



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature  
Second Session

Select Special  
Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner  
Search Committee

Tuesday, February 7, 2017  
10:04 a.m.

Transcript No. 29-2-1

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta  
The 29th Legislature  
Second Session**

**Select Special Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner Search Committee**

Shepherd, David, Edmonton-Centre (ND), Chair  
Malkinson, Brian, Calgary-Currie (ND), Deputy Chair

Ellis, Mike, Calgary-West (PC)  
Horne, Trevor A.R., Spruce Grove-St. Albert (ND)  
Kleinsteuber, Jamie, Calgary-Northern Hills (ND)  
Littlewood, Jessica, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (ND)  
Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie (W)  
van Dijken, Glenn, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (W)  
Woollard, Denise, Edmonton-Mill Creek (ND)

**Corporate Human Resources Participants**

Dot Ellerby	Consultant, Executive Search
Trish Mills	Director, Executive Search

**Support Staff**

Robert H. Reynolds, QC	Clerk
Shannon Dean	Law Clerk and Director of House Services
Trafton Koenig	Parliamentary Counsel
Stephanie LeBlanc	Parliamentary Counsel and Legal Research Officer
Philip Massolin	Manager of Research and Committee Services
Sarah Amato	Research Officer
Nancy Robert	Research Officer
Corinne Dacyshyn	Committee Clerk
Jody Rempel	Committee Clerk
Aaron Roth	Committee Clerk
Karen Sawchuk	Committee Clerk
Cheryl Scarlett	Director of Human Resources, Information Technology and Broadcast Services
Rhonda Sorensen	Manager of Corporate Communications and Broadcast Services
Jeanette Dotimas	Communications Consultant
Tracey Sales	Communications Consultant
Janet Schwegel	Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

**10:04 a.m.****Tuesday, February 7, 2017**

[Mr. Shepherd in the chair]

**The Chair:** Well, good morning, everyone. I'd like to welcome members, staff, guests to this meeting of the Select Special Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner Search Committee. Say that five times fast.

My name is David Shepherd, MLA for Edmonton-Centre, chair of this committee. I just ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record, and then we'll hear from those on the phone.

**Mr. Malkinson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. My name is Brian Malkinson, MLA for Calgary-Currie and deputy chair.

**Mr. van Dijken:** Glenn van Dijken, MLA for Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

**Ms Scarlett:** Cheryl Scarlett, director of human resources, information technology, and broadcast services.

**Ms Mills:** Trish Mills, director of executive search in corporate human resources.

**Ms Ellerby:** Dot Ellerby, executive search consultant, corporate human resources.

**Ms Woollard:** Denise Woollard, MLA, Edmonton-Mill Creek.

**Mr. Horne:** Trevor Horne, MLA for Spruce Grove-St. Albert.

**Mr. Kleinsteuber:** Jamie Kleinsteuber, the MLA for Calgary-Northern Hills.

**Ms Dotimas:** Jeanette Dotimas of communications for the LAO.

**Ms Sorensen:** Rhonda Sorensen, manager of corporate communications and broadcast services with the LAO.

**Mr. Reynolds:** Good morning. Rob Reynolds, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

**Ms Dean:** Shannon Dean, Law Clerk and director of House services.

**Ms Rempel:** Good morning. Jody Rempel, committee clerk.

**The Chair:** Thank you.  
On the phones.

**Mr. Ellis:** Mike Ellis, MLA, Calgary-West.

**Mrs. Littlewood:** Jessica Littlewood, MLA representing Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville.

**Mrs. Pitt:** Angela Pitt, MLA, Airdrie.

**The Chair:** Thank you, everyone.

All right. Before we turn to the business at hand, a few quick operational items. The microphone consoles are, of course, operated by *Hansard* staff. Please ensure your cellphones are in silent mode. As usual, audio of the committee proceedings is streamed live online, recorded by *Alberta Hansard*. Audio access and meeting transcripts can be obtained through the Legislative Assembly website.

