and doing that without getting your review.

**Mr. Marz:** I think the second and third paragraphs are quite descriptive. They have to be knowledgeable of the legislation and administer according to the legislation. That's all spelled out in those two paragraphs. I don't think you want to get beyond that and

start spelling out the legislation. I think it's to the point. I'm not sure if it needs too much else.

**The Chair:** Any other comments?

Did you get enough direction there, Alayne?

**Ms Stewart:** Sure. What I gathered is that perhaps a bit of tweaking would be okay but not change the content.

**The Chair:** Okay. That's very good.

**Ms Stewart:** Bring it up to 2006.

**The Chair:** So is the search schedule next?

**Ms Stewart:** Let's see if that's a doable item. I know that Rhonda mentioned the work on the advertising that she had done. If the advertisement appears on the 7th, I would need to make sure that there's an opportunity to have your advertisement copy as well as a position profile approved before the 7th of January. So I haven't included a date in there other than December 16, but that was just my date.

**Ms Blakeman:** When do you need it approved by?

**Ms Stewart:** Technically, we would need it approved by January 3 at noon.

**Ms Blakeman:** So prior to January 3. When do we think this would be ready? What's the window of opportunity here?

**Ms Stewart:** Well, it'll be high priority for us. The one thing on the profile that I would need is to work with someone out of the Elections Alberta office to understand some of the complexities of the role to make sure that I'm capturing it correctly. I went in and had a look at some of the areas, wanting to streamline it a bit, and wasn't sure whether some of the information was out of the act. Some of the information fell under the responsibility. There was a lot of duplication.

**Ms Blakeman:** I think Bill Sage is probably the best resource there.

**Ms Stewart:** That's what I would need for the profile, to work with someone there to make sure that I'm not missing something.

**The Chair:** All right.

**Ms Blakeman:** Are there enough of us around next week, or could we have a subcommittee that's empowered to have a quick boo at this to give her something?

**The Chair:** Probably the most efficient way to do this is that once you've dealt with the office and you've made any tweaks to this, let Karen quickly fax it around to committee members. We'll get some feedback.

**Mr. Lougheed:** With respect to getting particulars of the job as was talked about, how about the former officer or the former before to get input as well as the current fellows that are in there?

**Ms Stewart:** The former Chief Electoral Officer?

**Mr. Lougheed:** Yeah. There's a different set of relationships there.

**Ms Blakeman:** I think he might have left a document as well that had some observations. Am I remembering that?

**Mr. Lougheed:** Yeah. He was saying something about that last time.

**Ms Blakeman:** I think he did. So there well may be a document that has some of his observations that's available through that office. I think that the current deputy or interim is not interested in the position – that's something else that's in my head – so I think he's a pretty good resource for us.

**The Chair:** We probably won't know that for sure until we pass that deadline, so we probably shouldn't make any assumptions there.

**Ms Blakeman:** Good point.

**The Chair:** So you've got that suggestion.

**Ms Stewart:** I do.

**The Chair:** Maybe just check with Brian and see if there's any way that he would like to be of service or if he actually did some kind of an exit summary of what he saw as the next challenges or suggestions.

**Ms Stewart:** I'll make contact with him first and see if I can do that.

**The Chair:** So you're going to aim for the January 3 date. As soon as anything's ready, we'll just have Karen fax the offices. I guess the chair and vice-chair will maybe take a look at the feedback and take some direction from that. Then we can still attempt to hit the advertisement deadline for January 7 if that sounds good enough for everyone.

**Ms Stewart:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** I think Denis has a question.

**Mr. Ducharme:** The only other thing with regard to the dates is the February 13 to 24 time period that the search committee conducts interviews: if we could change that to the 15th. On the 13th and 14th the government members are going to be busy.

**Mr. Marz:** Why? What are we going to be doing?

**Mr. Ducharme:** Shovelling my driveway.

**Mr. Marz:** Yeah, right. The 15th to 18th.

**Mr. Ducharme:** Twenty-fourth. Just change the date from February 13 to February 15.

**Ms Blakeman:** Oh, I see what you're saying. Well, that's option 2 for conducting interviews.

**Ms Stewart:** That's right.

**Ms Blakeman:** If it's possible to do it earlier, we're better off doing it earlier. Otherwise, you start getting into session. Trust me, doing this when you're in session is tough.

**Ms Stewart:** That was one of the options. Two options are pro-

posed. One is if you just want to do one set of interviews with the committee. I know it looks a little odd that option 2 comes first, but it was more because of the timing. I was trying to keep the timing working towards the front end. The first option really is for Executive Search to do preliminary interviews of the candidates that you would like interviewed. We would provide you with a one-page summary of the interview and then come back, review the interview reports with you, and then you determine the candidates that you would like to bring in for a final interview, so the shortlisting process. That, technically, is option one.

**Mr. Ducharme:** Yeah. I don't have a problem with that. Basically, we've got the two options. We can block it off for now.

**Ms Stewart:** They are there. That's right.

3:40

**Mr. Ducharme:** I'd rather do it sooner than later.

**Ms Stewart:** So we can determine which option you'd like to use once we see the list of candidates after the closing date.

**Mr. Ducharme:** Got it.

**Ms Stewart:** That's good. Okay.

Are you okay with the screening meeting date that I had on there, somewhere between February 6 and 10?

