

1-12-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, January 12, 2010

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, January 12, 2010" (2010). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 49.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/49

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

**Approved Minutes
Executive Committee
January 12, 2010**

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Thom Moore, Jim Small, Lisa Tillmann, Allison Wallrapp, Joan Davison, Laurie Joyner, Lewis Duncan

- I. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 5:15.
- II. Approval of Minutes—The Executive Committee approved the minutes of the December 3 and 9, 2009.
- III. Old Business – no business
- IV. New Business
 - A. Provost Search: Duncan states when McDaniel first informed him that Casey was the choice for president the plan was not to announce Casey's selection until January. Duncan explains this initial request to keep the information confidential created a potential problem for Rollins' search as the end of January is a late date to begin a search for a provost. Duncan says he therefore decided to initiate planning for the search and convened a group to address immediate questions concerning search firms and process. Duncan notes that later McDaniel decided not to wait but to announce Casey as its next president. Duncan elaborates the preliminary planning committee included Hawks and representatives from previous provost searches. The committee met to reexamine previous processes and also identify other institutions currently engaged in a provost search. Hawks then began preparing an electronic ad to announce the search and attract candidates. Duncan notes the committee agreed not to hire a search firm at the onset but to reconsider the need for a search firm after an assessment of the initial response to the ad. The committee also agreed to send letters to ACS schools and possibly Annapolis schools to announce the position. Duncan notes his personal philosophy is to have a search committee identify finalists which then pass to a selection group. The search committee's charge is to produce 2-4 candidates. Duncan states he favors at least one member of an underrepresented class be invited to campus. He elaborates that he envisions two phases of interviews: the first phase holds airport interviews for 8-12 candidates and then the second phase narrows the field and produces on-campus interviews. Candidacies will be held in confidence until the on-campus stage. Duncan then says he asked Foglesong to select two representatives from A&S to sit on the search committee. Small asks what will be the total structure of committee. Duncan responds one from Crummer, two from A&S, perhaps a Holt faculty member (depending upon A&S representation), and one or two students. Duncan notes he struggles with the appropriate administrative appointments to the committee, and wonders what role the deans should have in both the search and selection phase as direct reports to the provost. Duncan states he did ask Nielson to participate on the search committee because of his wide experience. Foglesong identifies three questions

for the Executive Committee to address: one is EC selecting committee members or nominating members, two, if we nominate then how shall the faculty vote, and three, if we nominate, how many names should EC send. Small points out that for Rita's search all faculty members of the committee were male. Foglesong notes he prefers a slate because it allows for balance based on gender, division, and rank. Boles states he prefers nominating a slate which allows for other people to be nominated from the floor. Boles notes the need to involve the faculty. Small says EC must be pragmatic in its selection of the search committee. He recalls that the last two provost searches were failures and a different search process is desirable. Tillmann argues that this seems an example of factualizing a perception based on little direct experience. She includes herself among those who worked alongside former provost Jim Malek on the Strategic Planning Committee who found him to be an ethical, responsible leader. Duncan says Casey felt there was an insufficient participation of administrators in the last search. Davison argues for nominations with more candidates than can serve so choice exists and so the faculty membership can participate in the process. Foglesong summarizes that the first question is whether to select or nominate committee members, and it seems EC prefers to nominate candidates. EC formally agree will nominate names to the committee rather than selecting a slate. Foglesong repeats that question 2 is how the faculty will vote for their representatives: whether one vote, two votes, or weighted voting. EC discusses the options and agree that weighted voting in which faculty members rank order preferences is most likely to best represent the faculty. Foglesong again asks question three: how many names to nominate. Small suggests a slate of no more than four. Small says we need individuals well suited to accomplish task. Boles concurs but emphasizes the need to provide faculty with sufficient choice. Davison cautions that if EC sends forth too many names then the people elected might win with only a small share of the vote. Small moves to nominate and Tillmann seconds a ballot of Davison, Easton, Jones, Simmons, and Stephenson, with the floor open for additional nominations. The motion passes EC. EC also agrees each faculty member can vote for up to three individuals, but must rank ordered choices.

- B. Rollins' Marketing: Duncan asks for the EC's advice regarding the current marketing effort and plans to place ads in the tunnels at OIA. Duncan notes his concern about how Rollins conveys its #1 status. EC looks at the current version of the ad and agrees the ad is acceptable given constraints.
- C. Rollins Code of Conduct: Tillmann introduces an issue about a student who was academically dismissed and in a subsequent e-mail to Karen Hater used threatening language about being provoked to bring a gun to campus. Tillmann explains the social issue was never adjudicated because the student already dismissed. The threat (and the lack of adjudication) now becomes problematic because the student is applying for readmission on the grounds of meeting conditions associated with the academic dismissal. Tillmann states such a threat is unacceptable. Small agrees and asks if she has the threatening e-mail. Duncan states he has no knowledge of the situation prior to today, but the issue requires complete adjudication which could lead to expulsion. Duncan elaborates without adjudication the student could not make a case and it is a problem to make a

decision without the student having an opportunity to defend self. Foglesong says EC probably should not take a stance in an individual case, particularly when factual issues not adjudicated but could issue a general statement. Foglesong suggests: “If a student makes a threat involving a gun against a member of the Rollins College community then the student should be expelled.” Boles explains it is a problem students withdraw before the College receives a crime report and adjudicates and dismisses students. EC unanimously endorses “If a student makes a threat involving a gun against a member of the Rollins College community then the student should be expelled.” EC also concurs it is desirable to address loopholes in the policy system.

V. Adjournment—the meeting adjourns at 6:35pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary