**2018 Guidelines for the Nominating Committee**

# **Guidelines with respect to the collaborative work of the committee**

1. It is helpful to begin early. As soon as the committee is formed, use the fall semester to go through the SCE membership list and to contact colleagues and networks. Each member should bring the names of several potential candidates to the first committee meeting at the annual meeting.
2. The Chair may find it useful to contact two or three previous nominating committee chairs to learn from their experience.
3. Much can be accomplished at the SCE annual meeting:
	1. The Committee usually holds one meeting early in the Annual Meeting to discuss the criteria of selection that the Nominating Committee consider important and to share the names committee members have already identified. Typically, the chair invites members of the outgoing nominating committee to attend the first meeting in order to share their experience with the incoming committee.
	2. Use the annual meeting to encourage all SCE full members and student members to submit suggested candidates and to encourage members to consider self-nomination. The Committee may wish to provide some form or process for self-nomination.
	3. The committee sets and announces a date after which further suggestions will not be considered (or the committee can say that suggestions will be accepted for consideration any time until the slate is final).
	4. Committee members can reach out to the conveners of Working Groups. Caucuses, and Interest Groups for their input.
	5. Committee members may find it helpful to attend sessions at which potential candidates are presenting.
	6. The Committee usually arranges a second meeting near the close of the SCE meeting to discuss what has been learned and accomplished, to share suggested names and self-nominations that various committee members have received during the meeting, to do some preliminary prioritizing of names in hand, to review the timeline, and to assign responsibilities.
4. With a fairly complete list of names in hand, committee members gather information about members under consideration. Some committees in the past have at this point contacted all those whose names have been suggested to ascertain their willingness to stand for election if nominated and to solicit their CVs, but CVs are readily available on the web now and willingness to serve can always be ascertained when an invitation is extended. Thus, it is not clear that preliminary contact with everyone on the list is necessary or desirable (it increases the possibility of hard feelings if people know they have been considered but not nominated). Also, see #9 below.
5. Names under consideration are shared in January/February with the Executive Administrator so that she can supply attendance history and participation, information as to whether the person has had lapsed membership in the past, and any other relevant information about contributions and performance.
6. If the Committee would find it helpful, the Executive Administrator can set up a website group page on which the Committee can list candidates and file their CVs and other information.
7. The Committee can do some work by e-mail exchange, but the Executive Administrator will arrange as many conference calls as the committee needs. Skype can be useful for conference calls.
8. Once the Committee has agreed upon (preferably by consensus, but by majority vote if necessary) a prioritized list, the Committee’s chosen nominees are contacted by the Committee chair to confirm their willingness to be nominated and to serve if elected. The chair moves down the prioritized lists until the slate has been filled.
9. If the Committee elected to contact everyone on the list at an early stage in its deliberations, then it is very important at this stage to contact and thank all those who were willing to be considered but have not been selected. If the contact is by telephone, a follow-up email should be sent.
10. The chair submits the slate of nominations to President and SCE Office—*ideally by May 15, but absolutely no later than June 15.*

# Guidelines with respect to qualifications for full members

The SCE does not have a formal, binding list of qualifications for office. The following are some considerations that may be helpful in selecting candidates.

1. It is important to remember that the positions are not merely honorific. Those who serve as officers of the organization or on the Board of Directors have significant ongoing responsibility not only for the scholarly well-being of the SCE, but also for its financial and organizational well-being. Members who agree to serve in the presidential cabinet or on the Board need to be willing to take on the responsibility of helping to run the business of the society. This is *a fortiori* the case with the vice presidency.
2. Members’ scholarly achievements and reputation are an important element of in candidacy considerations. We are an association of scholars in ethics. Most of our members work in academic settings.
	1. There is no minimum list of publications that qualifies one for a board position, but a significant scholarly record does show an understanding of the scholarly and educational enterprise to which this Society is dedicated.
	2. That said, the weight of a given member’s scholarly publication record should always be assessed against the particular challenges faced and/or privileges enjoyed by that scholar (so far as those factors can be known). For example, assessment of the scholarly record of a member who has spent years working in contingent appointments could appropriately recognize that her or his publication record has likely been accomplished without paid time for research, dedicated travel funds, access to research grants, or any of the other privileges that often come with a tenure-line position.
3. We have a broad and varied membership, and having a Board that reflects the Society’s diverse constituencies is extremely important. At the same time, we are so various that not all constituencies can have a presence on the Board at any given time. The objective, though, is that over time the members nominated for the Board and the presidential line will manifest the full richness of our scholarly community.
	1. Certainly, the Nominating Committee needs to be attentive to diversity with regard to the traditional categories such as race, gender, and sexual orientation; and confessional affiliation.
	2. But there are other types of diversity that are relevant to the SCE’s own work.
		1. Where was the candidate trained? It is probably not desirable to have a Board whose members have Ph.D.'s from only one or two schools.
		2. Where does the candidate teach or work? A seminary? A secular department of religious studies? A religiously affiliated theology department? An ethics center, hospital, or institute? We have members in all these settings and others.
		3. If candidates work in a traditional academic setting, do they have tenure-line or contingent appointments? An increasing number of our members have contingent positions of one sort or another, and the number is likely to increase in coming years. Bringing faculty with these relatively new kinds of appointments into the leadership of the SCE is important for the health of our organization. Realistically, this may mean modifying expectations for both scholarly achievement (expectations with respect to quantity, not quality) and regularity of past meeting participation, since contingent faculty often have heavier teaching loads and less institutional funding (or none at all) for travel to scholarly meetings.
		4. In what areas do the candidates specialize? What methodology do they use? Who are their conversation partners?
		5. In what country or in what area of the U.S. does the candidate live and work? Ethical issues can look different on the border with Mexico from the way they look in Canada, in cosmopolitan U.S. coastal cities, in the U.S. Midwest, or in inner city Chicago.
4. Given the fiscal and governance responsibilities associated with service on the Board, it is generally good to look to people who have at least 6 to 10 years as a full member of the Society.
	1. This strategy minimizes potential for conflict of interest, since Board members should not hesitate to do what they need to do (for example, challenge a policy they think is unwise) out of fear of career advancement, especially with regard to tenure decisions.
	2. Members at that point in their careers have typically had sufficient opportunity to establish their own scholarly identity, hone essential skills in collaborative decision-making, and demonstrate commitment to SCE by participating in its work in other ways.
5. Prior experience of leadership and collaboration should be considered important attributes for service on the board or as an officer. As a general rule, we don't want the SCE board to be the first important committee a person serves on.
	1. Given the emphasis that the SCE membership tends to place on prior involvement in the work of the society in its selection of officers, a good place to look for candidates for Vice President is the list of prior members of the Board of Directors, as well as the leadership of important standing committees and task forces.