**Ms Blakeman:** Well, it depends on how many people we're willing to go ahead with the meeting. No. I've worded that badly. How many people are we willing to hold a meeting without?

**The Chair:** Right. If there's any explanation, we've been dealing with budgets since 9:30 this morning.

**Mr. Marz:** I have no problem with the February 6 to 10 thing, except I won't be here. So as long as there are enough members to be here to do it.

**The Chair:** We're missing a few members today even, so we don't have the luxury of getting any feedback from them on availability. So some of this will have to be a little bit flexible. We'll just set some target dates, and then we're going to have to do some polling regardless.

**Ms Stewart:** Okay. I know Karen's great at scheduling.

**The Chair:** That's right. We'll just go through this as a guideline that we're going to try to stick to.

**Ms Stewart:** That's good.

**Ms Blakeman:** There's one other date in here, March 24 to 31. Not that I would know this, but that's got a very high likelihood of being a sessional break.

**The Chair:** I was thinking the same thing. I don't know what those dates are, so that's questionable.

**Ms Blakeman:** Traditionally, in the past a number of times that's the week that we've been off.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Ms Stewart:** That's a question mark.

**Ms Blakeman:** Well . . .

**Mr. Lougheed:** We follow the school breaks.

**Ms Blakeman:** Yeah. It matches with the school breaks. That's exactly right. They'll line up.

**Ms Stewart:** Are there any other questions on the process?

**The Chair:** Okay. So does someone want to move that the Select Special Chief Electoral Officer Search Committee adopt the tentative schedule that's been presented?

**Ms Blakeman:** I'll move that.

**The Chair:** Laurie. Any discussion? All those in favour? Okay. That motion is carried.

We've dealt with the timetable, the draft communications plan, the position profile, so now we'll go back to the budget. It appears that with the changes that we have suggested with the communication plan, we would actually be looking at a \$36,200 budget as opposed to a \$63,200 budget. So I wonder if someone could move that the Select Special Chief Electoral Officer Search Committee adopt the 2006-07 summary of budget estimates as amended?

Are you asking a question, Laurie, or moving that?

**Ms Blakeman:** I want to ask a question. Is it on the floor yet?

**The Chair:** No, because no one has acknowledged my question yet.

**Mr. Ducharme:** I so move.

**The Chair:** Okay. Denis has moved it. So it's on the floor, Laurie.

**Ms Blakeman:** You know, one of the other things that happened to us in the past is we've brought somebody in, and I'm just wondering if we've covered that potential cost in the budget. Travel: \$2,000 or \$1,000?

**Mr. Ducharme:** No. One is from one year's budget, and the other is . . .

**Ms Blakeman:** Okay. Well, depending on what fiscal year we finish this in, we've got a thousand dollars in there for travel.

**The Chair:** Karen would like to explain this.

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** Madam Chair, what we did is that we put in \$1,000 for travel projected to the end of this fiscal year. That was primarily to cover members' travel outside of session. We included an additional \$2,000 and were assuming that that would be in case we needed it for candidates coming in from out of town. There might be a few costs still going through for members, but we're working on following the same kinds of timelines, when spring session will start, that kind of thing, so there won't be a lot of expenses as far as travel expenses go for members. It's primarily to cover bringing candidates for interviewing.

**The Chair:** Laurie's concern is in case we do have to fly a couple of candidates here for interviews. Is that going to be covered in this budget if we pass it at \$36,000?

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** Madam Chair, how do we guess at whether all the candidates are going to be within B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan, or . . .

**The Chair:** We can't. But going back to my initial comment that we had money in this budget by default, we had the amount of money that would cover a budget of \$63,000. Maybe at this time we don't want to tie our hands at all by reducing it too much and just not making any assumptions about travelling. I mean, we know that we can reduce that. The advertising difference was \$28,000.

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** The new budget for advertising would be \$28,000. It's rounded off by a few hundred dollars just because when we do our budgeting, we round up.

**The Chair:** So would it be safe if we just knocked \$20,000 off this budget and passed a motion to try to conduct the search within that budget?

**Ms Blakeman:** Yeah. I think that's safer.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Ducharme:** Can I amend my motion?

**The Chair:** You certainly can.

**Mr. Ducharme:** To \$45,000.

**The Chair:** Any discussion on that? All those in favour? Okay, that motion is carried.  
Is there anything else that Alayne or Rhonda needs?

**Ms Stewart:** I was just going to mention that I did do some statistics from our 1998 search. There were two out-of-province candidates

that we did bring in then, but that goes back a while. Same with the Information and Privacy Commissioner: we had three out of province. Ombudsman we had one out of province. I think Karen was just kind of averaging, I'm assuming, based on some of our previous competitions.

**The Chair:** Thanks.

If there is nothing else, then I would ask for a motion that we adjourn the meeting.

**Mr. Strang:** What about the draft profile?

**The Chair:** We've done that.

**Mr. Ducharme:** Maybe on the draft profile, if I may, I notice that we've got the salary range, and I think it would be fair to say that it's under review.

**The Chair:** Good point.

**Ms Blakeman:** Can we give something and say it's under review?

**Ms Stewart:** We'll put the current range.

**Mr. Ducharme:** We can give the current range but add "under review."

**Ms Blakeman:** Okay. Perfect.

**The Chair:** Yeah. Good point.

Okay. Having said that, would somebody like to move that we adjourn? Richard Marz. All those in favour? That motion is carried. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 3:48 p.m.]