

**The following letter was written by Dr. Howard Thompson to Brent Hunter as a response to Dr. Thompson's request to Hunter that he explain the firings of Jaun Guyer, Shane Scott, and Fred Thompson.**

**Dr. Thompson is emeritus professor of marketing at Eastern Kentucky University. He was the Dean of the College of Business at Eastern for many years. He and his wife Eunice sent all three of their children to Florida College. In addition to being a regular contributor, he served on the National Council for nearly 20 years. In protest to the unjust firings, Dr. Thompson has resigned from the National Council and withdrawn all support to the college.**

June 21, 2002

Dr. Brent Hunter, Director  
Development Office  
Florida College  
119 N. Glen Arven Avenue  
Temple Terrace, FL 33617

Dear Brent:

Thank you for the time and effort consumed in replying to my e-mail questioning the wisdom and the damage to FC surrounding the firing of Jaun Guyer, Shane Scott, and Fred Thompson. You need not respond to this letter, but I thought you might like to have it in your file. It contains information drawn from letters and conversations with all three men, and some conclusions which seem to contradict Colly's explanations.

#### Regarding Jaun Guyer

Jaun also believes, as you do, that Colly knew his Maintenance Supervisor was not guilty of overspending "without authorization," "busting the budget," and "breaking trust with the Board of Directors." Here is Jaun's explanation which you, better than I, can verify having observed these events first hand.

- Jaun left a good job as Assist to the Maintenance Director at one of the regional universities in Indiana to accept a lower-paying job at FC. He could have had the job at Western Kentucky University, but, after Colly pleaded FC's desperate need, he came there.
- On arrival at FC, he found no files or records being kept on the buildings and an office that flooded with every rain. He told Colly he could not function without some improvements and Colly instructed him to "make an office." A modest office structure was built – with Colly or John Kempen signing all of the bills and aware of every dollar used – at a cost of \$25,000. This was the amount which led to Bill Hammontree's accusation that Jaun had "busted the budget"?
- In Jaun's view, Bill Hammontree's real problem was that his friends at CANCO working on Hinely Hall (having been given that contract before Jaun arrived and without having to bid for it and using below standards materials which met specifications written by CANCO) were required by "the new Maintenance Supervisor" (Guyer) to do the job right. One argument arose because the slope of the concrete floor was poured wrong and water would not run toward the drains. They tore out that floor and repoured it twice before getting it right the third time! The fact that CANCO, not in the residential construction business, built an addition to Bill Hammontree's home may have been perfectly legitimate, but the timing did cast doubt on this former FC Business Manager's credibility for "arm's length" negotiations.
- Jaun says Hammontree awarded the Sutton Hall cooling contract to his friends at CGM. This too was a disaster and "Colly took the contract away from CGM and gave it to SOUTHERN" when the whole system went down in late August 1999, after school had started.
- Jaun recalls that all of the FC buildings had leaky roofs but that Sutton Hall was especially

bad. He asked that a new terra cotta roof be installed for Sutton. It was paid for by recovering overcharges on the CANCO contract that Jaun caught.

- Lawn Maintenance was performed by J.D. Evans. Jaun took bids and contracted it out, saving FC \$10,000/year which went into the FC General Fund, not into the Maintenance Budget.
- 
- A disagreement between Hammontree and Jaun developed concerning the repair of the Auditorium roof. Hammontree insisted on repairing only part of the roof and painting the rest to match. Jaun said the sun would bleach the painted part and it would look terrible – he wanted a new roof. Hammontree convinced Vernon Hinely that he was right and Vernon agreed to pay the \$35,000 cost estimate if they did it Bill's way... which FC did. The roof is now discolored and the variation shows, plus it requires ongoing repairs.
- According to Jaun, several such incidents so embarrassed and frustrated Bill Hammontree that Bill told him that if he didn't go before the congregation and confess error for slandering him that he (Bill H.) was "going to see that he lost his job."
- Later, a "hearing" to review Jaun's performance was scheduled to which Bill Hammontree invited Bob Harmon, Vernon Hinely, and one or two others. Brought in to testify to Jaun's "unfairness/unreasonableness" in dealing with local contractors were people from CANCO and other contractor friends of Hammontree's. As a result of this "hearing," Bob Harmon told Colly to fire Jaun Guyer.
- Colly, to his credit, did try to defend Jaun but was allegedly told by Board Chair Harmon that if he couldn't fire Guyer, they would find another President who would. Colly begged Jaun to resign which Jaun did thinking he could at least save Colly's job. The next day, Colly announced in Chapel his "regret at having received Jaun Guyer's resignation!"

