

2-23-2006

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Feb. 23, 2006

Arts & Sciences Faculty

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Feb. 23, 2006" (2006). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 70.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac/70](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/70)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [wzhang@rollins.edu](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

**Minutes of the Meeting  
Arts and Sciences Faculty  
February 23, 2006**

Members Present: V. Aggarwal, M. Anderson, P. Bernal, G. Biery-Hamilton, A. Boguslawski, B. Boles, R. Bommelje, D. Boniface, E. Bouris, W. Brandon, S. Carnahan, R. Carson, J. Cavanaugh, J. Chambliss, D. Charles, M. Cheng, D. Cohen, E. Cohen, T. Cook, D. Crozier, M. D'Amato, J. Davison, D. Davison, N. Decker, R. Diaz-Zambrana, M. Dunn, S. Easton, L. Eng-Wilmot, M. Fetscherin, E. Friedland, J. Gorman, E. Gottlieb, Y. Greenberg, Eileen Gregory, D. Griffin, M. Gunter, D. Hargrove, F. Harper, S. Hewit, A. Homrich, G. Howell, R. James, Y. Jones, S. Klemann, M. Kovarik, H. Kypraios, T. Lairson, E. LeRoy, B. Levis, L. Lines, D. Mays, E. McClellan, C. McInnis-Bowers, M. McLaren, G. Meyers, A. Moe, T. Moore, R. Musgrave, R. Newcomb, M. Newman, A. Nordstrom, P. Pequeno-Rossie, S. Phelen, J. Provost, J. Queen, R. Ray, D. Rogers, M. Sardy, E. Schutz, M. Shafe, R. Simmons, J. Small, P. Stephenson, B. Stephenson, B. Stephenson, D. Stoub, K. Sutherland, B. Svitavsky, L. Tavernier-Almada, K. Taylor, M. Throumoulos, L. Van Sickle, R. Vitray, A. Voicu, D. Wellman, G. Williams, G. Winarski, J. Yellen, W. Zhang

Guests:

Michele Meyer  
Sharon Ager  
Cara Meixner  
Donna Lee  
Sharon Carrier

**I. Call to Order:** T. Cook called the meeting to order at 12:39 p.m.

**II. Approval of the Minutes:** The minutes from the January 26, 2006, meeting were approved.

**III. Announcements:**

T. Cook announced that the Spring Faculty Party will be held at 7:00 pm on Friday, March 24, 2006, at the University Club. The theme for the party will be some version of piracy.

T. Cook announced that the faculty and staff of the Olin Library will be hosting the Book-A-Year Reception on Friday, March 24, 2006 from 5:00 – 7:00 pm. President Emeritus Rita Bornstein will be the Guest Speaker. T. Cook apologized to D. Cohn about the conflict with the event and the Faculty Party and encouraged faculty to attend both events.

Rachel Newcomb announced that the first annual Summit on Transforming Learning will be held on March 24, 2006 from 12:00 – 5:00 pm. There will be a number of workshop sessions covering such topics as internalization, multi-culturalism, service learning and other items that are part of the Quality Enhancement Program. Dr Dick Cuoto, Professor of Leadership Studies at Antioch College will be the guest speaker and will deliver a presentation on Teaching Democracy by Being Democratic.

T. Cook announced that tomorrow in the Bieberbach Room there will be a Symposium on the Asturian Presence in the United States. During the time of Colonial Spanish Florida, many of the Spaniards settling down in the area were Asturians, starting with Pedro Menedez de Aviles, founder of Saint Augustine. All faculty are invited to attend the Symposium. As part of the activities planned, there is a concert by a choir of forty singers from Aviles, Asturia.

T. Cook announced that the All College Faculty meeting will be held on Tues 2/28 @ 12:30 PM in the Bush Auditorium. This is a change of venue from the Galloway Room.

T. Cook received from the Provost an announcement regarding the search for the replacement of Donna Cohen, Director of the Olin Library who will be retiring. T. Cook read the announcement which indicated that a national search will be conducted to fill the position. An advertised position will appear in the Chronicle of Higher Education and appropriate library newsletters. The members of the search committee are Associate Professor Bill Boles, Dean Sharon Carrier, Professor Ted Herbert, Associate Vice President Les Lloyd, Associate Professor Dorothy Mays, Professor Al Moe and Assistant Professor Darren Stoub. The search committee will begin reviewing applications on March 20, 2006.

