

3-2-2006

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 2, 2006

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, Thursday, March 2, 2006" (2006).
Executive Committee Minutes. Paper 103.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/103

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.

Meeting Minutes
Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences
March 2, 2006

Members attending: L. Duncan, P. Lancaster, R. Casey, Mark Anderson, Pedro Bernal, Tom Cook, Nancy Decker, Patricia Lancaster, Dorothy Mays, Catlin McConnell, Rick Bommelje

I. Call to Order: T. Cook called the meeting to order at 12:43 pm.

II. Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the meeting of February 16, 2006 were approved with corrections.

III. Announcements:

T. Cook thanked P. Lancaster for following up on the logistical details of the All-Faculty meeting and recognized President Duncan for a smooth running meeting.

IV. New Business:

Process for securing a new Dean of the Faculty

T. Cook stated that the next issue for consideration, especially for the A&S faculty, is the process for securing a new Dean of the Faculty. L. Duncan shared that he sent a notice to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees and asked for permission to proceed with the Dean of Faculty search on assumption that they were supportive and they concurred. It appears that there will be no problem in proceeding with the Dean of the Faculty search presuming that R. Casey will be approved as Provost.

T. Cook shared that he has been gathering information on past Dean of the Faculty searches. While there is no memorable record from past search committee members on how the searches were initiated, the president has assured that A&S faculty will determine how to proceed. T. Cook stated that this meeting would focus on how to gather from the A&S faculty their preferences in this matter and initiate the process that needs to be carried out.

L. Duncan apologized to Executive Committee members for the awkwardness of using the committee informally as an advisory group and indicated this would not be repeated.

T. Cook shared responsibility and stated that there are parliamentary ways that a group can turn itself into a committee of the whole or go into executive session if there are items that must be discussed confidentially. The minutes are a record and should contain what happens during committee meetings. N. Decker pointed out that members are officials carrying out certain responsibilities and it did not occur to her, until the faculty meeting, that there may have been some difficulty.

T. Cook explained that with the appointment of the Provost, the Executive Committee is being encouraged to take the initiative in how to approach the Dean of the Faculty vacancy. Serious consultation with the faculty is essential. T. Cook shared that some of the possible options to consider include a national search, internal search, or internal appointment.

L. Duncan pointed out that there are questions of timing. T. Cook concurred and stated that with a national search there would be the need for an interim Dean.

N. Decker asked if there were procedures identified in the By-Laws and R. Casey shared that they do not state how.

L. Duncan stated that, in terms of timing, if the faculty were interested in a rapid search this Spring, there is a second wave of searches that go on this time of year back filling other promotions at institutions. The understanding would be that if the faculty felt uncomfortable with the pool, the search would commence in the Fall with the traditional academic cycle. There might be a smaller interim window of time if a search this Spring would produce a candidate the faculty was excited about. The administration will support either timeframe. R. Casey pointed out that faculty should consider the structural reality of trying not to fall into the traps of the past. There is merit that an insider would have a better chance for some period of time of working out the relationships than an outsider would. R. Casey expressed that one of his concerns is that if someone outside the community were to be in the position, people's instinctive response is to go to the person they have familiarity with. In the Provost position, this cannot be done. The awkwardness could put an outsider in a difficult position next year.

L. Duncan stated that it was his impression that there is no obvious heir apparent. There are several internal candidates that might be considered viable. For the Provost position, no one disagreed that there was an obvious internal candidate to be considered for the position. He further stated that he does not believe this is the case for the internal candidates that would stand for the Dean of the Faculty position. L. Duncan emphasized that one thing that does need to be addressed which is, if an interim appointment is made, whether the interim appointment would be allowed to stand for the permanent position. L. Duncan cautioned that if it is true that the interim appointment is a viable candidate, it creates a very difficult dynamic for external candidates.

M. Anderson pointed out that a part of the issue with the process for picking a Provost is that it felt rushed and the faculty did not have ample time to talk things over. He encourages that we move slowly and give faculty lots of time to talk about what they want in a Dean. M. Anderson suggested that we think towards having an interim Dean and having a national search next year and not do something quickly. P. Bernal emphasized that an interim Dean is a necessity.

T. Cook asked for clarification from L. Duncan about the point made in his letter to the faculty of February 23, 2006 about the option of starting the process over and creating a search committee to determine whether to do a national search.

L. Duncan responded that he does not believe that the Dean of the Faculty search exceeds the threshold that he stated he would not support disingenuous national searches. He does not believe there is one obvious internal candidate as there was with the Provost search. P. Bernal asked if selection of an interim is an appointment or a search. P. Lancaster stated this would be a decision that the Provost makes to the President.

L. Duncan shared that he would like the faculty to weigh in on whether an interim Dean should be considered as a candidate, especially since it complicates the dynamic for external candidates. R. Casey stated that it also makes it difficult to perform the job since every action and decision could be questioned from a political perspective. P. Lancaster pointed out that there may be a person who is willing to serve as an interim and not be a candidate in the national search. P. Lancaster added that in serving as an interim, it is difficult to do major things. L. Duncan concurred with both R. Casey and P. Lancaster stating that for an interim or permanent person to do the job, some of the decisions cannot be made on the basis of popularity. If one is a candidate at the same time as trying to do the job of interim, they are under cross purposes for trying to simultaneously do what's in

the best interest for the institution and doing what's in the best interest for the candidacy for the permanent job.

M. Anderson queried if there were any good reasons for a person who is in the interim position to be on the slate for the permanent position. T. Cook responded that maybe the interim dean wants to be a candidate.

P. Lancaster advanced another option for consideration which is appointing a dean for a limited short term. L. Duncan shared how there could be an exception for an interim becoming a permanent candidate. He cited the recent situation in the interim Athletic Director search in which the interim, who was not a candidate for the permanent position, was advanced by the search committee unanimously as a permanent candidate after two searches and when the Ph.D. requirement was relaxed.

R. Casey indicated that the biggest task next year for the Dean of the Faculty is the curriculum reform issue. In this regard, he emphasized that the faculty should consider what the right thing to do is since this will most likely be more than a one year task. R. Casey shared that when he was appointed to the Dean's position, he walked into the second year of the General Education assessment reform project that had momentum. He further stated that if we don't have a new person from the outside next Fall, a 2-year appointment might be an important thing of us to think about.

D. Mays agrees that curriculum reform would take 2 years and asked how important it is for the Dean of the Faculty to shepherd it through from beginning to end. R. Casey indicated that there are issues switching in mid stream.

N. Decker shared that we have a tradition of national searches for the Dean of Faculty position and asked about the drawbacks of a specific individual. L. Duncan suggested that if we are going to talk about specific individuals that we go into executive session.

T. Cook declared at 1:13 pm that the Executive Committee was in executive session and re-convened back in regular session at 1:20 pm.

T. Cook asked for ideas on how the faculty can be surveyed on the process. R. Casey asked if there needs to be an open forum to discuss how the process should happen or that the Executive Committee needs to bring a set of options or a recommendation and have a discussion on that. T. Cook stated he believes it should begin with an open forum, especially with Executive Committee members attending, and then make recommendations for the next Faculty Meeting. L. Duncan concurred. P. Lancaster stated that if there is an initial open meeting, we might want to consider using a zoomerang survey to get the rest of the results. M. Anderson shared that he believes the faculty are interested in having an open meeting to first figure out what the issues are. Once the key issues are in the open, a zoomerang survey can be used. Faculty must feel fully engaged from the beginning. P. Lancaster stated that we could go to the meeting with options from the Executive Committee with the idea that other options can also be voiced.

T. Cook pointed out that it would be good for the faculty to have an understanding of what the key priorities are for the dean of the faculty during the next year or two.

N. Decker asked R. Casey what key issues beyond curriculum reform that Dean of the Faculty office will be taking on. R. Casey stated this is the only unique issue that will dictate decision making for the next ten years or so. Some of the other big issues include programmatic sustainability, the staffing of Holt school and the interrelationship of the A&S faculty, internalization, and the implementation of the honor code.

M. Anderson stated that R. Casey has streamlined processes which will make it easier for the new Dean. N. Decker shared that it is now easier to access to information.