Before we proceed any further with our business today, because this, of course, is the first meeting of the search committee and

because we have members that are joining us by phone today, we just need to quickly address the issue of teleconferencing. As all members are aware, section 6 of the Legislative Assembly Act permits participation in a committee meeting "by means of telephone or other communication facilities that permit all Members participating in the meeting to hear each other if all the members of the committee consent." We have the option of passing a motion now to permit teleconferencing, when available, for the duration of our mandate, or we can deal with this on a meeting-by-meeting basis. A motion to permit teleconferencing for the duration of our mandate would not preclude the committee from determining that in-person attendance at a specific meeting is required, and either motion would need to pass unanimously. Do we have discussion, questions, on the issue of teleconferencing?

Okay. We have two options in front of us. One, we can pass a motion for this particular meeting saying that teleconferencing is okay, or two, we can pass a motion saying that we are fine with teleconferencing, when available, for the duration of the mandate of this committee. Do we have a member that would wish to move either motion?

**Mr. Kleinsteuber:** I'll move the second motion, for the duration of the committee.

**The Chair:** Okay. Clerk, if you could read the wording on that.

**Ms Rempel:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I believe that Mr. Kleinsteuber has moved that

for the duration of its mandate the Select Special Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner Search Committee permit committee members to participate by teleconference subject to the proviso that the committee may require members' attendance at a particular meeting upon passage of a motion to that effect at a previous meeting.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Clerk.

We have that motion, then, on the floor. Just to note that members that are joining us on the phone are not able to vote on this particular motion as the motion is required to enable them to vote. All right. Do we have any questions or concerns regarding the wording of the motion as read?

If not, I will call the question. All those in favour of the motion as read by the clerk? Any opposed? That motion is carried and carried unanimously. Thank you.

We can move on, then, to look at the agenda today. The agenda was posted online. You've had a chance to review it. Do we have a member who would like to move a motion to adopt the agenda as posted? Ms Woollard. Thank you. All those in favour of adopting the agenda as posted? Okay. Any opposed? That motion is carried.

All right, then. We can move on, then, to the business of the day. Starting off with a quick orientation to give us a sense of a few of the pieces that are going to be involved in our work, we'll start out with the mandate. The mandate comes from Government Motion 34, a copy of which has been provided for information purposes and, of course, was brought forward in the last legislative session. Mr. Reynolds and Ms Dean are available if there are any questions regarding the mandate set out for the committee.

**10:10**

Okay. Hearing none, we'll move on to the next item, the committee budget. We do have funds in the committee's budget to cover the work of this committee, including advertising costs, member travel, and sundries. Ms Dean is available if there are any questions regarding the budget that we have available to the committee.

Hearing none, we'll move on to the next section in regard to committee support. First of all, we've had the opportunity to go around and introduce ourselves, but I'd like to take a moment to give committee members a bit more information on the support available to us through the search process. Again, I'd like to welcome Trish Mills. She's the director of executive search, who in addition to her professional expertise has also assisted a number of search committees and previous officer recruitment campaigns. I'd also like to welcome Dot Ellerby. She's the executive search consultant who will be assisting us with all aspects of the recruitment process. Thank you for joining us.

**Ms Mills:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wanted to provide just a bit of an overview about executive search. We are part of corporate human resources, which is the legislated responsibility of the President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance. Our team leads corporate programs to attract and recruit talent for executive manager and senior official positions in the Alberta public service. We provide consulting supports to some of the public agencies, and upon request we support select special search committees on recruitment of officers of the Legislature.

As the chair mentioned, we've worked with a number of select special search committees in the past, and in terms of our role that's typically involved helping the preparation of a position profile to present as draft to the committee; preparing draft advertising copy; if requested, providing input on advertising strategy; completing preliminary screening of applications based on the requirements set out in the ad and the position profile; and preparing resumes and summary information to facilitate the search committee's review of those documents.

