



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 27th Legislature
Second Session

Select Special
Chief Electoral Officer
Search Committee

Monday, April 20, 2009
8:01 a.m.

Transcript No. 27-2-1

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

**Select Special Chief Electoral Officer
Search Committee**

Mitzel, Len, Cypress-Medicine Hat (PC), Chair
Lund, Ty, Rocky Mountain House (PC), Deputy Chair

Bhullar, Manmeet Singh, Calgary-Montrose (PC)
Blakeman, Laurie, Edmonton-Centre (AL)
Campbell, Robin, West Yellowhead (PC)
Horne, Fred, Edmonton-Rutherford (PC)
Lukaszuk, Thomas A., Edmonton-Castle Downs (PC)
MacDonald, Hugh, Edmonton-Gold Bar (AL)
Marz, Richard, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (PC)
Notley, Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (ND)
Webber, Len, Calgary-Foothills (PC)

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> |

8:01 a.m.**Monday, April 20, 2009**

[Mr. Mitzel in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning, and welcome. I'd like to call the first meeting of the Chief Electoral Officer Search Committee to order, and I'd like to thank the members for accommodating the meeting on their already heavy meeting schedules. I trust that everyone has a copy of the meeting agenda and the other meeting materials, which were posted on the committee website last Tuesday.

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

Mr. Lund: Ty Lund, MLA, Rocky Mountain House.

Mr. Campbell: Robin Campbell, MLA, West Yellowhead.

Mr. Horne: Fred Horne, MLA, Edmonton-Rutherford.

Mrs. Kamuchik: Louise Kamuchik, Clerk Assistant, director of House services. Good morning, everyone.

Mrs. Scarlett: Cheryl Scarlett, director of information technology and human resource services.

Ms Friesacher: Melanie Friesacher, communications consultant, Legislative Assembly Office.

Ms Sales: Tracey Sales, communications consultant with the Legislative Assembly Office.

Mr. Lukaszuk: Thomas Lukaszuk, Edmonton-Castle Downs. Good morning.

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

Ms Norton: Erin Norton, committee clerk.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Karen Sawchuk, committee clerk.

The Chair: I'm Len Mitzel, MLA for Cypress-Medicine Hat and the chair.

Mr. Webber: Len Webber, Calgary-Foothills.

The Chair: Thank you. Also, just to note for the record those who said they could not make it: Mr. Bhullar, Ms Notley, Ms Blakeman, and Mr. MacDonald.

You have the agenda in front of you. There is one change. We'll move item 4 down to item 8 and move those other ones up: items 5, 6, 7, and 8. Okay? So we'll have the budget estimates after the draft advertising plan and copy. Are there any other additions or changes to the agenda? Could someone please move the agenda as revised?

Mr. Lund: I'll move that.

The Chair: Moved by Ty Lund that the agenda be approved. All in favour? That's carried.

Okay. Item 3, the mandate of the search committee. The committee's mandate is set out in Government Motion 11, a copy of which is included in our meeting materials. Basically, this item is for information only unless anyone has any questions with regard to this motion. Hearing none, we've all heard that and had a look at it.

We'll move on to the new item 4, which is the draft recruitment strategy and the timelines. Now, this document, that I think you've had, provides a summary of the search process and includes a proposed timeline. Are there any questions on this? You'll note that the timeline will take us from now right through until about the middle of October. No questions on that?

Mr. Marz: If I may, it looks like a significant amount of time is going to be eaten up in August, and that's just a time, typically, that many of us try to get away for a short holiday. If we could move some of that back into July, it perhaps would be better.

The Chair: For the record, too, Ms Notley has joined us. Welcome.

Ms Notley: Hi.

The Chair: Well, on that, Mr. Marz, you'll note there that one point, August 4 to 14, speaks to "preliminary interviews conducted and interview reports completed," and the comments are that it could be the committee and/or the executive search consultant to do this. If we agree with that, that could be taken care of. The preliminary interviews could be taken care of. Then you look at August 17 to 28; there would have to be time in there, I think. So we're looking at perhaps one day to review the preliminary interview reports and to shortlist the final interviews.

