

## **Operating Procedure XVIII – The Review Committee**

The purpose of the review committee will be to provide oversight and feedback to councilors, senators, and other sitting members of council on their performance. The committee will be bound by the following guidelines:

### **i. Convening of the review committee:**

The review committee shall meet as needed to fulfill its commitment to council. This includes providing each sitting member of council a review once per semester as well conducting formal reviews as requested by council.

### **ii. Levels of review:**

The review committee may undertake two different types of reviews. The first type will be check-up reviews and will consist of the committee going through the job description and interpretation document of each member of council to produce a brief summary of the progress that the individual has made. The second will be a formal review to investigate progress on projects, reports, committee activity, and other work done on behalf of the MASU. During formal reviews, individuals may be summoned by the committee to be interviewed. Interviews would be conducted to collect supplementary information regarding the individual's progress.

### **iii. The Interpretation Document:**

The interpretation document will be a form that outlines an individual's expectations of their duties and competencies to fulfill the expectations of their position. This document will also include any goals or platform promises should the individual hold an elected position.

### **iv. The Formal Review Process:**

The review committee must be able to objectively report on the conduct of members of council. As a result, committee members may only consider materials which are submissible. The review process should be free of individual biases that may exist because of personal knowledge.

Submissible materials to the review committee include:

- 1) All public minutes for either committees or meetings of council;
- 2) Testimony from interviews in relation to the conduct of a reviewed individual;
- 3) The posted job description for the role of the individual;
- 4) An interpretation document to be filled out by the individual.

The job description and the interpretation document will be set up as check lists. For each item on the respective check list, the committee will indicate whether or not the individual is

making progress on each item. It is meant to be evaluated in absolute terms, either a yes or no will be recorded. Once the committee has exhausted both lists, each document will be evaluated like a test and totaled with a percentage. The percentage is calculated by dividing the total items that progress has been made by the total items on the document.

**v. Review Thresholds:**

A satisfactory review will consist of an overall score of at least 50% on both documents. Individuals receiving a score of less than 50% overall on both documents or who receive less than 25% on either document will be given a warning followed by a mandatory follow-up review in 4 weeks time. If the individual is unable to achieve a satisfactory score during the second review, the committee will request a motion for impeachment through the ombudsperson. Any individual who receives a score of less than 25% overall on both documents will face a recommendation for immediate impeachment.

During the meeting which an impeachment motion is brought forward, a student-at-large member of the committee will present a summary of the findings of the review committee. The report should cover the most pressing deficiencies of the individual as well as briefly cover the major areas that the individual has failed to make progress.

**vi. Expectations of committee members:**

Committee members are expected to attend all meetings of the review committee, unless justification is provided in advance to the chairperson with at least 24 hours notice. Members who miss two consecutive meetings or three overall may be dismissed by the chairperson and replaced with another individual pending a 2/3 majority vote of council.

Members of the review committee found to be conducting in behaviour unbecoming of a representative of the MASU may also be dismissed by the chairperson. The replacement process would follow the same aforementioned procedure. Behaviour unbecoming includes: breach of confidentiality, failure to reveal conflicts of interest, disorderly conduct during meetings, or failure to be objective. Breaches of confidentiality are to be treated as a major transgression and the chairperson should seek the individual's timely removal from the review committee.

The chairperson of the committee will be responsible for calling meetings of the committee as well as preparing an agenda and providing collected materials at the meeting. It is the responsibility of all committee members, except for the ombudsperson, to aid in the collection of material or to conduct other duties as required by the committee.

All materials collected by the review committee are to be destroyed upon completion of the review. A copy of the final report will be retained on file and kept as long as the individual is a student at Mount Allison University. All decisions of the review committee will be final and are not subject to appeal.

January, 2014