If we're requested by the committee, we'll conduct preliminary interviews with candidates to facilitate a shortlisting and participate in final interviews with the committee. We also conduct reference checks on top for selected candidates and report all back to the committee to support their decision-making. We maintain an interface or liaison role with all candidates through the process, responding to any questions and directing communication back, and we assist the committee clerk on any communications more formally required to go to candidates from the committee. We also maintain an official competition record.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Do any committee members have any questions for Ms Mills or Ms Ellerby?

Hearing none, the next support available, then, of course, is through the Legislative Assembly Office, so in addition to those two officials we will have support from the Legislative Assembly Office staff. We have Mr. Reynolds, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, with us here today, and we'll give him the opportunity, I guess, to introduce his staff and if he'd like to provide brief comment on the support they can provide.

**Mr. Reynolds:** Well, thank you very much, Chair. It's a great pleasure to be here this morning with you all and those on the telephone. Congratulations on this very important committee.

I don't know how many of you have been on a search committee before. In my experience it takes a few months. Sometimes it takes a little longer than you'd think, but one of the greatest things about these search committees that I enjoy is just the fact that members all seem to work together very well on it. To me the search committees represent sometimes the best of the Assembly, all members working together to achieve something that's very good for the province and reflects well on themselves and the Assembly, in this

case the Ombudsman and the Public Interest Commissioner, bracket, whistle-blower protection person.

In any event, what we have here – I'd like to introduce the staff of the Legislative Assembly Office and describe briefly how they might be able to assist you, in addition, of course, to Trish and Dot. We all work together in this endeavour.

First of all, there's Cheryl Scarlett, who is known to you all, I imagine, the director of human resources, information technology, and broadcast services. You should have seen when she had a long title. Cheryl has worked extensively with executive search before on many search committees, and she has worked to prepare a draft of the position profile in this case, which you will be reviewing shortly. She works with executive search through the process of the competition and at the end, when you've chosen a candidate, too.

My colleague Shannon Dean is to my right here, which is difficult for you folks on the phone to know. Shannon is the Law Clerk and the director of House services. She has been with the Assembly for over 20 years. She's very experienced in providing advice to search committees. She will provide the legal advice and co-ordinate any procedural advice or support that's needed.

Dr. Philip Massolin is not here today. He's in a sunnier clime. He's the manager of research and committee services. He'll be able to provide procedural support. Usually search committees, in my experience, don't require a lot of research, but I imagine you'll guide your own way.

With respect to communications, on my left here is Rhonda Sorensen, who's the manager of corporate communications and broadcast services, and Jeanette Dotimas, who is a communications consultant. She's an integral part of communications. They do great work, and they'll be talking to you about a communications plan, which is essential in terms of how you advertise for the position. They're very adept, as committee members will know, with social media and other avenues that you may wish to get the message out on to attract the most qualified candidates.

Finally, last but, as they say, certainly not least, Jody Rempel, the committee clerk, who will be providing you with administrative and procedural support throughout the committee. Jody also is your first point of contact. Of course, her smiling face is the first one you see when you enter the room, generally. Her e-mails are the ones that alert you to what you have and haven't done and what you will be doing, and she'll be, generally, as you know, soliciting you for advice with respect to when you can meet. She's really the person who's the main administrative person for the committee, and of course don't hesitate to contact her.

Good luck in your work. It's important work. The Ombudsman is the oldest office. Well, I shouldn't say that. Peter Hourihan might be listening. He's not the oldest person around, but the act is the oldest act of the officers of the Legislature. Maybe it could be brushed up sometime, but that's not your task. Alberta was one of the first if not the first province to have an Ombudsman. It's been an honoured position, and I know you'll appreciate this the more you get into your work.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Reynolds.

Moving on, then, to the question of substitutions and teleconferencing, the standing orders also allow for official substitutes to be designated to participate in a committee meeting. Now, although substitutes are permitted, the members of previous search committees have at times agreed amongst themselves not to appoint substitutes once the selection process begins because of the need for consistency and the difficulty of having a member try to step in and participate effectively in only one part of the recruitment process. I think this has worked well in the past and certainly has

some good reason behind it, but I'll leave it to the discretion of the committee as to whether or not we would want to take a similar approach.

