I. Report Date: 28 January 2021

II. Name of Committee: Nominating Committee

III. Committee Members: Melissa Moll (chair), Joe Clark (chair-elect), April James, Kristie Nelsen, Marlene Wong

IV. Board Action Required:
   • Consider recommendation for Year 2 of the pilot initiative for MLA Board Student/Early Career Representative (A separate confidential recommendation will be submitted to the Board by February 22.)

V. Brief Summary of Activities
   • The selection process for Year 2 of the pilot initiative for MLA Board Student/Early Career Representative began in early January 2021, led by chair-elect Joe Clark. The call for nominations was posted on January 4, and Nominating Committee will submit a written recommendation to the Board by February 22. The Year 2 process is generally following the Year 1 set-up, with the addition of a diversity statement and a CV requested from applicants.
   • We revised the Committee handbook to reflect current nominating processes, resolve discrepancies, clarify responsibilities, and incorporate the diversity statement. Three highlights:
     o To streamline logistics and provide more information for committee deliberations, all candidate materials will be collected towards the beginning of the selection process.
     o Member-at-Large and Recording Secretary nominees will submit an activity summary plus a diversity statement of no more than 300 words.
     o Vice President/President-elect nominees will submit an activity summary, CV, and philosophical statement. Previously limited to 500 words, the philosophical statement will increase to an 800-word maximum with a prompt that incorporates the roles of diversity, equity, and inclusion within the candidate’s vision.
   • The Committee deliberated how to implement the diversity statement and what wording to use as a prompt for nominees. After an election cycle or two, we encourage the future Nominating Committee and the Board to evaluate the use and impact of the diversity statements with questions such as: Are the statements meeting their intended purpose? Would other methods provide better information from candidates? Does the process or the prompt need revision? (For example: What is meant by the term “diversity”?)

Respectfully submitted,
Melissa Moll, Chair