T. Cook recognized D. Mays, Chair of the Finance and Service Committee, who stated that a concern was brought by the students to F&S about prices paid for textbooks. It was brought to the attention of F&S that there is a correlation between textbook prices and the manner in which faculty submit their textbook adoptions. This was surprising to F&S and D. Mays introduced Tom Quinby from the Rollins bookstore who gave an overview of how the business works and how the faculty can help students pay less for their textbooks each year.

T. Quinby stated that used textbooks last year were slightly over \$700,000. This represents a savings of approximately 25% off the price of a new book. Additionally, the Rice Family Bookstore paid out \$167,000 last fiscal year during the buy-back periods. This represents an increase of \$12,000 from the previous year. By comparison, in 2002, the Bookstore paid out \$105,000. Textbook orders that are received after the buy-back period prevent approximately \$70,000 from being paid out. The combination of higher used textbook sales and increased buy back resulted in savings to the students of more than \$440,000 through the used textbook program. With the increased prices of new textbooks, there is a focus on getting more used books in for the students and it begins with the faculty. If textbook orders are submitted in a timely fashion before the students leave and before the buy back period is over, used books can be ordered. T. Quinby requested that the faculty submit the textbook orders before the buy back period is over. J. Provost asked if it applies if a course will be offered the term after next and he concurred and provided specific examples of this. J. Yellen stated that several students remarked that they buy new books on-line and inquired about the price mark up in the Bookstore. T. Quinby pointed out that the mark up is a standard level throughout the country. T. Quinby also indicated that some students who order on-line purchase the wrong edition. Book orders for the summer term are due on March 10, 2006.

#### **IV. New Business**

T. Cook recognized T. Lairson who moved a resolution expressing the sense of A&S Faculty regarding the process for selecting a new Provost.

The motion was made and seconded.

Copies of the resolution were distributed. T. Lairson shared the background of the resolution. On Friday, February 17, 2006 there was an open discussion of the faculty on the process for selection of a new Provost. A consensus emerged during the meeting that a resolution should be drafted. T. Lairson was volunteered to draft a resolution and it currently has 33 signatures. T. Lairson stated that the resolution was necessary because of the long standing tradition of democratic participation in processes such as the selection of a Provost. In this case, the President presented a candidate for Provost. The resolution indicates that there are flaws in the process. T. Lairson emphasized that the faculty members who signed the resolution do not want to equate the process with which this was done with the outcome – i.e. with the person that the President has proposed. T. Lairson stated that he is personally favorable toward R. Casey becoming the Provost. He also pointed out that many faculty attending the informal meeting were also favorable. The process was deeply flawed and established a very bad precedent. It did not conform to the ways in which things have been done in the past and the faculty who signed the resolution believed it was important to explain it to the President.

T. Lairson identified that T. Cook received a letter from the President this morning which is relevant to the process. (Appendix 1) T. Cook explained that he received the letter via e-mail from the President who asked him to read it to the faculty. (Appendix 1)

T. Cook turned the floor back over to T. Lairson who stated that in his opinion, and the opinion of a few of the signatories of the resolution that he was able to contact in the past two hours, that the President has responded effectively to the resolution that the faculty did not have a chance to vote on. T. Lairson pointed out two specific sentences in the resolution that had been addressed: 1. “We the undersigned call on President Duncan to recognize the serious flaws in the process used to select the next Provost for Rollins; and 2. We urge President Duncan to see the wisdom of effective consultation with and participation by the faculty in all important decisions at Rollins.

T. Lairson stated that he would withdraw the original resolution and substitute for that a second resolution which was distributed.

T. Lairson read the substitute resolution.

### **A Resolution Expressing the Sense of the A&S Faculty Regarding the Process for Selecting a New Provost**

**We, the A&S faculty applaud President Duncan’s letter to the faculty of February 23, 2006. At the same time, we wish to convey two important points regarding the process of consultation with the faculty:**

- 1) Effective consultation is not ad hoc, narrowly construed or after the fact.**
- 2) We expect to play a direct role in deliberations and decisions concerning the dean of the faculty position and in other college-wide deliberations and decisions.**

T. Cook indicated that the Parliamentarian had ruled that T. Lairson has the authority to withdraw the first motion at his own word and introduce the second motion.

The motion was seconded.

Discussion was opened on the motion. J. Provost asked if another item should be placed in the resolution on forming a special advisory committee to the President. J. Provost additionally asked why the Executive Committee would not serve as the advisory committee. J. Provost pointed out that she would like to see this added to the resolution. E. Gregory pointed out that there are no staff members on the Executive Committee. T. Cook reinforced that the Executive Committee consists of the chairs of the major governance committees, President and Vice president of the Faculty, and the President of SGA. This is an A&S group and there are also no Crummer faculty members. W. Brandon asked for clarification about what the By-Laws say about searches. T. Cook stated that the faculty of the entire college must vote on and pass the recommended candidate for Provost. The By-Laws do not address how Provost candidates emerge. T. Cook identified that past Provost candidates (Dan DeNicola, Charles Edmondson and Patricia Lancaster) have come from administrative initiative. B. Levis stated that if the President established an ad hoc committee that the recommendation would need to come to the A&S faculty for its approval. C. McGinnis-Bowers inquired as to who is on the Executive Committee and who attends the meetings to express opinions on a regular basis. Additionally, C. McGinnis-Bowers requested to know the purpose of the Executive Committee. Unless the value of an additional committee is understood, C. McGinnis-Bowers challenges the efficacy of it. Parliamentarian M. Newman pointed out that the President can appoint an ad hoc committee to advise him on any college business. It does not take a vote of the faculty as to whether or not an ad hoc committee can be appointed. M. Newman believes the President desires a sense of how the faculty feels about the idea. T. Cook stated that the title of the group mentioned in the letter is the President's Advisory Council as opposed to committee per se. C. McGinnis-Bowers emphasized that her concern is the idea that there would be a standing group that will advise the President. M. Newman explained that a standing committee cannot be formed without a vote of the A&S Faculty. T. Cook noted that the present motion that is on the floor makes no mention of the Advisory Council. E. Gregory opposes that the ad hoc committee should be added on to the motion because it undermines the governance system. The governance system has been undermined already as the President does not know that we do not have a Senate anymore. This is embarrassing and frightening to her. We have a history of having colloquia which worked well for many years. J. Small agrees with E. Gregory and moves that the first statement be stricken from the resolution. He indicated that he does not understand the meaning of the first point. T. Lairson shared that the purpose of having the first sentence is to describe what the President has done to date and to urge that this should not be repeated. T. Lairson additionally stated that an Advisory Council is a form of ad hoc committee. D. Rogers pointed out that an amendment to the motion has been discussed and it never got made, never got seconded, and discussion should not continue until one of those two things happen because it adds confusion to the discussion. The amendment is J. Provost's point of having a more formalized statement of the advisory council. J. Provost stated that she had a question of clarification and that she would make a motion if it is necessary. J. Davidson spoke in favor of the first point in the second resolution. In the informal faculty meeting, a question was raised about who the president consulted with on the issue of the provost candidacy. Except for members of the Executive Committee, no

faculty members raised their hands. To this group it appeared that consultation had been narrowly construed. There was also mixed opinion from members of the Executive Committee as to whether or not the President consulted with them. Some members indicated the President informed them. J. Davidson does not believe the President understands what the faculty concerns are. In the President's letter that was read today, questionable statements have been made: 1.) if it is the opinion of the faculty, even a substantial minority, that the process has been overly flawed, he will withdraw the recommendation and immediately act to convene a search advisory committee; 2.) the President wants to have a sense of the faculty about whether to proceed with the consideration of Dean Casey for the position of Provost. Even though the President has admitted some unintentional mistakes, he does not fully appreciate what the concern is related to the process. The committee must be more than ad hoc.

