

**Minutes of the Special AFC Meeting  
October 12, 2021  
Held by Zoom**

**PRESENT:** A. Abdou; R. Baker; K. Bessant; D. Combet; W. Cook; K. deForest; J. Dolecki; R. Dwivedula; R. Elliott; R. Gasse; R. Hinthier; E. Holland; R. Kramer; D. Lakevold; L. MacKay; M. Malainey; A. Marshall; C. Mason; A. McCulloch; L. McLachlan; S. Medd; E. Mihelakis; K. Noll; S. Petrella; D. Ramsey; W. Robles; B. Rose; J. Russell; K. Saunders; C. Schneider; B. Strang; D. Taylor; M. Torabi; E. Varley; D. Winter; L. Wood; F. Zehtab-Jadid; L. Jardine; S. Grills (Vice Chair); L. Murray; S. Mott (recorder).

**ABSENT:** B. Ashton; M. Hamon; D. Héту; D. Klonowski; M. Malazdrewicz; V. Maud; L. Mayer; K. McKenzie; I. Puppe; B. Spence; H. Venema; K. Wong; L. Xu; H. Zhuang; C. Kazakoff-Lane (Library); M. Milosevic (BUSU); T. Gill (Student Services)

**REGRETS:** J. Allan; S. Asselin; J. Lindsay -(Science)

**ON LEAVE:** C. Boulton; J. Forsythe; P. Harms; H. Liu; J. Naylor; D. Racine; L. Robson; D. Smid

**GUESTS:** Dr. Kofi Campbell (V-P Academic and Provost); Shannon Downey (Executive Officer to Provost & VP Academic)

### **1.0 Call to Order**

Dr. Scott Grills introduced himself as Vice Chair of AFC, welcomed members to the meeting and gave the land acknowledgement. Dr. Grills gave a special welcome to Dr. Kofi Campbell, who will speak on the decanal search recommendations.

### **2.0 Presentation from Dr. K. Campbell – Recommendations re Decanal Search Policy and Procedures**

Dr. Campbell clarified the version of decanal recommendations that the Faculty of Arts received is a redacted version: item 21 was omitted and contained the recommendation that this particular search committee not be reconvened, due to “broken relationships.”

Dr. Campbell then addressed each recommendation to identify any concerns. The following comments apply to the numbered recommendations:

1. An observation was made that the language was confusing as to whether this involves a conflict of interest between the applicant and/or the search committee members. A second concern was the omission of siblings from the list. Third, the conflict of interest should be noted for the Chair as well, not just for the search committee members.
2. A suggestion was made to look at other universities for their best EDI practices e.g., University of Alberta). This training should be ongoing as people are currently only required to do this training once every 2 years.

A question was asked as to what kind of guidance the CHRO is to provide. Is it just dealing with questions of bias or other areas of guidance? Another suggestion was to have someone physically in the room during the deliberations that can help guide the discussion and that this person should not be a voting member. There was resistance to HR’s involvement. Members felt that this external guidance person should be jointly selected by both the Union and Administration. Dr. Campbell suggested that the decanal search committee members could jointly select this person, without the participation of BUFA.

It was suggested that the Chair requires more training.

A comment was issued that these recommendations don't go far enough. Dr. Campbell encouraged all to let him know if there are matters that are not included.

3. A suggestion was made that this item was paternalistic. Others felt there should be a limit of only two external members on the search committee and that the votes should always be done by secret ballot.
4. How would the hiring process proceed if three people are short-listed and then just before the interview, one withdraws from consideration? In such an instance, can the search proceed with only two candidates interviewed? There also needs to be language should there be only one strong candidate – what does that mean and what process should be followed? A comment was discussed that there needs to be accountability for the Committee – that they must justify their decision. It was noted that it is not the Committee that makes the decision, but rather the President and BOG.
5. This Guide exists already.
6. No critical comments.
7. If a member is in a conflict of interest, that member should resign from the Committee. In addition, the term “concrete protocols” to manage conflicts of interest opens up a wider debate or possible litigation.
8. No critical comments.
9. The terms “any committee” should be a matter considered by BUFA.
10. No critical comments.
11. ALL voting should be by secret ballot, regardless of whether candidates are internal or external.
12. No critical comments.
13. A comment was made that the Chair won't have to break the tie/vote if the number of committee members is uneven, though it was recognized that such a concern may arise in the context of abstentions or absences.  
A suggestion that in recommendation 13.b.v, the wording be made clear that “coaching or guidance” refers to the candidate being considered and not to members of the committee.
14. There was a suggestion made that a majority vote should also be required from the faculty representatives elected by the home Faculty and that the number of committee members from other faculties be limited to no more than two per Faculty.
15. There was a strong objection to the notion of “deliverables or outcomes” but the premise behind this is still useful – even the job posting takes into consideration that people could meet the job duties in different ways (take into consideration non-traditional career paths). Discussion furthered that we should have both – certain qualifications are needed, but also a vision of what the applicant expects to be accomplished at the end of their decanal term.
16. This is already current practice. It was suggested that someone who has knowledge and experience on EDI principles should do the screening of ads.
17. No critical comments.
18. The wording should be clearer.
19. This recommendation was viewed as very important and it was suggested that it needs to be at the top of this list.
20. Clarification on acceptable and unacceptable practice needs to be clearly outlined for the committee. (E.g., calling up a colleague and asking for information about a candidate is an unacceptable practice.)

General Questions and Comments:

Members questioned what happens next. Dr. Campbell informed AFC that he is meeting with all

faculties, collecting information, and figuring out what is practical and what is not. He will then craft a policy and take it to the Board. When questioned about the timeline, Dr. Campbell stated that he is hoping to have policy recirculated by the end of this term or in early winter 2022. A discussion ensued about the term of the new Acting Dean as 2 years, rather than the 364 days as directed in BOG policy, and whether this new policy would ensure an early Dean of Arts search. Dr. Campbell does not want to rush the next search as another failed search would be catastrophic for the Faculty of Arts. If there was a strong majority decision to have a new search start right away, Dr. Campbell would consider it, but he does not see a unanimous front on this issue.

Doug Ramsey cited three examples of later search starts that were successful earlier this year: two at Wilfred Laurier, which were posted in January, and one at Saint Mary's that was posted in April. Dr. Campbell noted that even though quick searches were done at other institutions, that does not mean that it worked out well for them. He also noted that it is possible that there may be three decanal searches next year.

A comment was made that with an extended Acting Dean of Arts term of two years, Arts is "stuck in the middle of the road", rather than making progress. Discussion followed.

Dr. Campbell excused himself from meeting after discussion was concluded.

### **3.0 Adjournment**

**MOTION: (McCulloch/Noll) THAT, due to time restrictions, the meeting adjourn with the intent of another special AFC meeting to be scheduled within two weeks to discuss motions.**

**CARRIED.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.