

Selection of Commission members.

EC&CC meeting, October 4-6, 2023



Photo by Yuya Makino

Silvina Ponce Dawson

DF, FCEN-UBA & IFIBA, UBA-CONICET

President Designate, IUPAP





The composition of commissions will be renewed at the in-person GA that will be held in October, 2024.



The composition of commissions will be renewed at the in-person GA that will be held in October, 2024.

Commission members are chosen from the candidates nominated by the Liaison Committees of IUPAP's members and by those nominated by Commissions. The process includes various instances of nominations/selections to determine the slate that will be voted by the GA.



The composition of commissions will be renewed at the in-person GA that will be held in October, 2024.

Commission members are chosen from the candidates nominated by the Liaison Committees of IUPAP's members and by those nominated by Commissions. The process includes various instances of nominations/selections to determine the slate that will be voted by the GA.

The determination of the slate is very complicated. There are too many constraints to satisfy, which is pretty much impossible: geographical distribution, gender balance, coverage of sub-disciplines, at least one member involved in applications + continuity of (some of) the members.



The composition of commissions will be renewed at the in-person GA that will be held in October, 2024.

Commission members are chosen from the candidates nominated by the Liaison Committees of IUPAP's members and by those nominated by Commissions. The process includes various instances of nominations/selections to determine the slate that will be voted by the GA.

The determination of the slate is very complicated. There are too many constraints to satisfy, which is pretty much impossible: geographical distribution, gender balance, coverage of sub-disciplines, at least one member involved in applications + continuity of (some of) the members.

A nomination sub-committee will be appointed to assist with the determination of a slate to be presented to the GA. Its job will be to consider all the nominations and produce a proposal trying to satisfy all these conditions, considering as well that a reasonable minimum expected number of territory-elected positions to Commissions and the EC, as a function of the member category, be equal to the number of units, limited to maximum 18 units, averaged over a period of 9 years.



The composition of commissions will be renewed at the in-person GA that will be held in October, 2024.

Commission members are chosen from the candidates nominated by the Liaison Committees of IUPAP's members and by those nominated by Commissions. The process includes various instances of nominations/selections to determine the slate that will be voted by the GA.

The determination of the slate is very complicated. There are too many constraints to satisfy, which is pretty much impossible: geographical distribution, gender balance, coverage of sub-disciplines, at least one member involved in applications + continuity of (some of) the members.

A nomination sub-committee will be appointed to assist with the determination of a slate to be presented to the GA. Its job will be to consider all the nominations and produce a proposal trying to satisfy all these conditions, considering as well that a reasonable minimum expected number of territory-elected positions to Commissions and the EC, as a function of the member category, be equal to the number of units, limited to maximum 18 units, averaged over a period of 9 years.

At the GA, Liaison Committees may resubmit their nominations of persons not on the slate, but these renominations must be supported by at least one other Delegation. The Executive Council then will prepare a final ballot with its recommendations and any renominations for a position to be voted by the GA.



Last time I was in charge of the sub-committee and I noticed various problems:



Last time I was in charge of the sub-committee and I noticed various problems:

Commission chairs nominated people with affiliation in the territory of an IUPAP member, but the LC of that member nominated someone else or did not make nominations for that commission.



Last time I was in charge of the sub-committee and I noticed various problems:

Commission chairs nominated people with affiliation in the territory of an IUPAP member, but the LC of that member nominated someone else or did not make nominations for that commission.

Some LCs nominated people that were not active members of the communities that the corresponding commission represented.



Last time I was in charge of the sub-committee and I noticed various problems:

Commission chairs nominated people with affiliation in the territory of an IUPAP member, but the LC of that member nominated someone else or did not make nominations for that commission.

Some LCs nominated people that were not active members of the communities that the corresponding commission represented.

Some LCs nominated too many people compared with the units they pay without indicating any preference among them.



Last time I was in charge of the sub-committee and I noticed various problems:

Commission chairs nominated people with affiliation in the territory of an IUPAP member, but the LC of that member nominated someone else or did not make nominations for that commission.

Some LCs nominated people that were not active members of the communities that the corresponding commission represented.

Some LCs nominated too many people compared with the units they pay without indicating any preference among them.

Some LCs failed to nominate candidates.



Last time I was in charge of the sub-committee and I noticed various problems:

Commission chairs nominated people with affiliation in the territory of an IUPAP member, but the LC of that member nominated someone else or did not make nominations for that commission.

Some LCs nominated people that were not active members of the communities that the corresponding commission represented.