Ms Notley.

Ms Notley: Yes. This is the strategy and timelines document that we're looking at? Is that it?

The Chair: Yes. That's where we've gone to, yes.

Ms Notley: Okay. I had wanted to raise a concern with the July 20 to 31 dates. Now, I realize that everyone is away at different times, but to have these key decisions being made in the very heart of the summer is problematic. It would seem to me that we either have to adjust somewhat to people's schedules or, alternatively, come up with a way for people to participate in this discussion when they're not actually here, you know, by way of having, for instance, the screening reports sent to people on their computers and then – no. I don't even know if you can get access to the House if you're out of the province. Anyway, I'm out of the province through that whole period.

The Chair: Through the whole period of July?

Ms Notley: The middle of July to the first week of August, as I suspect many people are, and I have some real concerns about that piece being done in my absence.

The Chair: Okay. What are some suggestions?

Mr. Lukaszuk: Well, all of that will be predicated on how many applicants we have. My question would be to the staff. From historical data, how many applicants did we have last time we were searching for a Chief Electoral Officer? Does anybody have a recollection of that?

The Chair: On what? I'm sorry.

Mr. Lukaszuk: How many applicants did we have the last time we were searching for a Chief Electoral Officer?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Mr. Chair, I stand to be corrected, but I believe it was well under a hundred.

The Chair: Just a point, then, that might help on this, too. I forgot to mention this. There's one really important factor that I forgot to bring up, and that's that for the previous six officer searches the committees had utilized the services of executive search to assist with all of the search process. Unfortunately, executive search, corporate human resources is unable to assist the committee due to staffing constraints, so we're drawing on the expertise of human resource services with the LAO at the outset to assist the committee in establishing the usual search parameters through the various documents that we're going through now, including the process of issuing a request for proposals for an external executive search consultant.

That doesn't speak to Ms Notley's point on July 20 to 31 and how we'd be able to access the screening reports.

Mr. Horne: A few questions, Mr. Chair, and I'll come back to your last point because that concerns me greatly. Further to what my two colleagues just said, I do think this is a very important decision, and I think the summer is going to be problematic. I realize that there's some thought to be given, after the consultant is retained, to how much the consultant may be able to do by way of background. I guess my question would be, then, if we were to work backwards in sort of planning this, is there particular significance to the October 5 to 9 goal for the report to go back to the Assembly?

The Chair: Mr. Horne, I don't think so. I think that it was just to follow through because if you look at the timeline that they used previously, these were just plugged in, and this is what it came to: October 5 to 9 would probably be the time when they finished; certainly, from September 21 to 25, the time taken to do the background checks; then to the one before that, the 14th to the 18th, the final interviews; and on and on. I think that's how they got that number.

Mr. Lukaszuk: Mr. Chairman, my guess would be that the timeline stems from the House sitting schedule. We probably would want this Chief Electoral Officer to be installed by the Legislative Assembly this fall so that he then has the entire winter and spring to be able to work in his capacity, rather than waiting until the spring session to have him installed. The House has to be in session for him to be installed.

8:10

The Chair: That's correct. But I don't have that standing order in front of me now as to what . . .

Ms Notley: The House goes to the middle of November.

The Chair: The middle of November, as Ms Notley said.

So what you're saying, then, is that perhaps this can be moved a bit? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Horne: If I can, Mr. Chair, that's my question. We do have a Deputy Chief Electoral Officer, you know, so we're not in a position where the work of this office has come to a grinding halt. If there's a way for some thought to be given to that, unless there's some other time imperative here that I'm not aware of that might be pertinent, I think we should look at that.

I guess the other thing is just with respect to your last comment. I'm quite surprised to be informed that executive search is not able

to provide the customary assistance for an appointment of this importance. I'm just wondering if there's any explanation for that?

The Chair: Yes, there is.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Actually, I've just received an e-mail.

The Chair: You've just received an e-mail? Okay. Would you mind reading that?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Do you want me to read it into the record?

The Chair: Yeah.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We did ask executive search to confirm in writing the reasons, and it says:

Thanks for your . . . consideration of our Executive Search team to assist the Select Special Chief Electoral Officer Search Committee in their upcoming search.