### Regarding Shane Scott

You have Shane's letter explaining the circumstances leading up to his firing. Your letter to me points out correctly that Shane was not tenured and that Southern Association of Colleges and Schools guidelines do not require that contracts of untenured faculty be renewed. Is it not inconsistent that Colly chose to observe this SACS guideline and ignore guidelines concerning due process and a review before peers? Also, Shane's letter does not point out that although Colly at first decided to take no action against Shane, Colly changed his mind after receiving the "protest letter" which had gathered five dozen signatures and probably a question or two from a Board Member. As had been pointed out, Colly knew Shane had done nothing wrong scripturally or morally, and made such a statement to the faculty. In fact, two years ago when Ferrell Jenkins resigned because of the way Shane was mistreated, Thaxter Dickey served as an intermediary between Colly and Ferrell (who at the time were not speaking to one another?) and Ferrell agreed to stay another year if Shane was reinstated. Colly reportedly mentioned to Thaxter, but Shane was never told, that he expected Shane to resign at the end of the next year when Ferrell retired. But Shane had already received a signed contract for that next year. If he had been told about being expected to resign, he would not have agreed to teach at all since FC would have had to pay

him anyway because of the signed contract he held! It appeared less than honorable to many that when Ferrell retired, Shane immediately was asked to write a letter of resignation which would have softened the blame on the administration for dismissing him. He refused to do so and so was fired or as Colly may prefer, “his contract was not renewed.” It is interesting too that the “objectionable website responses” (1) to the protest letter FC received and (2) to the criticism of Shane’s article, were approved and edited by Colly and Ferrell before they were posted on Shane’s website. And yet, Colly maintained that it was Shane who was “giving FC the reputation of becoming too liberal,” because the website was not taken down immediately and that Shane had to be sacrificed in order to preserve FC’s conservative reputation? Is there no limit to the number of equivocations which will be made to avoid exercising leadership and facing the truth?

### Regarding Fred Thompson

Your letter to me notes that 2/3 of the student body who are freshmen did not know Shane Scott and that it was “without historical precedent” for the mostly sophomore annual staff to dedicate the annual to Shane. It is not clear to me what “historical precedent” you have in mind, but would it not be more correct to say that nearly all of the student body knew Shane because they had met him at the many summer camps he worked every year or had met him on campus because of his involvement in dozens of campus activities/functions that year?

- It is a tradition (?) that the Annual Staff is allowed to select the person(s) to receive the dedication. And it is a student-run-and-paid-for-with-student-fees annual – no money is required from the FC General Fund for this publication.
- It is a tradition that no one know to whom the dedication will be made until it is announced in Chapel.
- The Annual Staff (not Fred Thompson) made this selection unanimously although Fred suggested that they consider others and proposed two other names to them which they rejected.
- That the student body knew and loved Shane Scott was evident by the FIVE MINUTE standing ovation given in Chapel by the students (and most of the faculty?) when the announcement was made.
- Fred told Colly that he planned to tell him two weeks ahead of the meeting in Chapel so Colly could be prepared with remarks of his own. He had hoped Colly would be gracious enough to let the students “have their day” without exacting retribution. Colly, however, learned from another person who had been contacted for some background information about Shane to be used in the annual. She was not made aware of the need to keep it a secret until the announcement in Chapel.
- When Colly let Fred know he was upset that Shane had been chosen, Fred did attempt to apologize to him when Colly stopped by Fred’s office regarding a question concerning health insurance which Fred had been researching. Fred told Colly that he was sorry the choice of Shane had offended him and that this was not his intention. Colly’s response was an “explosive tirade” which cut off further discussion. Monica’s first reaction to the incident was to tell Fred that if he got fired she was going to resign. Ralph Walker later dissuaded her

from doing so. You wrote that “Colly felt that when Fred did not apologize that he had no choice but to let him go;” and that “I personally believe if Fred had apologized before he was let go, Colly would have accepted it...”

- In view of Fred’s and Carolyn’s contributions and dedication to FC (refer to Fred’s letter to Colly enclosed) and his continuing value to FC which will be difficult to replace, it is difficult to believe that a sane person would have found that he had “betrayed the college and the entire administration” and therefore was being relieved of his duties. Because he did not inform Colly of the annual dedication secret before he found out from someone else? The real reason has to be much more logical, and I suspect is far more reprehensible. Could it have something to do with fact that Fred saved FC thousands of dollars by bidding out all of the printing/publication contracts and that Bill Hammontree’s friends no longer have this business? Or that Fred pushed for a review by Gallager Brokerage of the FC health care policy (which Colly refused to permit) and which would have avoided most of the 48 percent increase in premiums this year paid to a small agency which Bill Hammontree recommended?

FC has lost three dedicated and valuable employees during the past three years - - one who “busted the budget by spending \$25,000 getting the maintenance operation up and running;” one who “did not follow quickly enough the President’s suggestion that he not defend on his website his maligned and misunderstood position which involved nothing unscriptural or immoral to begin with;” and one “who did not tell the President quickly enough the name of the person to receive the secret dedication honor.”

Surely you do not believe this nonsense?!! What and who are the real reasons behind such apparent idiocy? It is my prayer for FC that someone in the Administration and/or the Board will recognize and correct these injustices before a fine institution implodes.

Sincerely,

Howard Thompson