Some LCs nominated too many people compared with the units they pay without indicating any preference among them.

Some LCs failed to nominate candidates.

The final list selected by some Commissions had exactly 14 names. Others had more names: those lists were most helpful since they allowed us to make adjustments so as to satisfy all the constraints I've told you about.



Last time I was in charge of the sub-committee and I noticed various problems:

Commission chairs nominated people with affiliation in the territory of an IUPAP member, but the LC of that member nominated someone else or did not make nominations for that commission.

Some LCs nominated people that were not active members of the communities that the corresponding commission represented.

Some LCs nominated too many people compared with the units they pay without indicating any preference among them.

Some LCs failed to nominate candidates.

The final list selected by some Commissions had exactly 14 names. Others had more names: those lists were most helpful since they allowed us to make adjustments so as to satisfy all the constraints I've told you about.

Bottom line, we need:

- a better communication between LCs and commission chairs
- a list with more than 14 names per Commission
- indication of preference (by LCs and Commissions)



Last time I was in charge of the sub-committee and I noticed various problems:

Commission chairs nominated people with affiliation in the territory of an IUPAP member, but the LC of that member nominated someone else or did not make nominations for that commission.

Some LCs nominated people that were not active members of the communities that the corresponding commission represented.

Some LCs nominated too many people compared with the units they pay without indicating any preference among them.

Some LCs failed to nominate candidates.

The final list selected by some Commissions had exactly 14 names. Others had more names: those lists were most helpful since they allowed us to make adjustments so as to satisfy all the constraints I've told you about.

Bottom line, we need:

- a better communication between LCs and commission chairs
- a list with more than 14 names per Commission
- indication of preference (by LCs and Commissions)

+ now we have Corporate Members who can also nominate.



Last time I was in charge of the sub-committee and I noticed various problems:

Commission chairs nominated people with affiliation in the territory of an IUPAP member, but the LC of that member nominated someone else or did not make nominations for that commission.

Some LCs nominated people that were not active members of the communities that the corresponding commission represented.

Some LCs nominated too many people compared with the units they pay without indicating any preference among them.

Some LCs failed to nominate candidates.

The final list selected by some Commissions had exactly 14 names. Others had more names: those lists were most helpful since they allowed us to make adjustments so as to satisfy all the constraints I've told you about.

Bottom line, we need:

- a better communication between LCs and commission chairs
- a list with more than 14 names per Commission
- indication of preference (by LCs and Commissions)

+ now we have Corporate Members who can also nominate.

This is what I considered to make the proposal of how we should proceed.

Proposed steps to elaborate the slate

CCs are given a form containing the list of current Commission members with the terms they have served. CCs indicate who of those members should continue, in which capacity (regular member, chair, vice-chair, secretary) and why (in the case of those whose continuation is not recommended).

Proposed steps to elaborate the slate

CCs are given a form containing the list of current Commission members with the terms they have served. CCs indicate who of those members should continue, in which capacity (regular member, chair, vice-chair, secretary) and why (in the case of those whose continuation is not recommended).

At this time, CCs can include additional names with affiliation in IUPAP's territorial or corporate associate members providing all the necessary information + a brief justification of each new proposal. It would be advisable to contact the nominated people to check their availability.

Proposed steps to elaborate the slate

CCs are given a form containing the list of current Commission members with the terms they have served. CCs indicate who of those members should continue, in which capacity (regular member, chair, vice-chair, secretary) and why (in the case of those whose continuation is not recommended).

At this time, CCs can include additional names with affiliation in IUPAP's territorial or corporate associate members providing all the necessary information + a brief justification of each new proposal. It would be advisable to contact the nominated people to check their availability.

I am not certain if this first step will be done through the nomination system we used in the past or not (I am consulting with Hari about it).

Proposed steps to elaborate the slate

CCs are given a form containing the list of current Commission members with the terms they have served. CCs indicate who of those members should continue, in which capacity (regular member, chair, vice-chair, secretary) and why (in the case of those whose continuation is not recommended).

At this time, CCs can include additional names with affiliation in IUPAP's territorial or corporate associate members providing all the necessary information + a brief justification of each new proposal. It would be advisable to contact the nominated people to check their availability.

I am not certain if this first step will be done through the nomination system we used in the past or not (I am consulting with Hari about it).

The EC shares with the LCs the list of people with affiliation in their territory or institution/company that were recommended by Commissions, distinguishing between those that are already commission members and those who are not.