We are available to provide you and the Search Committee with consulting services to assist in recruiting an executive search professional to work with you on this file. To manage our level of resources and high work demands, we are currently limiting our search services to meet the needs of Alberta government departments and significant agencies, boards and commissions.

As I mentioned in our telephone conversation, I would be pleased to assist you with your evaluation of proposals and/or meeting with the successful vendor to provide them with an overview of our previous processes.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss [this] further.

It is signed by Alayne Stewart, who is the director of executive search.

The Chair: That's just a bit of a change from what I mentioned before, you know, that we will be able to use their services as well, at least for the preliminary part. I think that there are some people retiring there, and they don't have enough staff to do all of the work that they did before.

Mr. Marz: I would like to suggest that from the August 17 to 28 dates to the bottom of the page everything be moved back two weeks.

The Chair: Further advanced two weeks.

Mr. Marz: Advanced further ahead two weeks. You'd be starting at near the end of August instead of the 17th, the search committee meeting, and then everything gets backed up that two weeks until the end. So, you know, you'll still make your decision in October, which should be plenty of time to get this into the House.

The Chair: Well, that will answer Ms Notley's question, then, if we do the next one, if we move that one two weeks as well.

Ms Notley: Well, yeah. That's the thing. You'd have to move more than just what's being suggested there.

The Chair: The two bullets prior to that.

Mr. Marz: Well, could we move them the other direction: earlier? There's a PNWER conference, too.

Mrs. Scarlett: Just for clarification, there was a question in terms of access of internal documents and out of province. With the laptops

you have an ability to get access to those documents if they're posted by us.

The Chair: Okay. Did you have another comment?

Ms Notley: No. That's better information. It would be better to just actually be able to attend the meeting when those are screened, for obvious reasons.

The other thing. I note our budget there. I'm just a little concerned about the idea of our spending all this money on an executive consultant externally. Like, is this a wise way to go about this? I'm just really surprised that we have this exceptionally developed system internally, and we're going to go outside and potentially spend, you know, \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 that we wouldn't otherwise need to spend. I mean, am I the only one that thinks that that's not the best use of our money?

The Chair: We moved the budget item on the agenda down to the bottom, so we haven't even discussed that yet. We have not discussed that yet at all.

Ms Notley: Oh, did we? Okay. I'm sorry.

The Chair: There's one point, though, and I understand the summer schedules. If we do the advertising as we have it now and then wait five, six weeks before we even start doing anything, there's going to be a gap between setting the advertising out and then actually doing any screening. That is problematic as well.

Mr. Lukaszuk: Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with Ms Notley's comments. Our summer schedules are not something that I would take into much consideration because if all of us were to take out our calendars, with all the conferences and work-related trips and other engagements that we have, we probably wouldn't be able to get this done at all. So I think it's fair to accept that some of us will be missing some of the meetings, and the work just has to carry on. We have to accommodate the schedule the best that we can under the circumstances.

The Chair: There's one other point, too, that we have to keep in mind. There will probably be an external committee struck for a boundaries review, and they're going to be asking for some advice from Elections Alberta on this. This is going to have to be done in the very near future as well.

Ms Notley.

Ms Notley: Yes. I mean, I appreciate the point made by Mr. Lukaszuk; however, I think that to have the preliminary assessment of the candidates done in the very heart of the deepest, darkest part of the summer when you have at least one opposition member that's telling you right now they can't be here – presumably, you want this process to unfold in a way that is functional and open. I'm just saying that picking that part of the summer for that particular activity, I mean, kind of defines everything else that flows. I just don't think you could find a less available time in the summer than the very centre of the summer.

The Chair: Let's try this. You look at July 6 to 17. The applications are screened and the screening reports prepared by the executive search consultant. I think those either will be available on a website for all of us or we can get hard copies of them, and then we meet to review those. I guess there's also an opportunity to do

that by teleconferencing if they're not available. What we're doing is reviewing those and perhaps looking at a short list. That can be done by teleconferencing as well, because you will have availability of the copies either by hard copy or by electronics.

