

Mini Committee Duties

1. Provide guidance and feedback to the candidate on their materials:
 - a. CV
 - b. Teaching statement
 - c. Research statement (except for instructor track)
 - d. Selected papers (selected teaching materials for instructor track)

All mini-committees should strive to help each candidate prepare the best possible case. In that way, no one candidate is disadvantaged.

2. Develop a proposal for the external letter writers for discussion and approval by the standing committee.
3. Digest and summarize the external letters, the teaching committee report and the candidates' materials for the standing committee.

Protocol for selection of external letter writers

1. The candidate is asked for the names of 7 potential external letter writers. The candidates may consult with whomever they like except for members of their mini committee. Any member of the standing committee with whom they consult will be obligated to discuss the advice given to the candidate during the standing committee meeting at which the external reviewers are decided. The candidates are suggested to annotate their list. That is, they should include the general areas of expertise of each person, if they know the person and how, what parts of their work they may be familiar with, etc. The candidates are to email their list to the Head and the Associate Head for Faculty Affairs.
2. Independently, the mini committee also develops an (annotated) list. In this round, the mini-committee's list should consist of 7 or 8 people.
3. After completing their list, the committee should contact the Head and Associate Head for Faculty Affairs, who will forward the candidate's list to the committee. The committee may ask the candidate for clarification or more information on the people on the candidate's list. If there is a lot of overlap between the two lists, the committee may add to their list at this point.
4. Next, the committee's job is to "merge" the two list and come up with a slate of external reviewers, actually a "schedule." This will be presented to the standing committee by the mini committee. The details are elaborated below.

Producing a merged list

The Faculty of Science wishes to obtain 6 external letters of appraisal. Some letter writers may decline and so the process is not a one shot deal. Let C be the set of reviewers identified by the candidate and M be the mini committee reviewer list. Any reviewers that are on both lists end up are credited toward the candidates list, so it is useful to define a department-only set of reviewers, $D = M$ set-minus C . The following must remain true at all times in the letter requesting process:

- The number of requests from C must greater-or-equal the number requested from D .
- There must always be at least one person on the candidate's list that is not asked.

The mini committee should develop a proposal for the initial slate of 6 reviewers to be solicited, as well as whom to ask when one or more decline, all the while satisfying the above constraints. The proposed slate and schedule should be the best possible reviewers for providing the standing committee with the most informed and authoritative opinions to help it make a fair and sound decision. To simplify the process, requests will proceed in rounds, i.e., the plan is to wait until definitive responses have been received from all of the initial review requests before moving on to make other requests.

For each possible combination of one or two declines, the aim is to specify a subset of the same size of new potential reviewers to request. In the simplest case this will consist of 6 individual replacement names. As an upper bound, there would be 6 individual declines and 15 double declines to consider. However, this is unlikely to occur; the mini committee should consult the Head and Associate Head if the replacement schedule becomes overly complex. If there are declines that are not anticipated by the schedule presented to the standing committee, the Head will simply discuss it with members of the mini-committee without approval by the entire standing committee.

The original slate and the schedule is presented for discussion and approval to the standing committee. Allow 15-20 minutes for the presentation and another 15-20 minutes for discussion. Topics to consider presenting include:

- Summary of research areas that need covering
- Other desiderata (understanding of Canadian system, big name, someone with a broad view, etc.)
- Original mini committee slate and brief bios
- Candidate's slate and brief bios
- Proposed slate and schedule
- Discussion, reviewer conflicts, any improvements
- Standing ctte suggestions for improvements to candidate's materials