**10:20**

I'd like to open up the floor, then, for discussion by committee members. What are your thoughts on how we would like to proceed in regard to substitutions?

The clerk just pointed out to me that this is not something on which we can make a motion because standing orders allow for substitution; this would more be a general agreement amongst members as to a principle we would like to hold to in proceeding with this process.

Would members, generally, be in agreement that we would want to discourage substitutes as part of this process? Mr. Malkinson.

**Mr. Malkinson:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. With this search I think the logic would be sound for why we would want to discourage substitutions. You know, I think of just the hiring I've done in my office, for example, which, of course, is a bit of a different thing. You want that consistency, to be able to see the answers to questions one candidate has given versus another, and it would make sense to have that consistency, I think, to make the final decision. At least from my personal perspective, I think what you're suggesting makes sense, and I would be interested to hear from any other committee member who has an opinion one way or another on that.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Malkinson.

Any other members have thoughts or comments? Anyone on the phones? Mr. van Dijken.

**Mr. van Dijken:** Yes. Thank you, Chair. Yes, I do believe the recommendation is a good one. What it does do for us as committee members is that it charges us to be diligent in the work that we're doing and to make ourselves available as best we can. I think the recommendation is the proper way forward in the circumstance, so I would support that recommendation.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. van Dijken.

We have the general proposal, then, that we would be in agreement that we would not appoint substitutes for future meetings in this process. Any members wish to raise any concerns or objections with that? Excellent. We'll let the record show, then, that the committee is in general agreement on that point. Thank you.

One last point, then, regarding meeting attendance. Now, of course, we've discussed the question of teleconferencing, and we made the decision that it would be permitted, but I'll just remind committee members to please advise the committee office in advance if you wish to make use of that option.

In regard to the interview process itself, there is an issue of attendance and participation in selecting the final candidate of choice, to be recommended by the committee. Again, this is something that's been brought up by previous search committees, and there's been agreement amongst committee members that only members who have been present for all candidate interviews in their entirety should participate in the final candidate selection. That's been the general practice and agreement of previous committees, the logic being, I guess, that if you haven't been present to hear all candidates, you aren't properly informed to make a full decision. Of course, that's at the discretion of the committee, so I'd like to open the floor if any members have any thoughts, comments on that as an agreement.

**Mr. van Dijken:** I guess I have one question. You know, we made a general agreement, not through motion but through general understanding. In the case of extenuating circumstances, say the death of a committee member and possibly needing to replace that member, we put ourselves in a position where – is this another general understanding, or is this a hard-and-fast motion that we're looking for?

**The Chair:** Clerk.

**Ms Rempel:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Of course, you know, I'm just going to comment on what I've seen in previous search committees. It's not a hard-and-fast motion, as the chair already noted with the substitution issue. I mean, they are permitted by the standing orders. I don't believe the idea with previous committees has ever been to make something impossibly difficult, as you say in the case of the death of a committee member or just something entirely unanticipated like that. I think it's more, actually, in line with your comments earlier in the meeting. It is, really, just to encourage everyone to get together and to make themselves available and to make sure everyone is on the same page as they're going through the process.

**Mr. van Dijken:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Any other thoughts or comments from members?

Would the committee generally be in agreement, then, around the principle that it would be expected that members would be present for all candidate interviews in order to participate in the final selection of a candidate? Any objections or concerns? All right. On the record, then, we'll note that that's adopted as a general agreement by members of the committee. Thank you.

Moving on, then, to confidentiality and documents of the proceedings, I'd just finally like to remind everyone just briefly about the importance of respecting the confidentiality of all applicants throughout this search process. In order to safeguard the privacy of potential applicants, previous search committees have distributed most briefing materials to committee members in hard copy, and they are considered for your eyes only, as it were. Once a meeting is over, committee members leave their materials behind so that documents can be shredded, reorganized, et cetera, as appropriate for the next meeting. To ensure consistency for committee members, the materials prepared by the committees branch are distributed to you in a personalized binder, so you can feel free to make any notes, et cetera, on the materials.