Mr. Campbell: We're not back in session, I think, until October 26. I would suggest, being as important as this is, that teleconferencing is one thing, but I like to be at the meeting rather than teleconferencing. I would suggest that we close the competition around the middle of July and hold our meetings in September or October, understanding that everybody wants a bit of a summer break but also understanding that in September or October we go full bore with this and get it done. If you can't attend the meeting in September, well, so be it, but at least we're not putting everybody at a disadvantage, you know, over the summer vacation.

Also, if we're hiring an outside consultant to do this, I mean, this is probably going to be their primary focus, to get this completed, so I don't think we're putting them at a disadvantage either to look at getting this done. Also, in fairness to the applicants for the position, again, July and August are prime vacation time, and people spend time with their families, so the less we can do in July and August – I think we'd be best served to look at September or October.

The Chair: Which brings up a point, Mr. Campbell. If we do that, then the competition will close at the end of June. We would close it at the end of June, and the applications will be screened the first part of August. We'd move everything two weeks because you mentioned something about the search committee looking – it would be the first part of August when we'd meet, then, right? Everything moves two weeks right from June on.

8:20

Mr. Campbell: I'd move everything two weeks back from July 3. I'd have the competition close the middle of July, and I would have us actually getting into the interviews and that in September. I mean, like you say, we're scheduling this to be reviewed October 5 to 9. With us not sitting till October 26, I don't think there's any urgency, that we can't have this reviewed the week before we come back to sit. Nothing is going to happen until we table it in the House on the 26th anyway.

I'm just trying to bring my calendar up here. You'd think that after a year I would know how to run this thing.

I would suggest that we don't have to do our final references and put the successful candidate till the 19th of October.

The Chair: So we're looking at taking everything from – actually, not July 3, unless you want to leave the advertising open longer.

Mr. Campbell: I'd leave it open longer and close it, like, July 14.

The Chair: Is that a concern? When you leave an advertisement out too long, is there a concern on that?

Mr. Campbell: Or start advertising later. There's nothing that says that we have to advertise starting June 6 to 13. We could start July 3.

The Chair: Okay.

Mrs. Scarlett: If you're adjusting your schedule, for instance, to bump everything two weeks back, I would also recommend that the actual placement of the ad be in the middle of June instead of at the beginning of June. Plus it would all run concurrently.

The Chair: So we're looking at moving the ad from June 6 to 13, then, to the end of the month, and then from there we'd move everything down two weeks, which brings up a point that Mr. Marz made earlier about August. That means that there will be at least one meeting in August.

Ms Notley: I think that's already on your agenda. You already have meetings in August.

Mr. Marz: Push it towards the end of August.

The Chair: Yeah. It would be the 15th.

Mr. Marz: I don't know if we want to start advertising in July. I'd rather stay with June. I think more people would see it in June rather than July because it's the holiday season. We don't want potential candidates to maybe miss the ad because they're out of the country.

The Chair: That goes to the other point that you mentioned, you know, that not only do we perhaps have some holiday schedules, but even the potential candidates that want to apply may also have holiday schedules. You mentioned that, too, Mr. Campbell. So maybe we're looking at extending it for three weeks, instead starting, say, June 20.

Mr. Horne: Mr. Chair, if I can just make a suggestion. I don't think the committee needs to get into necessarily the level of detail of all of these steps. The ones that concern and require the committee to meet are probably the most important. Surely, if we ask for the time frame to be reworked along the lines that Mr. Campbell has suggested, the clerk can provide us through you with a revised schedule. We can have a discussion around the August meeting on what timing might best suit most members of the committee. Beyond that, I'm not sure what else we can do at this juncture.

The Chair: To be clear, there was a point that Mrs. Scarlett made about the advertising, which is important as well. That's why I'm discussing that.

Mr. Horne: We can provide that direction now in terms of the rest of it.

The Chair: Yeah.