J. Yellen asked T. Lairson if the modified resolution was composed after he read President Duncan's letter and he confirmed. J. Yellen stated that since there are many questions about the points in the modified resolution he is doubtful there is enough time to come to some sort of agreement.

T. Cook indicated that this meeting has 25-30 minutes remaining. The All-College Faculty meeting at which R. Casey's name will be put forth as a candidate for Provost is on Tuesday at 12:30 pm as everyone knows. Since the resolution is about process and not the individual, T. Cook asked T. Lairson if this issue can be discussed productively after Tuesday and he concurred. T. Lairson believes that one thing needs to be discussed today which is the faculty's view of R. Casey's nomination for Provost.

T. Moore stated that as one of the original signatories of the original resolution, he supports the substitute resolution as it is written. The President wrote his letter last evening and occasionally we need to trust an administrator. T. Moore believes the faculty should approve the resolution and to get the sense of the faculty over R. Casey's nomination and then go back and ensure that the president understands that this is an issue for us. The process is important. We need to move ahead with this and trust the President. T. Moore believes we can.

D. Davidson stated that he supports the resolution. He emphasized that there is a fundamental problem that is not addressed nor responded to in the President's letter, which is the President does not understand participation and consultation. Additionally, while the faculty has to vote on the candidate who is brought forward, the selection of the choices is the business of the committee. The composition of the committee is very important. D. Davidson indicated it is important to make a statement to President Duncan regarding this issue. D. Davidson inquired whether the conversation between President Duncan and the Executive Committee about R. Casey's nomination for appointment for Provost, was recorded in the minutes. T. Cook responded that it was recorded in the minutes as "the President introduced a personnel matter" at his request since there were people who had not been contacted or informed as yet. T. Cook stated that the committee had the impression it would be a short term process after which the announcement would be made and discussions begun. D. Davidson pointed out that, with all due respect, he finds this to be problematic. He indicated that the purpose of minutes is to maintain accountability and this contributes to the lack of legitimacy of the process. T. Cook, in seeking understanding of the point, questioned if it would never be appropriate for there to be discussions in the Executive Committee the details of which are not recounted in the minutes. D. Davidson stated that the Executive Committee is a steering committee that directs the official business of the faculty and it is not done secretly. The President has the prerogative to consult informally with the members of the

Executive Committee. D. Davidson stated that in his opinion, when the meeting is in session, nothing should be off the record.

T. Cook indicated that that is taken under advisement with thanks.

D. Boniface asked if there was anyone present who wishes to speak against the resolution and if so, please state what they do not like about it. In the interest of coming to a consensus it would be appropriate.

T. Cook repeated that this was a request for opponents to the motion to make themselves known and voice their objections.

E. Cohen addressed his “fellow senators” by indicating that he is not opposed to the resolution but that there is something missing. The President has asked for a sense of the faculty. Should he withdraw R. Casey’s name or convene the committee. E. Cohen pointed out that he has not heard anyone state that there should be an advisory committee.

E. Cohen stated that there should be a third part of the resolution to the effect that the President should call a colloquium to have further discussion of the process.

A. Homrich called the question.

The question was called.

### **The second resolution passed by voice vote**

T. Cook acknowledged T. Lairson who had another motion. T. Lairson stated that due to the circumstances of the All-College Faculty that it is important for the A&S Faculty to go on record of being opposed to or in favor of R. Casey’s candidacy. T. Lairson emphasized that he would like to make the motion that the A&S faculty endorse R. Casey’s name for candidacy for Provost.

The motion was seconded.

T. Cook identified that the motion on the floor is that the A&S Faculty, by a vote, endorse the nomination of R. Casey for Provost. The motion was seconded and is open for discussion.

A question was asked from the floor: What is the purpose? T. Cook called on T. Lairson to respond. T. Lairson pointed out that the original purpose of this faculty meeting was to discuss the faculty’s position with regard to R. Casey’s nomination for Provost, in preparation for the All-College Faculty meeting which will take place on Tuesday. The prior resolution, which deals with the process, should not be equated with the second issue.

T. Lairson emphasized that he believes it is important for this body to discuss the question prior to the All-College faculty meeting.

