

From: [Situ, Ping](#) - [REDACTED]
To: [Zeiders, Katharine Hunsdon](#) - [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Nominating Committee Follow-up
Date: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 1:42:44 PM

Dear Katie,

I truly appreciate you checking with me first on this matter. But, I think it might be a better approach to open this discussion to the entire committee including Jane. I have been on the Nominating Committee a few terms (as a member) and almost all the chairs have been doing business the current way. I'll be more than happy to support you to serve as chair of this committee if it is something you wish to take on.

Thanks and kind wishes,

Ping

<> <> <> <> <> <>

Ping Situ

Associate Librarian

Student Learning & Engagement Dept.

University of Arizona Libraries

[REDACTED]

<> <> <> <> <> <>

From: Zeiders, Katharine Hunsdon - [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 1:18 PM
To: Situ, Ping - [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Nominating Committee Follow-up

If you'd like me to send this to the entire Nom Com group, I can do this, but just wanted to run this by you first!

From: Zeiders, Katharine Hunsdon - [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 1:16 PM
To: Situ, Ping - [REDACTED]
Subject: Nominating Committee Follow-up

Hi Ping,

Hope you're having a good week. I just wanted to touch base with you about something that happened to the Nominating Committee. As you know, at the last meeting, Jane came with the list of people who completed the survey. She had marked people in red who were ineligible, but after being pushed a bit more, three of those marked (Matthew Abraham, Lin Wei Hua, and Maggert Keith) were "ineligible" for other reasons (e.g., her personal experience with them, rumors of them being problematic and not good candidates for CAFT). Although I appreciate Jane's help in this process and I acknowledge that she comes with a lot of experience, she is not an elected member of the Nominating Committee

and her making her own personal decisions about people seems inappropriate.

I'd like to request that we revisit this process: that Jane presents the survey results and highlights only the names that are ineligible based on either their position (e.g., dean) or their title (e.g., they are not tenure track/continuing status, or the president of CAFT). All other names should be allowed to be discussed and be given a fair process for the position. I do understand that Jane had concerns about Matthew Abraham because he may have a CAFT case, but this should be verified with the CAFT chair if possible (and we should have a process in place to do this every time we have names).

Related, I believe we need the survey results in advance of meetings. After the meeting, the survey was put on Box, and I looked at a few of the candidate's comments and it gave me a lot more context (and would weigh into my decision). For instance, Matthew Abraham was the CAFT Chair, a C11 member and has other qualifying characteristics). Having this information beforehand is necessary so we can adequately discuss each candidate.

Would love to know your thoughts on this. And I'm happy to support you in ways that we can make this process run smoothly.

Thank you for your consideration and your leadership on the committee,

Katie

Katharine H. Zeiders, Ph.D. (she/her/hers)
Associate Professor | Family Studies & Human Development
The University of Arizona College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
650 N Park Avenue, Rm 235
Tucson, AZ 85719-5089



https://cals.arizona.edu/fcs/faculty/katie_zeiders

We respectfully acknowledge the University of Arizona is on the land and territories of Indigenous peoples. Today, Arizona is home to 22 federally recognized tribes, with Tucson being home to the O'odham and the Yaqui.