Ms Notley: Of course, I say this without knowing a lot of the background that preceded it, but it seems to me that part of the challenge arises from the fact that we're spending six weeks up front going after an outside executive search service. I mean, I'm not in government; I'm not a government member. But is there no capacity for us to ask that some of those priorities be reshifted? Some of the other work that's being done by executive search: is it as time-sensitive as the CEO is, you know, with respect to the boundaries and the session? All those important time-sensitive issues are there, and those drive our agenda. I understand that, but it appears as though there's been a decision made internal to government that that level takes a lower priority than other things, which is thus pushing this whole process six weeks later than it needs to be and then pushing our application and recruitment efforts into the summer, when it's the most difficult time to do it. I don't know what say we have over that, but that seems to me to be part of the challenge here. I'm just not sure: do we have the capacity to question that initial decision?

The Chair: Well, I think you're going on to number 6, actually.

Ms Notley: Well, it's just that it impacts the timeline so dramatically, right? I mean, if you look at April 22 to June 5, that's what we're doing.

Mr. Horne: Mr. Chair, I wonder if I could suggest that on the issue that Ms Notley is speaking about, which concerns me greatly as well, the committee could perhaps through you request that the Clerk of the Assembly take up this matter directly with executive search on behalf of the committee, perhaps provide a little more background on the significance of this particular assignment, and see if some accommodation might be made within that office to provide us with the required assistance. I recognize in saying this that the answer may come back no, but I think it's a valid question that needs to be asked, particularly in the economic circumstances that the province finds itself in.

The Chair: Good point, Mr. Horne. I think that, yes, absolutely, I can do that. If the answer comes back no, then we're moving forward with the timeline we've set. If the answer comes back yes, then there can be some adjustments to the timelines that we've been talking about, correct?

Are we okay, then, with this? We've talked about adjusting the timelines; we've moved things. Now it all hinges, really, on a discussion with the Clerk as well. Okay? So when I've had the discussion and we have the decision back, it'll be circulated, and we can move forward then with whatever decision was made. Okay?

Well, with that, I think we need – no, we don't need a motion on that, do we?

Mrs. Sawchuk: If the committee wants to hold this document kind of in abeyance until that next step is taken, I think we can just leave it, not put a motion on the record at this point.

The Chair: Fine.

Okay. Let's move on to number 6, then, the search consultant. You know, the LAO human resources can assist the committee. I've been given the note that we just received from executive search that they can also assist. The suggestion by Ms Notley is questioning whether there's a need for an external search consultant to be contracted, and I guess I'm open for comments on this as well.

Mr. Campbell: Well, I think we just leave that in abeyance, too, until we get a response from the Clerk on whether or not we can adjust the schedule of the executive search to do the work we need.

The Chair: Okay.

Mrs. Scarlett: With respect to whatever comes out of the issue that's being pursued, indeed, the option in terms of looking at a consultant, I think it's important to state that there is a difference between going out and looking for a firm to provide the full services that an executive search firm would be doing in some cases – that being, meeting with the committee right off the top, developing the advertisement, doing the advertising on our behalf – whereas what is being proposed in the one scenario is that with the oversight, whether it's of human resource services with the Legislative Assembly or also the assistance that's been offered through CHR by the direction of the committee here, the services that we're looking for through the RFP would be very select in terms of providing labour and assistance relative to some of the screening processes, initial evaluations. There will be significant involvement, you know,

through human resources services or CHR, whichever, in terms of guiding the process along and assisting in that. So it's combined.

8:30

The Chair: Okay. We will also hold that in abeyance as well given that if the answer comes back from the Clerk that this isn't possible, then we're going to have to meet again shortly. Everyone fine with that? Okay.

That takes us to the draft position profile. The profile that you have in your documents was updated with the assistance of Elections Alberta and the Deputy Chief Electoral Officer. For the committee's information the profile is referred to in the position advertisement and is also posted on the external committee website along with the position advertisement. Are there any questions with regard to this position profile?

Ms Notley: Is there someplace where we can see how the profile is updated, to compare the old with the new?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Mr. Chair, I could pull out the old one. I believe the only changes were that they've had changes in the numbers of staff, and then they also accommodated any legislative changes that have been made since the last CEO was hired. I can definitely pull the 2005-06 one that we had and circulate it to members if they'd like.

