

Resumption of business from last week – refer to agenda for 9-24-2021.

Results of votes taken last week:

Motion: to appoint John to write a draft of a bylaw to allow any ladder faculty member to access any candidate's file [at any stage] during a search. Approved 16 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain [This has been updated to reflect the votes of those not in attendance.]

Motion: to conduct a search this year for a regular ladder-faculty position Approved 15 yes, 2 no, 0 abstain [Updated to reflect the votes of those not in attendance.]

Motion: to proceed with search at the rank of senior or for advanced junior (defined as receiving PhD in 2017 or earlier). Approved: 10 yes, 7 no, 0 abstain [Updated to reflect the votes of those not in attendance.]

It was suggested that we do ranked voting to further explore the group's preferences in regard to the third motion. We're set up now to do that on opavote.com

Chair's recommendation: We negotiate with EDI about the following paragraph of the search plan *after* approving the search plan as written, so that we can advertise immediately.

During this period, any committee member may call upon a member of the Philosophy faculty who is not on the committee to review a (blinded) writing sample in their area(s) of expertise, and write a brief evaluation. Non-committee members do not view candidate files until after the shortlist is approved. After the search committee reviews all of the applicants' files, the committee will discuss the cases. They will choose a long short list of 8-10 candidates and conduct zoom interviews with them, and then create a short list. The committee will make a report of their short-list with a ranking and full evaluation of each candidate on the short list, not just the top-ranking one, and the supporting evidence, and forward the ranked list and report to the department for review by the whole faculty, and scheduling of campus interviews. (p.3)

Two points – whether the whole faculty can access files from the beginning, and whether the whole faculty can have a limited role in the choosing of the shortlist – are negotiable, and they are as negotiable after we agree to the search plan as written as they are before, up until November 12th, when the candidate pool is formed.

Approving the plan as written (modulo rank of search and teaching needs, which are still to be determined) means that we are accepting that there will be an external member and that the whole faculty will not be choosing the short list. It also means that we are accepting the paragraph above as a *starting point* of negotiation.

If so, then we have two questions to decide today: rank of search and fields of teaching need.

1. Possible ranks of search that have been proposed:

Open
Senior

Senior + Ph.D 2017 or <
Senior + Ph.D. 2016 or <
Senior + Ph.D. 2015 or <
Tenured – candidates close to tenure encouraged to apply

2. Areas of teaching needs. Current list: Metaphysics, Epistemology; Philosophy of Science (including Philosophy of Biology); Logic, History of Philosophy.

There's been a proposal to cut out "(including Philosophy of Biology)" as weird and unnecessary. Do we have other needs, or wish to cut other things from this list?

New Announcement

A. Mixed news in regard to UCLA budget: 1) Threatened state cuts restored, 2) 3% budget increase for UC, 3) State expects UCLA to reduce non-resident undergraduates to 18% (from 25%), 4) Structural deficit at UCLA means in years ahead faculty searches will be scarce, even with retirements. → Make the most of this one.

Announcements remaining from last week

A. As per UCLA's parliamentary framework, non-binding votes in meetings (AKA straw votes) are never permitted.

B. New KPPE Board members: John Carriero, Mark Greenberg,* Barbara Herman, Pamela Hieronymi,* David Kaplan. (* = new)

C. Some KPPE funds are available for activities – make proposals, including for 2022-23. Try to do so before December 1st if it involves more than \$10,000.

D. In 2021-22 we will do a department self-study as part of the 8th year review, and in preparation for the visiting committee visit next year. The study will be led by John Carriero and the Chair. If there is an issue you think should be investigated, or a constituency consulted, let one or both of them know (or ask David Blank to let them know).

Part of the preparation for the review should be a review of our bylaws (which will be reviewed by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdictions as part of the 8th year review. Those interested in serving on a committee to discuss the bylaws should let the Chair know.