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This Committee, appointed by the VPA&P in consultation with Deans' Council and the President of the Faculty Association, shall advise on regular faculty appointments (professors and lecturers) of duration two years or more.

UARC shall review the hiring process and provide advice to the Dean before a hiring recommendation is sent to the VPA&P for approval.
Current UARC Members

Chair: Flora Ng (Chem Eng)

- (AHS) Steve Prentice; Rhona Hanning
- (Arts) Doreen Fraser, Andrew Faulkner
- (Eng) Gerry Schneider, Catherine Rosenberg
- (Env) Jonathan Li, Johanna Wandel
- (Math) Ken Davidson; Kevin Lamb
- (Sci) Tadeusz Gorecki; Brian Dixon
The Chair (through the Dean) shall provide UARC with a brief summary of the recruiting process including efforts to solicit candidates from the underrepresented gender. Documentation (such as CVs, letters of reference) will be provided for the top three candidates.

If all three are of the same gender, documentation will also be provided for the top candidate of the opposite gender.
Role of UARC

- UARC monitors the hiring process to ensure that positions were **properly advertised**, that both the letter and the spirit of the hiring procedure were followed and that there was a **thorough search for candidates**, especially candidates of the underrepresented gender.

- It provides advice to Chairs, Deans and the VPA&P with respect to faculty hiring, and reports to Senate annually, via the VPA&P, on its activities and operation.
Observations

- There is a range in content and quality of the memos submitted to UARC by the Department Chairs.
- We also note that some departments provide excellent reports while some other departments do not provide the necessary documentation.
What we look for

- Hiring process is open and fair
- Special Efforts to Recruit Under-represented gender
- Potential conflict of interest (DACA selection)
- Hiring matches the advertisements
- Consensus in Department
Role of UARC

➢ Ensure Policy 76 is followed in the hiring process

➢ We do not re-evaluate the qualifications of the candidate – the purview of the Department

➢ We will do a comparison of candidates to identify anomalies and, if there are anomalies, look for explanation in Chair’s discussion, or solicit an explanation - the candidate meets the description in the advertised position
We Need

- Discussion of relative merits of top three candidates and candidate of opposite gender
- Recommendation of Dean
- Contingency plan that will be followed if first choice does not accept the offer
- Reference letters for top three candidates and candidate of opposite gender

- ALL PARTS OF THE UARC FILE SUBMISSION FORMS MUST BE ADDRESSED (Forms are available at the Secretariat Website- under UARC)
Chair's Memo to the Dean re: Summary of Recruiting Efforts

1. A summary of recruiting efforts, with specific reference to:

- a statement of the time period during which advertisements appeared
- a statement of, reference to relevant UW websites
- a description of specific efforts made to recruit applications from the under-represented
- A statement on potential conflict of interest- if any and /or how was it resolved.
2. A description of the selection procedure, with specific reference to:

- the process (e.g., appointment, open meeting, secret ballot) by which the DACA/SACA was constituted
- the names of members of the DACA/SACA
- the number of candidates who were considered for the position
- the names of the candidates who were short-listed or interviewed
- the nature of the interviews (e.g., seminar presentation, undergraduate lecture, discussions with Committee and/or faculty members)
- an indication of what consultation took place with department/school members (their awareness of the process, opportunity to comment, etc.), comments from DACA/SACA members and others on any seminars and interviews of the successful applicant and of the runners-up (copies of actual comments may be included, if desired)
3. **Signatures of all DACA/SACA members** *(not required if copies of their actual comments have been included)*

4. **An explanation of the ranking of the candidates, with specific reference to:**

   - the names of the successful applicant and the two runners-up
   - the relative strengths of the top three candidates, and statement of how the proposed appointment fits within the aims and current composition of the department/school
   - other reasons, if any, for the recommendation of the DACA/SACA
   - the best applicant of the opposite gender (name, relative strengths, CV and related materials), if all three candidates are of the same gender
   - department/school strategy if the successful applicant declines (intention to proceed to runners up? plans to readvertise?)
5. ATTACHMENTS: Documentation should include:

- Copies of all advertisements for the position as they appeared in journals, CAUT Bulletin, etc. (Authorizations for advertisements should not be included.)

- Written documentation (CV, letter of application) for each of the top three candidates for the position.

- Three letters of reference for candidates who were interviewed.

- CV and related materials for the best candidate of the opposite gender if all three candidates are of the same gender.

Note: UARC would prefer to receive files of all ranked interviewees, regardless of their number; this is seen to be especially valuable when the successful applicant declines, since it may well avoid a further submission to UARC.
The Process

Designed for efficient processing

Includes:

➤ Advance notice that a file is being prepared
➤ Check lists so that the file is complete the first time
➤ Use of SharePoint to avoid delay in file delivery

Forms

Summary of Recruiting Efforts
http://secretariat.uwaterloo.ca/forms/facultyappts.htm

Check List for UARC File Submission
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>What</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Decision is made to make an offer to a candidate</td>
<td>Advise dean’s office: name of candidate, when to expect file to be ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s office</td>
<td>Hear from department</td>
<td>Advise Equity Office name, department, when to expect file to be ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrange for review (depends on reviewer availability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Reidel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hear from faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>While chair’s memo is being written</td>
<td>Prepare file in the order set out in the Check List for UARC File Submission; ensure complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>File complete</td>
<td>Complete and sign the <em>Check List for UARC File Submission</em>; deliver file to dean’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s office</td>
<td>Receipt of file From Dept</td>
<td>Add dean’s memo to file; complete and sign the <em>Check List for UARC File Submission</em>; scan and upload to SharePoint as one document, with check list at the front; advise Secretariat when upload completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Office</td>
<td>Receipt of notification that upload completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Within three working days of notification that file is ready</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Office</td>
<td>Reviewer uploads Check List for UARC Reviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UARC chair</td>
<td>Completion of review</td>
<td>Email letter to AVP&amp;P, dean’s office, Equity Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After offer was made to the candidate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Receive response to offer</td>
<td>Advise dean’s office whether offer was accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s office</td>
<td>Hear from department</td>
<td>Advise Equity Office whether offer was accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After offer was made to the candidate:

- Department: Receive response to offer
- Advise dean’s office whether offer was accepted
- Dean’s office: Hear from department
- Advise Equity Office whether offer was accepted
Questions?