

Matthew Garrett, Public Comment to BC Academic Senate, 7 Sept 2022

I would like to address two agenda items that are closely related.

First, as the Senate considers who to appoint to the district wide diversity committee, I ask that the Senate consider the radical idea of allowing . . . diverse viewpoints.

That committee has been consistently staffed by the administration with faculty who hold one particular point of view, and this year the Senate will - for the first time - have control over who to appoint (at-large) to that committee. The executive board already decided to send Andrea Thorson to join that district committee (as chair of EODAC). I ask that the senate fill the at-large position with someone who represents a different point of view, not another person with a similar background and similar viewpoints who has already served in that capacity in recent years. I ask the Senate to set the precedent of appointing faculty with diverse views to the district-wide diversity committee.

Second, as the Senate considers appointments to our campus diversity committee (EODAC), I also hope intellectual diversity could play a role, but alas, I do recognize that we have three new guiding rules that the Senate adopted last year. They state priority to nominations shall be based on:

1. Tenure over non-tenure
2. As many departments & pathways as possible
3. Preference to earlier submissions

Rule #2 forces a choice among early nominated faculty in the same pathway. For example, you must choose only one scientist; your options are Ximena Da Silva Tavares, Joes Saldivar, or Gilbert Ayuk.

According to rule #3 – whoever was nominated first should receive the appointment. That would be Ximena, then Joe, and then Gilbert. But oddly, the Senate has received a proposal to disregard rule #3 by rejecting all applicants before 7:30am. This would result in Gilbert leapfrogging over Ximena and Joe.

This strange new plan would also allow Andrew Bond to leap-frog over David Neville. Also, Jeff Newby and Ed Borgens would leap-frog over Matt Garrett and Daymon Johnson.

Is it appropriate to let later nominees leapfrog earlier nominees (in violation of rule #3)?

And why was this plan advanced after the executive board soundly voted against it?

It is additionally strange that we are only applying this new 7:30am start time to one committee. Indeed, I was also nominated to the equivalency committee in the early morning but apparently that pre-7:30 nomination is uncontested.

Why is this new 7:30 start time only applied to one committee?

Why are we even considering a proposal that ignores rule #3 of the nominating procedures?

And is it ethical to change the start time for nominations after they have been submitted?

Thank you.