Mr. Lund: Mr. Chairman, when you go over and look at the knowledge/experience requirements, because we're going to be doing a boundary review, I think it's really, really important that this individual have a pretty thorough understanding of Alberta. This upcoming boundary review is going to be extremely critical when we look at the changes in the population and what has happened around the province. I don't see anything in this under number 9, the knowledge/experience requirements, that relates to this individual having a good understanding of Alberta. I've observed some of the obscene things that happened in the federal redistribution. It's just unbelievable how anybody could draw the lines the way they were drawn. I would urge us to put another bullet in there that would acknowledge that the individual needs to have an understanding of Alberta. I'm talking about the geographic, nothing else.

The Chair: That's duly noted. A point to that too, though, is that certainly this individual, his or her office, will be making recommendations to the boundary review committee, which will be an external committee. But it's a point well taken, I think, Mr. Lund. How would that be worded, as you mentioned it, that the individual have some geographic knowledge of Alberta?

Mr. Marz: Mr. Chairman, if I may, it's not just geographic. It's travel patterns within those geographic areas, I think.

Mr. Lund: But that all fits into it.

Mr. Marz: Yeah. As long as that's understood.

Mr. Lund: Yes. Exactly. I know we don't want to have the book be too long, but those are the kinds of points for our communications people, who are expert in how to use words.

The Chair: Perhaps they would be able to draft something that would be appropriate.

Mr. Lund: Thank you.

The Chair: Any other points with regard to the position profile?

Ms Notley: I was just looking for the section where it talks about the relationship with – I think it's under Organization: "is responsible for two groups." It's on page 4. It's not clear what exactly is being said there. I mean, it talks about being a direct employer of some people, and then it talks about this critical relationship with the deputy returning officers. It says, "Implicit in the legislation is the authority of the Chief Electoral Officer." I have to say that it's really not a clear statement of what's going on there. I was really trying to get an understanding of what was trying to be said there. If someone could tell me, that would be great, but I read it several times and didn't quite understand what it was supposed to mean.

Mrs. Sawchuk: I believe – and I could be wrong here, too – that they were trying to make the distinction between the staff that are hired directly through the office of Elections Alberta or the Chief Electoral Officer and who respond directly to Elections Alberta and those that are then hired on that next level down by the returning officers, et cetera, and who report to the returning officers. It's like an indirect line of reporting that they wanted to distinguish. We could ask for a rewrite on that portion if the committee so wishes.

Mr. Lukaszuk: Well, this is a descriptive document. The actual relationship and organizational pattern of that office are clearly laid out in the act and the regulations. If you disagree with this description of what the act and regulations say, that's fine, but it's actually all in the act and the regs. It doesn't really matter what this document says. It's the act and the regs that prevail, right?

Ms Notley: Well, I'm not saying that I disagree. I'm just saying that it's not clear. I mean, I understand the desire to distinguish between the two. That's fine. I'm just saying that the position profile is not clear as to what the line of authority is there. That's all.

The Chair: That certainly could be rewritten to make it a little more clear.

Any other points on the position profile? Would someone move that the committee approve this Chief Electoral Officer position profile as amended as suggested? Mr. Lukaszuk. All in favour? It's carried. Thank you.

This takes us to the draft advertising plan and the draft advertising copy. You also have that in your papers. I guess I can ask Ms Sales or Ms Friesacher to address this. They've completed the draft advertising plan for consideration as well as a draft advertisement copy, so I'll turn it over to you people.

Ms Friesacher: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As you mentioned, we have put together some options for the committee to review. This is based on previous search committees. We've utilized the entire budget here, so depending on the committee's direction, we can move some options around.

We'll start with option 1. That's an Alberta-wide advertising strategy. That would be to advertise two runs in the Saturday career sections of the *Edmonton Journal* and the *Calgary Herald* as well as single runs in Alberta's five other dailies.

The second option is a western Canada recruitment strategy. That is option 1 plus a triple run in the *Globe and Mail*'s western edition.

Option 3 is a national recruitment strategy, which is option 1, option 2, plus the career section of the *National Post* and the *Globe and Mail*'s national career section.