T. Cook reinforced that the motion that was just passed will be delivered to the President as expressing the sense of the faculty. It states that the faculty wishes to play a direct role in deliberations and discussions concerning the dean of the faculty position. At some point this issue needs to be discussed in a faculty meeting.

R. Ray stated that he believes the passed resolution addresses the concern as to the omission in the President’s letter should he re-start the entire advisory process. If we make an affirmation of this candidacy, we clearly are making a statement that regardless of how flawed the process is to date, we don’t have to start it over again.

T. Cook stated that this addresses the question in the President’s letter, “Do we want to start the process over again?” and it effectively answers the question in the negative.

E. Schutz asked if endorsing the candidacy is endorsing him and whether we would see other candidates.

T. Cook responded that no additional candidates would be seen. One nominee is being offered at Tuesday's meeting for an up or down vote of the entire College faculty. An endorsement of R. Casey's candidacy would amount to a negative answer to the question about whether we think the process has been so flawed that we will have to start over. W. Brandon stated that she finds this personally coercive. It bypasses any discussion that feels free. Tom Lairson has indicated that he is personally in favor of Roger's candidacy. The question is how free others would be to speak out if they may not be happy with his candidacy -- particularly people who are junior faculty, non-tenured. This is so coercive. Some of us were hoping for a secret ballot so we wouldn't have to be visible about whether we agree with Roger's candidacy or not.

T. Cook stated that the President has been informed of the request for a written ballot at Tuesday's All-College Faculty meeting. T. Cook pointed out that all it takes is that someone requests a written ballot and there would be one.

A request for a written ballot was made from the floor.

The request was seconded.

T. Cook emphasized that this is not debatable.

G. Williams stated that those people who do not believe Roger should be Provost should say so.

P. Pequeno suggested that we continue this at the All-College faculty meeting and get a vote – up or down.

T. Cook identified that there would be discussion on Tuesday although the same constraints discussed by W. Brandon will be in place as well.

W. Brandon stated that this is the problem with there not being an open search – the position not being posted and other people not being allowed to declare candidacy.

T. Cook repeated W. Brandon's point for those unable to hear the initial statement.

S. Carnahan stated that prior to her sabbatical last year, she left a powerful faculty, united on many issues. This year, she expressed a sense of disenfranchisement, impotence, and cynicism on the part of many junior faculty members regarding their ability to be heard and effect change. S. Carnihan encouraged all faculty members to take very carefully and to heart the lessons of the Provost search and to be ready to be articulate as a group to ensure that it doesn't happen again.

T. Cook indicated that the floor remains open for discussion of the motion from T. Lairson that this body endorse the candidacy of R. Casey for Provost.

D. Griffin stated that if nothing is done, we are in fact answering the President. He has asked for a response. If we don't respond in any way, it should go ahead. Those who have serious concerns should voice those concerns. Even if we don't vote, this will happen on Tuesday.

T. Cook affirmed that this will happen on Tuesday unless there is a direct statement to the contrary.

E. Schutz stated that he does not want to be misconstrued against having R. Casey as Provost. His point was that if R. Casey was the sole candidate, how he could endorse him without seeing other candidates.

Paper ballots were provided by T. S. Holbrook.

E. Gregory suggested that there is now paper and to do a quick straw vote via written ballot.

Paper was distributed

The straw votes were tabulated and the vote was 45 – Yes; 24 – No.

**V. Adjournment:** There was a motion to adjourn and the motion was passed at 1:50PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Bommelje  
Vice-President/Secretary

#### APPENDIX 1

#### Letter from the President to the Faculty of Arts & Sciences

February 23, 2006

Distinguished Faculty Colleagues,

I regret that, depending upon the timing of this discussion, I may be unavailable to be present at the Faculty Senate meeting due to concurrently held committee meetings of the Board of Trustees at which I am required to attend. If so, then I am requesting Senate President Tom Cook to please read the following statement, and that it be entered in the official minutes of the meeting.

