

Faculty in attendance: Barbara Herman, Calvin Normore, David Kaplan, AJ Julius, Josh Armstrong, Katie Elliott, Mark Greenberg (1<sup>st</sup> hour), Michael Rescorla, Pam Hieronymi (briefly), Shel Smith, Sherri Roush

We thought we did not have a quorum at any point in the meeting (bare majority of total faculty = 11). David Blank has since advised that majority is measured against those who can be expected to attend, which doesn't include those on leave or other modified duties. By this standard, this term, we need 8 faculty, which we had. We approved the following:

1. We voted unanimously to approve the minutes of 10-15-2021 as sent to us over email.
2. We voted unanimously to give the Yost Prize to Kyle Scott and Jungsuk Lee.
3. We voted unanimously that the department consider itself an Affiliate of the Critical Reasoning Project. (This carries no ongoing financial obligations, though earlier in the term the faculty voted in favor of a second seed grant for the project.)
4. We voted unanimously that the department consider itself a Sponsor of the History, Philosophy, and Science of Science group (HPASS) which has been meeting in the department for three years. We recommend the decision about the \$500 grant for refreshments for 2021-22 requested by Sherri Roush be delegated to the Vice Chair, Barbara Herman.
5. Most of the meeting time was spent discussing the procedure for the current faculty search that was circulated by Barbara (search chair).

Clarification about Step 2: It will be possible, for those who wish so, to do the evaluation at Step 2 with the blinded files only.

Steps 7 and 9: our voting methods for determining the short list and deciding who to make offers to need to be decided before any of us knows which outcomes we want, i.e. now. A voting method in this case is a method of calculating a rank ordering of preferences of a group from the rank orderings of preferences of the individuals in the group. Different methods have different properties, so

- a. all of us will educate ourselves about the properties of various voting methods at [opavote](#), and [SEP - Voting Methods](#)
- b. Michael, Mark, and David will work on coming up with a list of desiderata properties for the method, and voting methods that can meet them, and
- c. all faculty should submit to them any desiderata properties they think of.

(Example of a desideratum property: Where there is only one winner, it shouldn't be possible to win by being everybody's second choice. Another example: It shouldn't be possible to win if one didn't have the support of a majority. What does "support of a majority" mean?) Note that we may well want different properties for the shortlist vote and the hiring vote. We hope to receive a proposed list and proposed methods for both votes from Michael, Mark, and David by December 3<sup>rd</sup>, and **meet to discuss these voting issues on December 10, 2-4p**, unless it turns out the methods of voting can be decided over email.

We also discussed the possibility and desirability of straw voting. Recall that straw voting is prohibited by Sturgis, for any vote, not just votes on “substantial matters.” In principle the department might vote for a bylaw that gives us the right to conduct straw votes. For several reasons that could not give us the right to do straw votes in this search. This is because the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction cannot be assumed to be willing to approve that as a bylaw. (Their approval of Linguistics’ search procedure was not an endorsement of the straw votes described in it but an oversight, as reported by David Blank, the Chair of that committee when those bylaws were approved, and current Chair), and there is reason to think straw voting would not be approved by CR & J, because it is prohibited by Sturgis. We would not be able to get an actual ruling from CR & J on this before the voting on the search begins. Also note that for the department to submit new bylaws to CR & J requires a 2/3 vote in favor of them.

Note from Chair: Those who desire straw votes are free to talk among themselves about a proposed bylaw, but due to the practical irrelevance of the issue to this search, and the fact that we have a lot of other business to discuss, I don’t want to spend more meeting time on this topic until after the search. All the more so because our first three meetings in Winter term are scheduled for Adam’s tenure case, and this case cannot be delayed without putting in peril the effective date of a positive tenure decision. When a delay is due to CAP the university applies the decision retroactively to July 1<sup>st</sup> of the year it was supposed to become effective. If the delay is due to the department or candidate then it does not, and the administration has announced repeatedly that it will be enforcing this rule.

Our meeting December 3<sup>rd</sup> will largely be devoted to issues about the grad program (agenda to follow), and that discussion will be led by Sam.