Does anyone have any questions or concerns with that process? Okay. Excellent. I hear none.

We have a few decision items, then, that we have to consider as a committee today. First of all, we have the position profile, which has been posted online. We've had that available online for members to review. It's the position profile for the role of Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner. Before we begin our discussions, I'd just ask if Ms Scarlett could maybe give us a quick overview of the document and how it was put together.

**Ms Scarlett:** Thank you, Chair. Together with my friends here we had the opportunity to take a look at the previous Ombudsman position profile, with the intent of updating the profile to primarily build in the component in terms of the Public Interest Commissioner responsibilities as well. What you see in front of you is an updated document from 2011 that took and combined together the roles and responsibilities for both the Ombudsman and the Public Interest Commissioner. We also had the opportunity to meet with the current incumbent to solicit any kind of feedback relative to the primary responsibilities, and we thank him very much for his comments and assistance in that.

The primary changes are directly related to the addition of duties related to the Public Interest Commissioner. It has been formatted in a template that is similar to past search documents and presented to you for any questions, comments, or approval.

**The Chair:** Excellent. Thank you, Ms Scarlett.

Do members have any questions regarding the document, the profile? Members on the phone, any questions?

**Mr. Ellis:** No. Thank you, Chair.

**The Chair:** I'm not hearing any questions from members. That being the case, do we have a member who would like to move a motion, then, that we accept the profile as created?

**Mr. Kleinsteuber:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Mr. Kleinsteuber would like to make that motion. Ms Rempel, do we have wording for that motion?

**Ms Rempel:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I believe that Mr. Kleinsteuber has moved that

the Select Special Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner Search Committee adopt the Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner position profile as distributed.

**10:30**

**The Chair:** Excellent. All right. Any further discussion on that motion?

Hearing none, I'll call the question. All those in favour of the motion? On the phones? Thank you. Anyone opposed? That motion is carried.

We'll move, then, to the draft search timetable and discussion of process. We have a draft timetable for the recruitment process that was included with the meeting materials. This is a fairly aggressive timetable. If necessary, it can be adjusted according to our needs, but this, I think, gives us a useful outline for the structure of the process of our search.

Ms Scarlett, if we can ask you to maybe just run through the timetable with us quickly before we open the floor for discussion.

**Ms Scarlett:** Thank you again. As charted out, we've tried to identify the major components and milestones to assist the committee in planning for the next meetings. The first step, obviously, is today in terms of approval of the documents. Thereafter we will go out based on your direction in terms of posting the position. When the competition closes, CHR will be our primary folks involved in the initial screening criteria to bring all the resumés and information relative to screening back to the committee. The committee then will review and provide direction in terms of first-round interviews, again meeting to review the results of the first-round interviews, further direction in terms of further screening for further interviews, and hand in hand with that, at the direction of the committee, obviously, reference checks and security screening, again coming back to the committee so that the committee can review and make a final decision. Then the Clerk and myself will be assisting in terms of the contract negotiations, et cetera, based on the direction of the committee. Once that's finalized, then the committee report is tabled.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms Scarlett.

As noted, this is an aggressive timetable. It does require a fair amount of commitment from each of us as committee members to accomplish this, but I think it's reasonable that it could be done. We will have a bit of a discussion later about how this may work around the estimates period, but at present it looks like the next step for the

committee, then, would be that we would be meeting around the week of March 20. So during that constituency week we'd need to find time.

That said, we have Ms Scarlett and the other persons who are involved in this process here if members have any questions about this timeline or concerns. Ms Woollard.

**Ms Woollard:** Thank you, Chair. As you've already identified, this is a pretty aggressive timeline for the committee to fulfill its mandate but also to carry out a thorough search. I'm just wondering how feasible – I mean, obviously, when you constructed it, you must have looked at the feasibility. How feasible is it likely to be, and do you think that the various support teams will be able to accommodate these timelines?