As previously announced, I have recommended Dean of the Faculty Roger Casey for consideration by the full faculty of Rollins College as a candidate for the position of Provost. Apparently mistakenly, I assumed in requesting his consideration for acceptance by the full faculty of the College, as to be determined by an all-College faculty vote, that this was in itself a fully inclusive way of seeking faculty voice in that decision. While such an approach is entirely consistent with the by-laws of the College as they address the procedure for selecting a Provost, the by-laws remain silent on the process for reaching such a recommendation before submission for full faculty consideration. As part of his review, Dean Casey has then been holding open forums and meeting with faculty and staff from other areas within the College to facilitate their consideration of his candidacy.

However, I have heard the concerns expressed by some of our respected faculty colleagues over the process that led us to this point, and specifically the lack of explicit faculty input into design of the process of search and selection. It is certainly reasonable to expect significant faculty participation in selecting the College's chief academic officer. In hindsight, then, I agree with many of these criticisms. Preceding my open letter to the full faculty recommending Dean Casey for consideration, I solicited comment from a number of individual faculty, staff and students, from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, from an advisory group composed of the College's endowed chair holders, and from the senior administrative officers of the College. However, these solicitations were made informally and always within a solely advisory context. In retrospect, this should have been formalized within a clearly structured search process and with explicit faculty participation in determining that process.

Specifically, I inappropriately assumed the outcome of what should have been a more inclusive search committee review of possible internal candidates, as well as including that committee's participation in further designing the process by which the position might be filled. My only excuse is that I was perhaps overly influenced by the natural presumption, as supported by my

informal discussions with faculty and others, that Dean Casey would emerge as clearly the best qualified internal candidate. While I continue to believe that this is the case, the faculty should have had the opportunity to be more explicitly involved in these earlier deliberations. As I have said, I believed that bringing Dean Casey's name forward for consideration by the faculty as a whole was a sufficiently inclusive opportunity for faculty to share in this decision. However, I better understand the subtle difference of having the all-College faculty fully participate in the making of a decision, as prescribed in our by-laws, and having you more fully participate in the process leading up to that decision point. For this unintentional exclusion, I do sincerely apologize. It will not happen again.

More generally, a transparent process under the guidance of a formal search committee also should become the administrative practice in deciding if we are to hold a national search to fill positions of senior leadership. I do have one strongly held conviction in this regard. I will not support a disingenuous national search in which external candidates are solicited to apply and compete against a strong internal applicant who with high probability will become the candidate of first choice. I would be happy to discuss this principle with you at some later time if needed. It is from this perspective then that I believe such searches should most immediately give consideration to highly qualified internal candidates before pursuing external applications. However, at the very least in the future I will seek a more explicit way of involving faculty in developing the process of assessing any and all such qualified internal candidates before the point of recommending them for formal review and endorsement.

Furthermore, if it is the opinion of the faculty, even a substantial minority of the faculty, that the process leading to my recommendation of Dean Casey for your consideration as Provost has been overly flawed, I will withdraw that recommendation and immediately act to convene a search advisory committee composed broadly of faculty, staff and students to formally consider his and other candidacies for the position, and to recommend an inclusive process for moving forward from where we are today. I am therefore requesting a "sense of the faculty" as to whether or not you would like to proceed with consideration of Dean Casey for the position of Provost at the scheduled all-College faculty meeting next week. Let me please be clear about what I am requesting - this specifically is *not* intended to be a referendum of the Faculty Senate's support for Dean Casey's candidacy for the position, but rather a sense of the faculty as to whether or not the process of reaching such a selection vote has been sufficiently exclusive and incomplete that you would prefer to delay the full faculty consideration until a formal search advisory group can develop and execute a more participatory selection process.

And finally, in order to formalize and strengthen the long-term advisory and open communications relationship between faculty, staff and students and the senior administration, I will be convening a President's Advisory Council composed of representatives from the all-College faculty, staff and student body. I will be asking the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to nominate several faculty from Arts and Sciences to serve on this council.

Once again, I deeply apologize to those faculty who have felt disenfranchised from the process of selecting a new Provost for our College. I am committed to addressing those concerns in the short term, and preventing them from recurring in the future.

Respectfully yours,  
Lewis Duncan  
President, Rollins College