Proposed steps to elaborate the slate

CCs are given a form containing the list of current Commission members with the terms they have served. CCs indicate who of those members should continue, in which capacity (regular member, chair, vice-chair, secretary) and why (in the case of those whose continuation is not recommended).

At this time, CCs can include additional names with affiliation in IUPAP's territorial or corporate associate members providing all the necessary information + a brief justification of each new proposal. It would be advisable to contact the nominated people to check their availability.

I am not certain if this first step will be done through the nomination system we used in the past or not (I am consulting with Hari about it).

The EC shares with the LCs the list of people with affiliation in their territory or institution/company that were recommended by Commissions, distinguishing between those that are already commission members and those who are not.

LCs submit nominations through the nomination system (improved 30th GA version) giving a 4-category score to each name. Current Commission members with affiliation in their territory/company/institution whose continuation was recommended by CCs must be included with high score; if not, an explanation should be provided. A separate, ordered/ranked list of all the names submitted should be sent to the EC (or produced from the nomination system).



What follows is more or less the same as last time:

What follows is more or less the same as last time:

Each CC receives the nominations made by LCs for the corresponding Commission, including the scores given to the names, and submits a recommendation of Commission members through the nomination system. The list of names should exceed the total number of Commission members.

What follows is more or less the same as last time:

Each CC receives the nominations made by LCs for the corresponding Commission, including the scores given to the names, and submits a recommendation of Commission members through the nomination system. The list of names should exceed the total number of Commission members.

The nomination sub-committee gathers all the information to produce a first draft of the slate in which, if necessary, names suggested by the EC will be added .

What follows is more or less the same as last time:

Each CC receives the nominations made by LCs for the corresponding Commission, including the scores given to the names, and submits a recommendation of Commission members through the nomination system. The list of names should exceed the total number of Commission members.

The nomination sub-committee gathers all the information to produce a first draft of the slate in which, if necessary, names suggested by the EC will be added .

The draft slate is discussed at the EC&CC meeting that will be held immediately before the in-person GA. The slate is provided to the GA before its starting date.

What follows is more or less the same as last time:

Each CC receives the nominations made by LCs for the corresponding Commission, including the scores given to the names, and submits a recommendation of Commission members through the nomination system. The list of names should exceed the total number of Commission members.

The nomination sub-committee gathers all the information to produce a first draft of the slate in which, if necessary, names suggested by the EC will be added .

The draft slate is discussed at the EC&CC meeting that will be held immediately before the in-person GA. The slate is provided to the GA before its starting date.

What do you think? Do you have any suggestions?

What follows is more or less the same as last time:

Each CC receives the nominations made by LCs for the corresponding Commission, including the scores given to the names, and submits a recommendation of Commission members through the nomination system. The list of names should exceed the total number of Commission members.

The nomination sub-committee gathers all the information to produce a first draft of the slate in which, if necessary, names suggested by the EC will be added .

The draft slate is discussed at the EC&CC meeting that will be held immediately before the in-person GA. The slate is provided to the GA before its starting date.

What do you think? Do you have any suggestions?

I have two questions:

What follows is more or less the same as last time:

Each CC receives the nominations made by LCs for the corresponding Commission, including the scores given to the names, and submits a recommendation of Commission members through the nomination system. The list of names should exceed the total number of Commission members.

The nomination sub-committee gathers all the information to produce a first draft of the slate in which, if necessary, names suggested by the EC will be added .

The draft slate is discussed at the EC&CC meeting that will be held immediately before the in-person GA. The slate is provided to the GA before its starting date.

What do you think? Do you have any suggestions?

I have two questions:

How to “count” (for the territorial balance) members nominated by corporate associated members.



What follows is more or less the same as last time:

Each CC receives the nominations made by LCs for the corresponding Commission, including the scores given to the names, and submits a recommendation of Commission members through the nomination system. The list of names should exceed the total number of Commission members.

The nomination sub-committee gathers all the information to produce a first draft of the slate in which, if necessary, names suggested by the EC will be added .

The draft slate is discussed at the EC&CC meeting that will be held immediately before the in-person GA. The slate is provided to the GA before its starting date.

What do you think? Do you have any suggestions?

I have two questions:

How to “count” (for the territorial balance) members nominated by corporate associated members.

According to Article 6 of IUPAP’s Internal Regulations: All elections of Commission members are for a term of 3 years and there is a set of rules on permanence to guarantee rotation and renewal. In particular, service in all capacities shall not exceed 3 terms whether or not those terms are consecutive. Exceptions can be voted by the GA.

What happens when a person who was member of one Commission is nominated for another? I think this rule applies as well. What do you think?