

## Report of Accountability Committee:

1. Challenges (what did we face that limited our capacity to meet)
  - a. Hard to come up with a Standardized system of measuring accountability
  - b. Scheduling Issues for those on the committee.
  - c. Not well established in its scope and capabilities, there exists unknowns in its activity at times.
  - d. Unexpected situation with delayed ratification of Board Members. Being a Board of Directors committee and that has not necessarily existed in the past, needed to establish goals and create means to establish those goals. No member on Accountability committee from previous years, difficult to find previous documentation, which explains a lack of institutional knowledge. which did allow for some flexibility but a significant amount of difficulty to find specific purpose.
  - e. Difficulty in creating the performance report for the Directors and Senators not sitting on Legislative Council, no evaluation process exists for these individuals, and the evaluation process is difficult to apply to them.
  - f. The current Committee Terms of Reference Evaluation Framework:
    - i. *'EVALUATION. The process for evaluation shall consider resources, but not limited to the:  
a) Executive Mandates;  
b) Articulated goals; and  
c) Reports to the Legislative Council, and the Board of Directors.'*
    - ii. At time ambiguous mandates for executive mandates.
2. Goals for the next committee (what should do)
  - a. Document items more formally and ensure there is a carry over and access to previous documents of the committee. This would promote institutional knowledge from members rolling over from previous years, in addition to considering the advantage of having a member which . Establishment of exit reports for members
  - b. Meet bi-weekly, clearly established meeting times, whether electronic or physically
  - c. Set Deadlines for creating an evaluation system near the beginning of the semester.
  - d. Clearly defining the actual purpose of the committee
  - e. Defined framework for performance evaluations of representatives of the Society.
    - i. Include attendance as a formal metric for performance evaluations.
    - ii. Early-on in Summer meeting period inform representatives of their expectations.

- f. Define the public report to be given to the BoD once every month, therefore a meeting must take place minimally once-a-month,
    - i. Ensure Directors are attending meetings for them collectively to be informed and work hand-in-hand with each other for the monthly BoD presentation.
  - g. Review what is currently successful and what is not.
  - h. Action plan over the Summer period.
3. Reform (ideas of what could potentially look like)
- a. Review the Accountability Committees terms of reference to discern if they must be modified.
  - b. Peer Evaluation
    - i. Surveys - the committee can design the survey and come up with a way to measure accountability and which questions to asks the respondents.
  - c. Consult Faculty associations and departmental representatives to ensure that each faculty representative is being held accountable to their constituents
  - d. Base guidelines on the duties and obligations of each role as outlined in the constitution and terms of reference - make sure that councillors are aware of these guidelines.
  - e. Open door/whistle blower policy:  
 The possibility of the draft creation of a whistleblower policy or point of first contact for those wishing the express discontent within an operation within the Society. A draft policy that may or may not include a process involving the committee, in which the committee would collaborate and consult with others in the Society to construct.