



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 | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

SSMU Nominating Committee Report (REDACTED)

Submitted to the Board of Directors: 2025-01-07

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 | (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 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 January 7, 2025, the Committee's membership is as follows:

Jessica Bakar, Parliamentarian (Chair, non-voting)
Dymetri Taylor, Director
Elina Qureshi, Director
Rishi Kalaga, Director
Aubrey Nan, Member-at-Large
Isabella Quintero Jimenez, Member-at-Large

2. Summary of Application Cycle

The Nominating Committee was tasked with the hiring of one (1) Judicial Board Member-at-Large.

For the **Judicial Board Member-at-Large** position, applications were opened on October 24, 2024, and closed on November 11, 2024. A total of 4 individual applications were received, and all 4 applicants were shortlisted for interviews. An invitation to interview with a request for candidates to provide their availability was sent out to all candidates on November 15th. The candidates were interviewed on November 22nd, November 25th, and November 26th. The interviews were conducted by the Parliamentarian and with another member of the Committee, when possible. All interviews were conducted remotely via Zoom, and all interviews were recorded.

Following the conclusion of the interview process, the Nominating Committee voted on its nominations for the position via email. Email votes were solicited from December 6th to December 19th. Each member of the Nominating Committee was encouraged to evaluate the candidates independently, looking holistically at interview recordings, notes, and ratings to propose a ranking. The Committee voted with a majority preference for the recommended candidate.



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 4 shortlisted candidates for the Judicial Board Member-at-Large position. No letters of rejection or nomination will be sent to candidates until the Board has approved a candidate to fill the position.

3. Shortlisted Candidates: Judicial Board Member-at-Large Position

- a. Candidate 1
- b. Candidate 2
- c. Candidate 3
- d. Candidate 4

4. Nomination: Judicial Board Member-at-Large Position

The Nominating Committee recommends the nomination of Candidate 2 to the Judicial Board Member-at-Large position.

The following paragraphs briefly highlight the reasons for the nomination of the above-mentioned candidates.

1. Candidate 1 has some volunteer experience, co-curricular involvement, and expressed interest in the legal field. The candidate demonstrated strong teamwork skills as well as potential for growth. However, the candidate was not elaborative in their interview answers and lacked sufficient understanding of the SSMU's structure, mandate, governing documents, and function of the Judicial Board. As such, the Committee does not recommend this candidate for the Judicial Board Member-at-Large role.
2. Candidate 2 is a third-year Psychology student with a strong demonstrated interest in the Judicial Board. Although the candidate does not have previous professional experience in the legal field, they thoroughly highlighted the relevant work experience and academic background they bring to the role. The Committee recognizes the value of this candidate's transferable skills in communication, time management, teamwork,



and impartiality. The Candidate also had an intermediate level of knowledge of the SSMU and was able to demonstrate their research into the SSMU's governing documents and previous Judicial Board documents. Overall, Candidate 2 had a solid interview in which they were eager, engaged, and elaborative, and the Nominating Committee recommends the candidate for the role.

3. Candidate 3 has some legal experience and has served as a Member-at-Large on the Health and Dental Committee. The candidate was able to draw upon numerous relevant experiences during their interview, and they demonstrated adequate teamwork, impartiality, and time management skills. Because the candidate did not elaborate on many of their interview responses, the Committee identified communication and problem-solving as two areas for growth. The candidate also lacked a clear understanding of the Judicial Board's role and the SSMU's governing documents as a whole. While the Committee recognizes this candidate's strengths, the Committee does not recommend the nomination of Candidate 3 for the aforementioned reasons.
4. Candidate 4 showed a strong demonstrated interest in law through their Cegep studies, work experience, and co-curricular activities. The candidate has an impressive professional and co-curricular background for an undergraduate student, and they provided illustrative examples of their impartiality, teamwork, and problem-solving skills. Although the candidate expressed great enthusiasm for the role, the candidate's enthusiasm led to some unprofessional behavior during the interview. This and the candidate's lack of knowledge of Judicial Board procedures are the Committee's main reasons for not recommending Candidate 4 to the Judicial Board Member-at-Large role.

5. Upcoming Hiring Cycle

The Nominating Committee is currently conducting interviews for one (1) Board of Director Member-at-Large and up to four (4) Nominating Committee Members-at-Large. The Committee will also begin hiring for one (1) Board of Directors International Student Representative and two (2) Board of Directors Alumni Representatives.

The Nominating Committee welcomes any questions regarding its recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,
The SSMU's Nominating Committee