Depending on the committee's direction on where they want to advertise and who the target audience is, we can target these.

The Chair: For the committee's sake, too, the previous CEO search advertisement was placed in all the Alberta dailies as well as the *Globe and Mail* for the western provinces, from Manitoba west, and in the *National Post*.

8:40

Mr. Lukaszuk: Have you considered any electronic media other than just newspapers?

Ms Friesacher: A lot of these newspapers, actually, do come with a web-based component, so it's also a careers.com. There is an option; the *Globe and Mail* provides a listing on Workopolis for \$299. Advertising in newspapers is still quite a reach, a good way to reach a target audience, especially at the executive level.

Mrs. Scarlett: In addition, that ad and job profile will be listed on our website, on the CEO search website. So it's there with the appropriate links.

The Chair: We've got three options, really. The first option you mentioned was strictly within Alberta. The second option, basically, if I can kind of sum it up, is western Canada. The third option is Canada-wide. Any comments?

Ms Notley: Seems to me that we had this discussion before, when we were pursuing applications for the Ethics Commissioner, and it seems to me – correct me if I'm wrong – that we went with the widest possible distribution in part around this whole issue that we've just been discussing again, which is that it's summer and that even those great western-based people will be sometimes summering in P.E.I. I just remember this discussion from almost this time last year. So I think that it's our duty to make sure that we have the broadest advertisement and recruitment strategy possible to get the best person.

Ms Friesacher: That is correct. I can confirm that you actually did go with option 3 for the Ethics Commissioner search.

Mr. Campbell: I think we should go with option 3.

The Chair: Any other discussion?

Mr. Marz: The cost of getting people here from far distances ends up being a fairly significant cost as well. The farther you go, the bigger the costs are.

The Chair: I think that that became a point as well during the Ethics Commissioner one. I think that was addressed then, that if they were interested, they made their own arrangements to get here. Didn't we have one – we're getting way off topic here – from South Africa or something like that who was vacationing or something?

Mrs. Scarlett: With respect to the normal screening process and first-round interviews, there are many different options available dependent upon where the candidates are residing, some of those being telephone interviews as a first step, if you wanted to look at that.

The Chair: That's correct. Yeah.
Are there any other questions?

Mr. Campbell: Do you need a motion for that?

The Chair: Yes, I do.

Mr. Campbell: I move that
we go with option 3 as presented by LAO communications and approve the advertising plan and the advertising copy.

The Chair: All in favour? That's carried.

This takes us to the budget. An interesting point on the budget will certainly be dependent on what the decision is after we have a discussion with the Clerk. Is there any point in discussing this, then? It could be one way or the other. If the Clerk's decision is that this is not possible and we do have to do an RFP, I believe, then, that will mean that we have got to meet again for a short meeting for those two points: for the outside consultant and the budget. I might add: meet very shortly. I'll be meeting with him right away.

Mrs. Kamuchik: If I may, Mr. Chair, the committee could approve a budget which includes the possible cost of labour and services. If for some reason the Clerk is successful in being able to talk CHR into doing the screening for the search committee, then the funds would not be used and would be returned to the general revenue fund. It would save some time, the committee not having to meet again to approve a budget based on whether or not we have to go with an RFP and an outside consulting firm. Again, if the funds are there but are not used, then they're not used.

The Chair: Okay. That's a good point. Any other comments on that?

I guess that means that we need a motion to approve the budget as presented.

Mr. Lund: I haven't seen the budget.

The Chair: It was in the copies.

Mrs. Sawchuk: It was sent out by e-mail attachment the second day, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: It was the second attachment that came out. Have all the members had an opportunity to see the budget? Okay.

Mr. Horne: So moved.

The Chair: Mr. Horne moves that we approve the budget as presented. All in favour? Opposed? That's carried.

Is there any other business?

Just to recap, I will be meeting with Dr. McNeil, and then we'll be polling the committee very shortly, within the next day, to find out when we can meet for a short meeting to do those two points. Anything else?

A motion to adjourn. Mr. Marz. All in favour? That's carried. Thank you again for coming out.

[The committee adjourned at 8:47 a.m.]

