

- A. Experience on selecting expert consultant
- B. Be fact-based
- C. Omit less important details

# PCMS Cmt Composition

- A. Chem\_1: France-Isabelle Auzanneau (Faculty)
- B. Chem\_2: Kate Stuttaford (Staff)
- C. M&S\_1: Hermann Eberl (Faculty)
- D. M&S\_2: Gary Umphrey (Faculty)
- E. Phys\_1: John R Dutcher (Faculty) – PCMS Cmt Chair
- F. Phys\_2: Reggi Vallillee (Staff)
- G. CS\_1: Yang Xiang (Faculty)
- H. CS\_2: Jennifer Hughes (Staff)

## ❖ Indexing

- a. XYZ\_1 is a faculty member.
- b. XYZ\_2 is a staff member, except M&S.

# Expectation for PCMS Cmt: Identify Expert Consultant

## A. Description from Top Cmt (CEPS Restructuring Cmt)

COLLEGE of ENGINEERING  
AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES

### Mandate of Subject Expert Consultant

- Work with PCMS to highlight opportunities for revised college
  - Strengthen existing programs
  - Consider new programs
  - Revenue generation opportunities
  - Improved marketing
- Someone with administration experiences in the sciences covered by PCMS
  - Ideally dean level
  - External to the U of G
    - Dr. Rob Lipson, former Dean of Science, U. of Victoria
- Identify strengths
  - Critical mass exists to "stand alone"
- Identify weaknesses or areas for improvements
- Work with Proposal Consultant

UNIVERSITY of GUELPH

Feb 22, 2022

10

The slide features a blue header with the text 'COLLEGE of ENGINEERING AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES'. The main title 'Mandate of Subject Expert Consultant' is in large black font. Below it is a list of five bullet points, each preceded by a right-pointing arrow. The first and last bullet points are followed by a yellow arrow pointing left. The second and third bullet points are followed by a red arrow pointing left. The fourth bullet point is followed by a red arrow pointing left. The fifth bullet point is followed by a yellow arrow pointing left. The slide also includes the University of Guelph logo in the bottom left corner, the date 'Feb 22, 2022' in the bottom center, and the number '10' in the bottom right corner.



# Ranking Candidates for Expert

- A. Candidates considered: 8 names + 1 from SFU
- B. SoCS contributed 4 names, all Computer Scientists.
- C. Some considerations of my ranking
  1. It is impossible if each unit requests Expert from its area.
  2. A **fair** request is for the Expert to have **experience** and **expertise** in leading a Faculty/College that includes all 4 PCMS units.
  3. This can be expressed as the criterion  
“Does their Faculty have all of Chem, M&S, Phys, and CS?”

# Ranking Candidates for Expert

## A. CS\_1 (Mar 14)

1. 1<sup>st</sup> criterion: “Does their Faculty have all of Chem, M&S, Phys, and CS?”
2. “since Faculty of Science at U Victoria does not have CS, Rob Lipson sits at #7.”

## B. Chem\_1 (Mar 15): Including Dr. Lipson in top 3.

## C. Chem\_2 (Mar 16): Concurring Chem\_1.

## D. CS\_1 revised ranking (Mar 16)

3. “Does their Faculty/College have a unit for each of ...? (fairness to all 4 units)”
4. “I would not consider Dr. Rob Lipson suitable as the expert consultant from the perspective of fairness to all 4 units, given that 5 other candidates are qualified under this fairness criterion.”

## E. Phys\_1, M&S\_1 (Mar 16): Concurring Chem\_1.

## F. M&S\_2 (Mar 18): Rank Dr. Lipson top 1<sup>st</sup>, & ask CS\_1 to reconsider ranking on him.

# Response to M&S\_2 Request (Mar 19)

A. The criterion is about experience:

“instantiates [`sciences covered by PCMS`](#) with `Chem, M&S, Phys, and CS` explicitly.”

B. The criterion is about expertise:

“Wouldn't it be the expertise to lead a Faculty in the Subject areas of Chem, M&S, Phys, and CS?”

“Wouldn't the most direct evidence be the experience of leading such a Faculty?”

C. The criterion is about fairness:

“If the expert ... has leadership experience and expertise in subject areas of some units, but does not have those in subject areas of other units, can s/he understand, appreciate, and help promote opportunities and visions of all 4 units equally?”

# Post-Ranking Communication

## A. Summary of candidate ranking on closing (Mar 18)

1. Including Dr. Lipson as top 3 candidates: 5 against 1
2. No known vote from Phys\_2.
3. CS\_2 was away.

## B. On Mar 18, I expressed concern to John, and he responded:

“the onus is on each committee member to present strong, compelling arguments for their opinions if they expect others to agree with them. It seems that your arguments on this point did not resonate with the rest of the committee.”

## C. I learned this morning that CS\_2 voted (Mar 21) concurring with Chem\_1.