**Ms Scarlett:** The timeline that's outlined here, although aggressive, is similar to the timeline that was accomplished with a previous search committee, and we've had discussions amongst ourselves here in terms of our ability to commit and also work together to meet the proposed schedule that's laid forward.

**Ms Woollard:** Thank you.  
Just one supplemental.

**The Chair:** Certainly.

**Ms Woollard:** Does it look likely that this timeline will allow time for members of the committee to receive the documentation in enough time to be able to review documentation thoroughly in order to make informed decisions, in your best opinion?

**Ms Scarlett:** Again, they are aggressive time frames and dependent upon – you know, as we go through the stages here, I think the first area that is very time intensive is reviewing all the applications that are received and going through screening, making the notes, quite frankly, and putting them in a binder and getting them to you for a review. Also, when we come to that meeting with the committee, then Ms Mills and Ms Ellerby will be taking you through, in terms of each of the applications, the screening criteria to assist you with that as well. So it's not upon you to have to go and do your own detailed screening of each. We want to try to assist in terms of having all that documentation there for you.

As soon as the screening is done, we will be getting those materials to you for review. Part of it depends on how many applications are received in terms of the volume, but it was doable in the last search committee under these time frames, and the committee was comfortable that they had the materials in an appropriate time.

**Ms Woollard:** Thank you. That's very helpful.

**The Chair:** Ms Dean, you had a comment?

**Ms Dean:** I wanted to point out for the committee members – and I believe everyone is aware of this requirement in the standing orders. Once the budget process begins, in order for this committee to continue its work, there will need to be a motion passed in the Assembly. I know it's on the chair's radar and up for consideration, perhaps, later on at this meeting.

**The Chair:** Mr. van Dijken.

**Mr. van Dijken:** Thank you, Chair. My question is essentially on process, on identifying individuals that would be deemed eligible for such a position. We essentially are engaging in about a three-week timeline for advertising and receiving applications. Does

corporate human services do any headhunting, essentially? That is what I'm thinking with regard to identifying individuals that are felt to be very qualified for a position such as this. Do they then go through different mechanisms to allow those individuals to be made aware of the process that we're engaging in, whether that be in the province, outside the province, that type of thing?

**Ms Mills:** Thank you for that question. Our team does not typically engage in directly contacting candidates and doing what you described as headhunting.

The communications plan, which we haven't yet discussed: what we would recommend and what I think is reflected there is a very broad strategy that includes efforts to target pools of qualified, likely interested individuals, including professional organizations, and other means of reaching individuals with backgrounds that we believe we've identified in the profile. So rather than target individuals, our approach is to reach out to groups of those people and try to engage them that way.

**The Chair:** Do we have any other thoughts, comments, questions on the proposed timeline?

**Mr. Malkinson:** Just a quick question for Parliamentary Counsel, just following up on what you mentioned earlier. In case we miss our required timeline, i.e., we go longer than when the House – what I'm trying to say is: if we make our decision after the House rises, what procedurally are our options in that case?

**Ms Dean:** What an excellent question. There's a mechanism in both statutes – and I apologize; I don't have them right before me. My understanding, my recollection is that this committee communicates with the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices, who, in turn, then submits the recommendation to government, and they pass an order in council. Then subsequently there's a motion brought forward in the House. I can confirm that and bring that back to the committee at a later date.

**Mr. Malkinson:** I think we all share the same goal to get it done on time. I just thought I'd ask the question.

**Ms Dean:** There is a mechanism whereby the Standing Committee on Leg. Offices has a role in communicating your decision.

**Mr. Malkinson:** Okay.

10:40

**The Chair:** Okay. Excellent. Any further thoughts, questions from members? Anyone on the phones?

All right. We can move on, then, to the draft advertising plan and advertising copy. We've had some discussion about this already. The draft communications plan along with some sample ads have been prepared for our consideration by the LAO communications branch, and at this point I'll ask Ms Sorensen to address that document, and then we'll have the opportunity for some discussion.