P. Bernal's stated that it may be useful in the open forums with the faculty to separate the permanent position with the interim appointment in some way. He emphasized that a national search for the permanent position will be endorsed by the Faculty. N. Decker concurred and that it is her sense, especially since there was not national search for the Provost position. T. Cook queried, if there was a 2-year appointment, would the national search begin the year after next? R. Casey stated that the parallel metaphor is the way department chairs function. P. Bernal stated that if the faculty agrees on a national search than the interim with a term will be easier to advance. N. Decker asked if a new person being brought in as Dean of the Faculty will receive tenure and R. Casey pointed out that it is in the By-Laws. D. Mays suggested that in announcing the open meeting that possible options be identified and then follow up with zoomerang survey. T. Cook asked if this is democracy or advisory to the administration. D. Mays suggested that the results of a survey would be advisory. L. Duncan stated that the senior administration would appreciate specific advice. D. Mays recapped that based on this discussion that the interim dean would not be a candidate for the permanent position. L. Duncan pointed out this should be an informed decision by the faculty. R. Casey asked if his candidacy to Provost is affecting the line of thinking. N. Decker shared that there is a learning curve for someone new to the institution and to have both a new Dean of the Faculty and a new Provost is frightening. It is less of a concern with one person having their feet firmly planted. N. Decker stated with a known quantity in the Provost position, we can be more focused on a national search. M. Anderson agreed that we would not want two outsiders and with a President that is also relatively new. T. Cook stated that, in light of an internal person who has moved up, there is a reason why we do national searches with regard to diversity and new blood. L. Duncan stated that it is an easier argument to make if there are not large numbers of aspirant faculty who want to become the Dean of the Faculty. R. Casey asked if there were faculty members who wanted to perform the role. C. McConnell shared that it would be difficult to have someone play the role for a year with the curriculum reform and honor code issues and then step down. L. Duncan stated that it might be appealing to a candidate for whom serving a year or two and makes them an outstanding candidate for other Dean of the Faculty positions elsewhere. T. Cook asked for the appropriate time for the open meeting and R. Casey suggested that it occur in place of the department chairs meeting on Tuesday, March 14 @ 12:30 pm in the Galloway Room.

T. Cook asked if higher administrators should be present and P. Lancaster stated that she should be there since she would be the one to eventually carry out the process. L. Duncan shared that, with the Provost present, he would pass. R. Casey stated that he wanted to share important items about the job.

T. Cook asked if there will be a national search, who picks the search committee. P. Lancaster suggested that a next step for the Executive Committee could be to propose a slate with nominations from the floor. L. Duncan presumed that there would be staff and student representation. R. Casey stated that the last Dean of the Faculty search committee was made up of faculty. He also stated that much of the position involves staff. L. Duncan shared that a candidate who has been chosen with representation of staff and students makes their job easier.

C. McConnell stated that students have worked considerable with Dean Casey especially in the areas of community engagement and multi-cultural affairs. T. Cook emphasized that if we get his far in the open meeting, we will inquire about the compensation of the search committee.

L. Duncan stated that when putting the committee together there are templates in terms of representation. R. Casey recalled that in his search committee there were a number of mid level faculty members. L. Duncan emphasized that committee members are representing the entire institution and not just their own constituency.

T. Cook stated that the announcement of the open meeting will be forthcoming.

V. Congratulations

T. Cook formally congratulated R. Casey on his appointment to Provost.

There was discussion about absentee votes. P. Lancaster raised the issue of the voting status for a few full-time administrators who have visiting appointments in departments. There was a question about whether they can vote. P. Lancaster inquired if the Executive Committee would be willing to clarify if an administrator with visiting faculty rank can vote in faculty meetings. P. Lancaster stated that this would be for voting in the all-college faculty meeting. T. Cook indicated he will ask the Parliamentarian to research this issue.

VI. Institutional Review Board T. Cook announced that Jim Eck is convening the first meeting of the Institutional Review Board today.

VII. The Rollins Experience Faculty Discussion P. Lancaster stated that she is in need of an open faculty discussion to explore the Rollins experience. It is important to provide evidence to the Board of Trustees at the Spring meeting that the faculty have had time to think about and discuss it and have come to a conclusion about it, hopefully a positive one.

T. Cook asked if this applied only to the A&S faculty and P. Lancaster shared that it was for the all college faculty. T. Cook will schedule a colloquium for A&S Faculty on Friday, March 17, 2006. C. McConnell announced that the students will be sponsoring a faculty barbecue on the same date and will arrange for it to follow the colloquium.

VIII. Office of International Programs. R. Casey announced that two meeting have been held on the Office of International Programs. A search committee has been formed for the position of Director of International Programs. Committee members are Allen Kupetz, Donna Lee, Rachel Newcomb, Gabriel Barrenneche, Sharon Carnahan, and Tom Lairson, chair.

IX. The next Executive Meeting will be held on March 16, 2006 at 12:30 pm in the Faculty Club.

X. T. Cook adjourned the meeting at 1:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Bommelje
Vice-President/Treasurer