

The Faculty Executive Committee convenes this Committee of the Whole in response to a consistent and growing call from both faculty members and certain committee chairs to make candidate ranking of committees transparent on all ballots during college governance elections. FEC has historically tried to illustrate rankings, including issues with ballots containing candidates with a low ranking for the particular committee, while mitigating potential negative ramifications of full transparency. FEC will begin this Committee of the Whole by presenting the rationale that has shaped current policy—showing candidates in alphabetical order, but ranking in numerical order—then open the floor for discussion as to the pros and cons of full transparency of rankings during elections. FEC will conduct a brief post-Committee of the Whole survey, which will enable faculty to vote whether to continue with the existing policy or amend FEC’s operating code to list candidates with full transparency of ranking. Results of the survey will be made available to the community.

## POTENTIAL NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF TRANSPARENCY

- Transparency may create potential stress for candidates standing for tenure and promotion if it's known that members of ATC and PC ranked it low
- Transparency may cause candidates for tenure and promotion to feel vulnerable as rankings display disinterest in heavy service commitment and may be seen as having a negative impact; particularly in promotion cases
  - This may particularly impact faculty who are heavily burdened with other service commitments that fall outside of faculty governance
- Transparency may enable members of the faculty to avoid committees with heavy service commitments, putting undue stress on a select portion of the faculty willing to serve on these committees
- Interest does not guarantee effectiveness and transparency in ranking may defer consideration of a candidate's qualifications for a given committee to selection based solely on ranking

## POTENTIAL POSITIVE OUTCOMES OF TRANSPARENCY

- Transparency would accurately convey a candidate's interest in serving on the committee
- Transparency would make it more likely that faculty who are interested in the work would be elected
  - Not a guarantee depending on the constraints of the position: tenured/divisional representation/etc.
- Transparency would make elections easier for FEC by mitigating challenging conversations with faculty who are frustrated to be on a ballot for a low-ranked committee
- Other considerations?