### Similarly, for prospective Board Members, evidence of leadership and effective contributions in committees, the *JSCE* editorial board, working groups, and caucuses within the Society is an important place to start. However, evidence of leadership in other contexts is also relevant.

### Have the candidates held important leadership experience at their home institutions (department chair, dean, officers in their faculty senate)?

* + 1. Have the candidates held positions outside the academy at one time or another that would be of great value to the SCE Board (non-profit board or director roles, corporate managerial experience, experience in the financial sector)?
		2. In considering members who have contingent faculty appointments, the Committee may take into account the fact that regular participation and activity within the SCE ought to be required for consideration for a board position. However, since for contingent faculty, such commitment typically occurs only by utilizing one’s personal time and funding, successful participation should be rewarded as exceptional and not expected as a bare minimum.
		3. Similarly, in considering the candidates’ leadership at their home institutions, the Committee may take into account the fact that contingent status often bars one from participation in committees, the faculty senate, and other standard leadership opportunities. At the same time, since many contingent professors combine teaching with other work, they may often be the members most likely to possess significant experience in the other arenas mentioned above.
1. Concerning re-nomination of candidates who, in the past, have been nominated but not elected:
	1. If a member has been nominated for the Board or for the office of Vice President, the member may certainly be re-nominated after the passage of several years.
	2. There is a difference of opinion as to whether members who have been on the slate of nominees twice without being elected to office should be eligible, after a suitable period of time, for nomination a third time. These guidelines leave this decision to the discretion of the Nominating Committee. We ask only that you consider the division of opinion on this matter. Some believe that—provided the person in question is otherwise qualified and deeply committed to the SCE, and provided that the Nominating Committee believes that the person is one of the most qualified under consideration—the decision whether to stand for election a third time should belong to the individual. The thinking here is that both the organization and its members change over time and that a candidate whom the membership may not have preferred at one point might well be elected to leadership at another time. Others believe that if the membership has twice declined to elect an individual to office, it is neither prudent nor appropriate for the Nominating Committee to persist in re-nominating the person, and that this remains the case even after quite a few years have intervened.

# Guidelines for the nomination of student members

Student members are relatively new to the Society and thus less likely to be known by members of the Nominating Committee or by the members who will be asked to elect them. The issue of eligibility for student seats is also more complicated because when students are awarded their doctorate, they are no longer able to hold student seats on the Board. These two, taken together, mean that the Committee will need to be particularly proactive in inviting recommendations and will also need to request more information from those who suggest names for consideration. The Committee is also encouraged to seek statements of intent from students who are willing to be considered.

1. Soliciting Nominations:
	1. Invite all full members and student members to suggest names to the Committee for consideration.
	2. Inform student members that self-nomination is invited and appropriate; provide instructions as to how to self-nominate.
	3. Invite suggestions from the leadership of the Student Caucus and other student members; ask that suggestions be accompanied by written information about where the recommended student is studying, when the student anticipates completing her or his doctoral work, and any relevant prior contributions the student may have made to the life of the Society.
	4. Invite suggestions from SCE members who serve as faculty in Ph.D. programs, asking that suggestions be accompanied with the same written information noted above
2. Timing of service: Students who are elected will serve two-year terms on the board. The slate is prepared in the spring of year 1; the student is elected in January of year 2 and serves through year 2 and year 3. The student will need to have student member status through all three of those years. Thus, *a student who agrees to be nominated should be, at the time of agreeing to stand for election, three years from the completion of the dissertation*. [Note that the slate for 2019 represents an anomaly in this regard. In 2019 the membership will elect one student member to serve the standard two-year term, and one student member to serve a one-year term so as to set up the proper schedule of rotation. This means that the two students nominated for the one-year term would only need to be two years from the completion of the dissertation at the time of agreeing to stand for election.]
3. Qualifications
	1. Normally student members running for the Board should have been SCE members for at least one year before being placed on the slate of nominees.
	2. Students who self-nominate, along with those whose names are suggested, should be invited to write a brief paragraph about why they wish to sit on the Board of Directors, their reflections on the experience and expertise they would bring, and a summary of their SCE activities and participation. This would be for the use of the Nominating Committee in its deliberations.
	3. Caucus leaders and faculty members who put forward names may be invited to provide their reasons for thinking that the individual would be a hard-working and productive Board member.
	4. The Nominating Committee may also seek information about administrative experience that the student may have had in student government or as student representatives on university committees/boards or in organizations other than the universities they have attended.
	5. SCE student members, like our full members, are diverse and bring many gifts. We ask the Nominating Committee to be mindful of this abundance of perspectives in its selection of student nominees. Many of the considerations listed in section 3 of the “Guidelines with respect to qualifications for full members” are relevant to student members as well.