**Ms Sorensen:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm sure you've all read with great interest the communications plan we've put together for you. As Ms Mills has indicated, we're trying to include some broad-scope options as well as some very narrow-targeted options. You may choose to go with all of them; you may choose to pick through and decide on some of them. To give you a little bit of background, about five or six years ago, when a different committee doing the same work chose an Ombudsman, they chose to advertise twice in the *Edmonton Journal* and the *Calgary Herald*, which also included a posting on working.com. They chose a fairly narrow scope, but we have provided you with more options if for no other reason than

there are more options available to us today than there were five or six years ago.

First of all, we've put together some general advertising options, which include all of the daily publications in Alberta. With those, of course, are an online component. Not only do you get the print ad, but you also get the online component with those publications. We've also provided some costs if you chose to go nationally. With the *National Post* you're looking at \$2,200 for one ad. The *Globe and Mail*: they don't offer a one-ad posting; you get a package of three ads in print and 30 days online for \$12,000.

Then if you go to the next page, we're looking at some more targeted advertising options, which would include professional organizations. There are also some in the no-cost initiatives, but these are the paid advertising with the Canadian Bar Association as well as the Institute of Public Administration of Canada and, opening it up a little bit more, even a LinkedIn option and an Indeed option. With the LinkedIn package you're able to filter key qualifications so that people looking for those specific qualifications would be more likely to see the ad. A similar service with Indeed. I don't know if any of you are familiar with Indeed. It's similar to Google AdWords, where you're really trying to increase the profile of that particular posting. We're looking at a cost of \$500 to do something like that.

Then, of course, we would look at some no-cost initiatives, too, such as media relations, using news releases and our social media avenues to let people know that this search is ongoing and to link them back to our website. Also, the committee website: we'd put the full ad and the job profile on there and then look at the professional associations that offer no-cost initiatives such as the Forum of Canadian Ombudsmen, the Canadian Council of Parliamentary Ombudsman, and the Association of Canadian College and University Ombudspersons.

Altogether, Mr. Chair, if the committee were to choose to go with all of this, we're looking at under \$25,000. Then, of course, we've broken down the individual costs should the committee choose to focus in on specific initiatives.

I'll leave it at that.

**The Chair:** Thank you. Excellent.

Do we have any thoughts, questions from members? Mr. Horne.

**Mr. Horne:** Yeah. Thank you. Just flipping through the plan here, I was wondering if it was possible to get a bit more information on the *Globe and Mail* package. It is comparatively hefty.

**Ms Sorensen:** Yes. The *Globe and Mail*: we did speak with them today to see if they would offer us, like, just one ad, and they did say no. They would offer us the same price, though, to advertise four times as opposed to the initial three times that they had quoted us. Essentially, if you look at the *National Post* ad, you're looking at \$2,200 for one run. This would be now four runs, so \$3,000 per run. The difference with the *Globe and Mail* over the *National Post* is that you don't really have the choice but to run multiple times. That also offers – and I always say this wrong, so forgive me – eluta.ca, their online component. That is included within that package.

**Mr. Horne:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Any other members have any questions regarding the proposed ad communications plan? Anyone on the phones?

**Ms Woollard:** I'm just wondering: how long do we have between the ads before the applications close? Just a little technical detail, I suppose.

**Ms Sorensen:** If I may, Mr. Chair. If I'm understanding your question correctly, you're asking how long between the time we advertise and the time the competition closes?

**Ms Woollard:** Yes.

**Ms Sorensen:** Depending on the direction coming from this committee today, we would be going along the timeline that was specified, so we'd be advertising between February 10 and 17 and advertising a closing date of March 3, with the online component still running.

**Ms Woollard:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Any other thoughts, questions?

**Mrs. Littlewood:** Yeah. Can I be added to the speakers list, Chair?

**The Chair:** Yes. Please go ahead.

**Mrs. Littlewood:** I'm just wondering: in the event the committee doesn't decide on a candidate within the time frame, what are the other options that are available in terms of advertisements?

