POSITION DESCRIPTION

Position Title: Review Board and Tribunal Student Member
Position Status: SLC Appointment
Position Type: Volunteer
Honoraria: None

POSITION SUMMARY (Overview and Purpose)
The Review Board and Tribunal are independent bodies responsible for the judicial functions within the jurisdiction of the Students’ Union. Students can apply to the Review Board to appeal SU decisions that they believe were unfair or in violation of the SU’s Constitution, Union Bylaw, policies, or procedures. The Tribunal has jurisdiction over decisions of the Review Board. A student who is dissatisfied with a decision of the Review Board may be able to appeal to the Tribunal.

The Review Board consists of at least nine members, at least five of whom must be current undergraduate students. The Tribunal consists of at least five members, at least one of whom must be a current undergraduate student.

Student members of the Review Board and Tribunal are appointed for two-year terms and serve with a minimal time commitment. After an orientation session, each body meets only when its respective chair receives an application.

Student members may also apply to be the Chair of the Review Board. The Tribunal is chaired by a non-student member.

KEY RESPONSIBILITIES
Student members of the Review Board and Tribunal have the following responsibilities:

- Attend an orientation session;
• Attend meetings as called by the Chair, potentially with only a few days’ notice;
• Declare conflicts of interest;
• Review applications;
• Participate in hearings;
• Review and interpret the SU’s Constitution, Union Bylaw, policies and procedures;
• Examine evidence; and
• Render decisions.

The chair of the Review Board has the following additional responsibilities:
• Participating in additional training;
• Coordinating and communicating with other Review Board members;
• Scheduling meetings and hearings for the Review Board when needed;
• Ensuring the timeliness of Review Board processes, including providing a decision within a reasonable timeframe, respective of the individual circumstances or applicable deadlines;
• Communicating regularly with SU staff, particularly when an appeal is underway;
• Guiding discussions during meetings or hearings of the Review Board to ensure other members are given an opportunity to share their opinions;
• Enforcing procedures of the Review Board during any proceedings, including to ensure meetings or hearings function smoothly and effectively; and
• Drafting documents on behalf of the Review Board that fairly and reasonably represent the consensus of the Review Board members, and ensuring that dissenting members provide written input where appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS, DECISION AND AUTONOMY OF ACTION
The Review Board and Tribunal operate independently from the rest of the SU and follow their own procedures to ensure fair and just processes.

The Review Board and Tribunal make decisions based on facts or issues disclosed during a hearing. The processes for decision-making and communicating to relevant parties and the public must be consistent with procedural fairness.

INFLUENCE – INTERNAL/EXTERNAL
• Members of the Review Board and Tribunal primarily interact with the other members of their respective body regarding the proceedings of any appeal being heard by that body.
• Other students, SU staff, Elected Officials, or other members of the University community may be involved in Review Board or Tribunal proceedings as appellants, respondents, or interveners.

LEADERSHIP
Review Board and Tribunal appointees gain administrative experience and learn about governance processes.
One student member serves as Chair of the Review Board by appointment from SLC. The Chair is responsible for contacting other Review Board members to schedule hearings, facilitating meetings, and writing the first draft of any official Review Board documents, such as procedural orders and decisions.

WORKING CONDITIONS
Members of the Review Board or Tribunal must be available to attend any meeting or hearing of their respective body. Meetings are typically scheduled to coincide with the schedules of Review Board or Tribunal members. Meetings or hearings may be held virtually (such as by Zoom Videoconferencing) or in-person, on-campus.

Members will be asked to review relevant documentation, written submissions from parties to an appeal, hear testimony, and articulate their thoughts on the matter on appeal, within the boundaries of procedural fairness and as is appropriate for the appeal being heard. Meetings or hearings are scheduled as needed in alignment with applicable policies, and advanced notice for meetings or hearings will be provided.

ELIBILITY
A student is not qualified to become or remain a member of the Review Board or Tribunal if that student:

- Ceases to be an Active Member of the SU (i.e., if they are no longer an undergraduate student enrolled in at least one course during the academic year);
- Is a member of the Students’ Legislative Council, the University of Calgary Board of Governors, Senate, or General Faculties Council;
- Is a member of any SU Committee (including as a student-at-large member);
- Is a member of the board or executive or a full-time employee of any Tri-Media Group (The Gauntlet, CJSW or NUTV);
- Is a full-time, regular part-time or contract employee with the SU;
- Is an executive in a student club (non-executive club officials/members may apply);
- Has been a member of SLC within the past year, or an SU Executive within the past three years;
- Has taken an active role in any Union Election within the past year other than casting a vote (i.e. ran as a candidate, acted as an official agent, etc.);
- Is the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) for Union Elections;
- If the appointment is to the Review Board, the student is already a member of the Tribunal; or
- If the appointment is to the Tribunal, the student is already a member of the Review Board.
QUALIFICATIONS

Minimum requirements:

• Applicants must be a full- or part-time undergraduate student at the University of Calgary for at least the next two years.
• Applicants should demonstrate that they can be objective, thoughtful, reasonable, and thorough in the consideration of issues in dispute.