

[Chairman: Dr. Carter]

[3:50 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first item on our agenda today: would someone be good enough to approve the minutes as circulated?

MR. NOTLEY: So be it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't see anything there that really needs to be changed.

Earlier today, David and Drew met with Bud and me for just a moment to get a quick overview of what was here. We were checking to see if any other unusual problems had developed in the process. The reassurance was that everything seems to be working quite okay. So that's great. Commendations to all the staff people involved in trying to deal with the avalanche.

David, I wonder if I could pretty well turn it over to you. You sort of give us the overview with respect to the book. While we don't have a status report as to how many applications have been received and so forth, could you please give us a rundown as to your recollection of it so we could have it in the transcript as well as in the minutes?

DR. McNEIL: Just to review, we advertised in the major dailies across Canada on January 14 and in the Alberta weeklies the week of January 17 to 22, depending on what day the paper was published. We also sent out a number of direct source type letters to various women's groups the week of January 17.

To date, counting the applications I just picked up from the Clerk's office, we have received 227 applications and/or inquiries. I'm not certain of the breakdown in terms of how many females have applied, but I believe there are at least 30 from recollection of the last report I looked at. What we plan to do — and I think have been doing — is to issue an update to all committee members every Friday, saying: this is the number of applications; this is the number of inquiries; this is the number of female applicants. So you'll have that on an ongoing basis.

In terms of the process we've been following, we have been picking up the applications on a daily basis so we don't get behind as far as the screening process. In terms of the screening process, we looked at the person profile approved by the committee and identified those factors. We thought we could look at resumes and make a judgment as to what extent candidates met certain criteria listed in the person profile. The five factors we thought we could identify in the resumes were experience with people, achievement in their chosen field, knowledge of Alberta, knowledge of administration and management practice, and knowledge of law and investigatory procedures.

We set up a screening guide. As you can see under the screening guide tab in your book, we set up a scale. So every application we look at, we rate the candidates qualifications on a one to five scale under those five categories, make some observations, if there are any to be made, on the applicant, and then make an overall ranking. "A" means: meets the requirements as identified and recommend the person be interviewed. "B" is: meets some of the requirements. We recommend those resumes be be

placed in a "hold" situation. You may want to look at some of those further on in the process. "C" suggests that the individual does not meet the requirements, and therefore should "regret" those individuals.

So Drew and I together reviewed the first 40 or so resumes and tried to develop some consistency in the way we were screening. Since that point we have done groups of applications individually, and then I have reviewed Drew's screening to try to ensure that there is consistency all the way through the process as far as the screening is concerned.

What we have in the book are 10 candidates we have rated as "A" candidates and recommend be interviewed, and 31 candidates that we suggest meet some but not all of the requirements and should therefore be put on hold. We haven't put the remaining 76 resumes in the book because of the copying involved. Again, there may be some there whom committee members perceive as "B"s. There may be some "B"s that you would perceive as "A"s and "A"s as "B"s. What we have to do today is possibly review the "C"s to see if there are any that should not be regretted, and possibly review the "A"s so we can decide which individuals we should start interviewing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In actual fact, the "C" categories are all filed beyond that wall, in the robing room, so they are there for all of us to access.

DR. McNEIL: They're there for any individual on the committee. We have them here right now, so if we want to discuss any one of them today they're here for us to look at.

MR. MILLER: David, this is a very small point, but I notice that between the zero and the one — and I think there are only three zeros in all. Should we start out with a basis of zero, or should it be a basis of one?

DR. McNEIL: Zero means there is not enough information there to judge. One is sort of the lowest, so it's really a one to five scale. Zero is if it's really hard to judge whether the individual has knowledge of Alberta. Then we'll say that we can't tell from the resume, that they haven't indicated it or something like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where that occurs in an "A" category, you'll be asking about that area in a telephone interview. In theory, any candidate who has a zero rating — that's one area you'll pick up on. That gives us a fail safe.

DR. McNEIL: As it is, in the telephone interview we will explore each of these areas, plus the others listed on the person profile that we couldn't draw any conclusion on from the resume.

MR. NOTLEY: Was there any sort of general total you used to determine A, B, or C?

DR. McNEIL: No, more just looking at the range of . . .

MR. NOTLEY: In looking at these ranges, I notice

that in certain cases some of the "C"s are at figures that would total fairly close to the "A"s.

DR. McNEIL: It's more — are they consistently above three, for example. That's it. With these kinds of criteria, it's a little more difficult than normal to make those final judgments. In some instances, it's hard to get hold of their knowledge of law and investigatory procedures, for example.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions about the way the book is put together or the fact that we have access to "C" category applications? The process continues apace. We've had four more calls to my office today. Okay?

Shall we look at these "A"s first, or do you want to go through your preliminary interview program?

DR. McNEIL: Maybe we can talk about the preliminary interview, or the proposed plan, after the fact, after we get some people to interview.

MR. CHAIRMAN: After we get some names to go through. We'll have to do that today as well, before we get on to the next . . .

DR. McNEIL: That shouldn't take very long.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have the screening guide here.

MR. MILLER: David, the status report where these questions are all lined out — would you propose that this would be the format you would follow in your initial or follow-up interview?

DR. McNEIL: Generally, yes.

MR. MILLER: What would be left for the committee? You've asked very comprehensive questions here, and the committee would be asking the same sorts of questions. I think these would be structured more for the committee to ask and that you would be more for factual questions. In other words, these are more or less projecting into the future.

DR. McNEIL: The main objective is to get at what they've done in the past but also to try to get a bit of a feel for their philosophy on entering the job. I would see the committee getting much more in depth as far as asking hypothetical questions as to how they would handle a particular situation you can dream up, to get more in depth in how they would handle the job, plus exploring areas the preliminary interview identified as possibly being of concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Along that line, have you had an opportunity or is it your intention to sort of develop another phase of this when we get down to . . .

DR. McNEIL: For the final. Yes, definitely.

MR. MILLER: I don't think there's a hell of a lot left after you've gone through this.

MR. NOTLEY: It will certainly reduce what we have to do.

DR. McNEIL: I had some concerns as to just how many questions to put in about how the individual would approach the Ombudsman's job per se. Maybe we can discuss just which questions should remain and which should be left for the committee to deal with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Along that line, perhaps when we next meet or at the meeting after that you'll have the next document so we can compare what's going to be expected of us at that time.

DR. McNEIL: From the previous minutes, I believe Mr. Hiebert was going to generate some questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd have to check that; it doesn't register.

I take it that first we're going to look at our section of "A"s today to make sure they fit so they have someone to interview, and then we'll come back to this.

MR. NOTLEY: These people will get phone interviews.

DR. McNEIL: If they're out of town, we usually do a telephone interview. If they're in town, we usually meet them face to face.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, committee members, I'm open to whatever you want to do here. Do you want to go one by one?

MR. NOTLEY: On the "A" candidates, David, on the assumption that we want to include as many options as possible that are serious, if our professional people have gone through and accepted the 10 as being suitable for an interview, I think we should concur in that and go into whether we want to elevate some of the "B"s to "A"s. I think that would be more to the point.

[The meeting continued in camera]

[The report of the Special Committee to Search For and Select an Ombudsman was tabled in the Legislative Assembly on May 1, 1984]