**Ms Sorensen:** If I may, Mr. Chair. I'm not sure I understand your question, Mrs. Littlewood. I think the purpose of the advertising is to get the candidates, but are you saying that if we don't receive a candidate through those means, are there other options for advertising?

**Mrs. Littlewood:** Yeah. I guess if we have to readvertise or something of that nature.

**Ms Sorensen:** Okay. Essentially, if you had to readvertise, you'd be looking at the same cost, depending on which advertising options are chosen. So you would have to, I guess, look for additional funding to readvertise the position.

**Mrs. Littlewood:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Any others?  
Sorry. You had a comment?

**Ms Mills:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to add that, you know, another consideration if the search was not successful ultimately would be to consider engaging external support and doing some direct sourcing or headhunting perhaps if that was needed. We think the strategy proposed will be effective, but that is an alternative if it were not.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Are there any other further questions, comments?

All right. Hearing none, is there a member that would wish to move a motion in regard to the adoption of the communications plan and advertising copy as presented? Mr. Horne, I'm assuming that you would like to move that we choose to adopt?

**Mr. Horne:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Horne. Excellent.  
Ms Rempel, do we have a wording for that?

**Ms Rempel:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I believe Mr. Horne has moved that

the Select Special Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner Search Committee adopt the communications plan and advertisement copy as distributed.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Any further discussion or questions?

Hearing none, I'll call the question. All those in favour of the motion? Thank you. Any opposed? Okay. That motion, then, is carried.

Do members have anything for discussion under other business?

If not, we'll move on to the date for our next meeting. As set out in the draft timeline, which we looked over today, our next meeting will be scheduled for around the middle of March. That will give staff time to compile and review all the applications received and then distribute them for our review.

One potential complication that could be encountered would be the consideration of the 2017-18 main estimates. As already discussed, we're on a pretty tight timeline if we want to complete our mandate before the end of the spring sitting, and of course holding other committee meetings during the period in which the main estimates are under consideration is prohibited by the standing orders. So to ensure that we can complete our work in a timely fashion, we should consider being prepared to request an exemption from that prohibition if necessary. For those of you who are interested, this has been done previously with the search committee during the recruitment of the Ethics Commissioner in 2014.

Any thoughts or discussion on that? I know that the draft timeline is currently positing we'd be looking at scheduling a meeting during the constituency week in March, which would avoid any conflict with estimates. But depending on how things fall out for members, we may need to look at an alternate time, and depending when the budget is presented, we may run into the estimates process, I guess, with that meeting or future meetings.

Does anyone have any thoughts, questions, comments regarding that schedule?

**Mrs. Littlewood:** Chair, this is Jessica on the line.

**The Chair:** Please go ahead, Mrs. Littlewood.

*10:50*

**Mrs. Littlewood:** Thanks. I am wanting, I guess, to make sure that we're better safe than sorry and pass a motion, that we can ask the Government House Leader and the rest of the Legislature to pass that motion in the House to request that we can do that if we need to.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you, Mrs. Littlewood.

Mrs. Littlewood is proposing a motion, then, that we request that exemption. Clerk, could you read the wording on that?

**Ms Rempel:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just based on the practice that was noted in 2014 and what I believe Mrs. Littlewood is wanting to do, I believe she has moved that

the Select Special Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner Search Committee request that it be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order 59.01(11) and that it be allowed to meet during consideration of the 2017-18 main estimates and that the chair transmit this request to the Government House Leader with copies to all House leaders.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Mrs. Littlewood:** Sounds great. Thank you, Ms Rempel.

**The Chair:** Excellent. So, then, we have the motion on the floor. Do we have any comments, questions, discussion?

Hearing none, I'll call the question. All those in favour of the motion as read? Thank you. Any opposed? That motion, then, is carried.



That concludes all the business that we had for this meeting today. We will be in touch, then, regarding the scheduling of the next meeting.

Do we have a member that would like to make a motion to adjourn? Mr. Horne. Thank you. All those in favour? Any opposed? Thank you. All right. We are adjourned. Have a good day.

[The committee adjourned at 10:52 a.m.]





