



**Association étudiante de l'Université McGill**

*Située sur les territoires traditionnels des collectivités Haudenosaunee et Anishinaabe.*

**Students' Society of McGill University**

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories.*

[ssmu.ca](http://ssmu.ca) | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

# SSMU Nominating Committee Report (REDACTED)

Submitted to the Board of Directors: 2024-02-08

**Note:** This report has been submitted both completely and in full, as well as with all names redacted. It is the prerogative of the Board to use either document in either public or confidential session.



**Association étudiante de l'Université McGill**

*Située sur les territoires traditionnels des collectivités Haudenosaunee et Anishinaabe.*

**Students' Society of McGill University**

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories.*

[ssmu.ca](http://ssmu.ca) | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

## 1. Committee Mandate, Composition, and Membership

The Nominating Committee is a committee under the purview of the Board of Directors tasked with the selection of members to the Board of Directors and Judicial Board when necessary. In performing this function, the committee solicits applications from the SSMU membership, interviews selected candidates, and presents its recommendations for each position to the Board. When full, the committee consists of the Parliamentarian, three (3) Directors, one (1) Equity Commissioner, and four (4) Members-at-Large. As of February 8th, 2024, the Committee's membership is as follows:

Lisa Pennel, Parliamentarian (Chair, non-voting)  
Lalia Katchelewa, Director  
Nadia Dakdouki, Director  
Alexandre Ashkir, Director  
Taylor Prussky, Member-at-Large

## 2. Summary of Application Cycle

The Nominating Committee was tasked with the hiring of four (4) Board Members-at-large.

For the **Board Members-at-large**, applications were reopened and extended until November 15th, December 15th, and closed finally on February 5th. A total of 5 applications were received. One applicant was ineligible and one applicant was informed that serving on the Board of Directors would conflict with their current SSMU employment, to which they did not reply. An invitation to interview as well as a list of available times were sent out to eligible candidates on December 2nd and January 4th. The candidates were interviewed on December 13th, January 15th, and January 17th. The interviews were conducted by the Parliamentarian remotely via Zoom and recorded, with one other Committee Member present when possible.

Following the conclusion of the interview process, the Nominating Committee voted on its nominations for each position at its January 29th meeting. These nominations are not binding on the Board and as such the Board has the right to choose any candidate for the position. Presented in this report are 3 shortlisted candidates for the Board Member-at-large position. No letters of rejection or nomination will be sent to candidates until the Board has approved or rejected the candidates.



### 3. Shortlisted candidates: Board of Directors Member at Large

- a. Candidate 1
- b. Candidate 2
- c. Candidate 3

### 4. Nominations: Board of Directors Member at Large

The Nominating Committee recommends the nomination of candidates 1, 2, and 3 to the Board of Directors.

The following paragraphs briefly outline the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate and the reasons for their nomination. It is important to note that the order does not reflect any preference for any candidate, as the Committee considers all of them qualified for the Board.

1. Candidate 1 has extensive leadership experience in various prior Board positions and a finance academic background. He showed a deep understanding of governmental structures, their goals, and their inner workings, as well as a keen interest in being involved. Main concerns included the candidate's potential overqualification for the role and doubts regarding his ability to work well within a team, but were ultimately not deemed strong enough to warrant a recommendation to reject.
2. Candidate 2 has experience in advocacy, international involvement, and policy. The candidate stood out with a stellar interview showing great communication and decision-making skills both in the form and content of her answers. They emphasized her commitment to justice and accountability. The Committee noted a lack of student government experience but determined the candidate was still qualified.
3. Candidate 3 has experience in assisting a member of Parliament and engaging on equity matters at the faculty association level. He showed great interest in the Board as a place to make a positive impact and valued collaboration throughout his interview. Due to our large number of law student applicants, the Committee also looked favourably upon this candidate's ability to diversify the Board of Directors.



## **Association étudiante de l'Université McGill**

*Située sur les territoires traditionnels des collectivités Haudenosaunee et Anishinaabe.*

### **Students' Society of McGill University**

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories.*

[ssmu.ca](http://ssmu.ca) | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

## 5. General Concerns

Throughout the application process, the Committee discussed the large number of law student applicants as a barrier to diversity on the Board, though no solutions were identified for this cycle. Some concern was also raised regarding confidentiality considering the candidates' involvement in other student associations on campus, but ultimately, the risk is no greater than that of Legislative Councillors nominated to the Board.

Respectfully submitted,  
*The SSMU's Nominating Committee*