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)

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. 1st 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 1st, & ask CS_1 to reconsider ranking on him.

Response to M&S_2 Reqest (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.