Faculty in attendance: John Carriero, Adam Crager, Sam Cumming, Daniela Dover, Katie Elliott (2nd hour), Mark Greenberg, Barbara Herman, Pam Hieronymi, David Kaplan, Calvin Normore, Michael Rescorla, Sherri Roush, Shel Smith

The minutes of the 12/3/21 meeting were amended to clarify the motions regarding the Logic Course Requirement, and approved. The Logic Course Requirement proposal will now be set for electronic voting.

1. Motion passed unanimously (12 of 12): To adopt the Search Procedure Bylaws as circulated and then amended in this meeting, included below, p. 2ff.

2. Discussion of Voting Methods for Shortlist and Hiring stages of search.

Our team (David, Mark, Michael) has not reached consensus yet, but Mark and Michael submitted a proposal that we walked through to acquaint ourselves with the issues. (See file "Voting Method Proposal – 3")

Some possible desiderata for a voting method:

simplicity of method, not multiple rounds, (?)Condorcet consistency, treating every candidate the same.

Some high points of the discussion:

Condorcet voting has the advantage that a Condorcet winner is supported by a majority, and that it's very difficult to do strategic voting. It is however possible for the Condorcet winner to be everybody's 2nd choice.

Ranked Choice Voting lets first choices have a bigger influence on the outcome. It is however possible to do strategic voting. (To paraphrase CN: If Australia is any guide, if logrolling is possible, then logrolling will be actual.)

No one method can do all of the listed things. There will inevitably be trade-offs in our choice of voting methods, so we'll have to decide which things we value more.

We will meet next week, December 17th, 2-4p. for further discussion of voting methods.

Proposal based on Philosophy Faculty discussion:

Ladder-faculty search procedures

For each search, the department chair appoints an ad hoc search committee.

The proposed search committee membership, and search plan are submitted for the required university approvals.

Recruiting Phase

· The Search Committee chair, in consultation with relevant faculty, drafts an ad specific to the search, which must then be approved by the whole faculty.

· As soon as possible after the application period has closed, the report on the applicant pool is submitted for the required university approvals.

· Consistent with voting rights on appointments, all senate faculty will have access to the full dossiers of the applicants at some point after the pool has been approved. The stage at which this occurs in a given search will be decided by the whole faculty before the application deadline of that search, in the light of a discussion of best practices at that time.

Application Review Phase

· The search committee determines its procedures for reading applications, for gradually eliminating candidates from further consideration, for conducting candidate interviews, as long as in accord with university requirements.

· During the search process, the search committee will follow university rules about soliciting additional materials from applicants.

· The search committee decides on its recommendation for the shortlist; the faculty meet to discuss this recommendation. Final selection of a shortlist is done by the whole faculty by vote. The department's method for voting specifically on shortlists is decided in advance, before the department considers applications.

· The department's shortlist is submitted for the required university approvals.

Recruiting and Appointment Phase

· Once the shortlist has been approved, the search committee invites the shortlisted candidates for interviews, and, in consultation with other faculty, decides on the schedule for each interview. The schedules will provide opportunities for faculty and students to meet with the candidates as well as to hear the job talks.

· The search committee decides on its final recommendations; the faculty meet to discuss these recommendations. All final vote(s) about recommendations to hire (rankings of candidates, which candidates are backups in case the top choice declines) are a personnel matter and so voting must be inclusive and anonymous, e.g. online after the meeting. The department's method for voting specifically on hiring is decided in advance, before consideration of applications.

The final yes/no appointment vote should include the proposed rank and effective date.