

Heath M. Veuleman
Post Office Box 4758
Pineville, LA 71361-4758

December 5, 2012

SENT VIA EMAIL TO REDLTTRS4LIFE@YAHOO.COM

Louisiana College
Board of Trustees
ATTN: REV. GENE LEE
1140 College Drive
Pineville, LA 71359

RE: JOE AGUILLARD, ED.D.

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. Chairman:

It is with sincere regret and a conflicted heart that I write this letter to you. I find myself in an unfortunate and undesired ethical and moral dilemma whereby I owe a tripartite allegiance to a person whom I love dearly, a ministry of the Louisiana Baptist Convention (hereinafter referred to as the "LBC"), and my personal integrity and moral compulsion.

I feel a personal indebtedness to Dr. Joe Aguillard (hereinafter referred to as "President") that is great and deserving of loyalty. As I have stated numerous times before, the President has been like a surrogate father to me, a mentor, and a friend. He has been more than generous with me, always interceding for me, always with a kind word, and both personally encouraging and inspirational. Also, as a Southern Baptist committed to my polity, I fully understand and appreciate the President's dedication and great personal sacrifices he has made to remake Louisiana College (hereinafter referred to as the "College") into a ministry of the LBC reflective of our shared values as confessed in the Baptist Faith and Message 2000 (hereinafter referred to as "BF&M"). Not to mention the President's personal connection to the College, an affection that is evident every time he speaks of the institution, affection developed and nurtured by a legacy of family and friends intertwined throughout the history of the College.

Therefore, please be aware that this letter is not sent whimsically or capriciously. This is not an arbitrary or weightless notion. This letter comes to you immersed in prayer, and knowing the costs to the President, the College, the LBC, and myself. I can only be allegiant to one person, and that is to Jesus Christ, everyone else, everything else is second to my relationship with Christ, and I must reflect His values, His notions, and His lifestyle. Today, I am choosing Christ over any other allegiances, and therewith come this letter.

I no longer have confidence in the President to carry out his duties as assigned by the College Board of Trustees (hereinafter referred to as the “Board”). I no longer trust the President to honestly represent the affairs of the College. It is with a heavy heart that I must recommend the President be terminated and removed immediately.

Background

The President was hired amidst a very difficult time in the history of the College. Undaunted by vicious attacks on his person, his marriage, his children, and his family and his friends, he persevered because he was passionate about aligning the College with the fundamental beliefs of the LBC and Southern Baptist Convention (hereinafter referred to as the “SBC”) as stated in the BF&M.

The College was facing financial exigency upon his selection as President. Upon and after his selection, two-thirds of the faculty resigned in protest. Prior to his selection the College had been placed on Probation by the College’s Accrediting body, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (hereinafter referred to as “SACS”). According to a SACS report produced at that time:

“The College is governed by a Board of Trustees of [the College] of 34 members, all of whom, except the president (who serves by virtue of his office) are elected by the [LBC]. The [LBC] furnishes almost 25% of the annual revenue of the college. It is the only Louisiana college or university supported by the [LBC]. Baptist membership is a requirement of Board membership. In 2006, the College will celebrate its 100th Anniversary.

In the last few years, [the College] has been subjected to the tensions and turmoil caught up in struggles to determine its mission and identity and the accompanying competition for influence and control. The debates over authority and mission have been in context of a broader debate over doctrine and accountability within the membership of the [LBC], which owns the College and elects all its Trustees. Some want to see the College reflect a conservative theology more closely; others want it to become open and free; some want the Board to assert its governance authority more aggressively to require fidelity to the stated mission, others seek to protect faculty prerogatives and urge a more restricted definition of board authority.

It appears to the Special Committee that the faculty, in the absence of challenge or counsel to the contrary, accrue significant authority at the College over a period of years. Over time, some faculty members, and even some administrators, came to accept that pattern of faculty authority as normative. As new Board members were elected (Board members are restricted to two three-year terms), questions and concerns arose as to why the Board appeared to have less authority and power in this context than in other non-profit organizations or corporate models with which they were familiar. Even requests for information and explanations did not always receive responses. When the Board attempted to assert its authority, it did so in ways that violated the fundamental governance rules established by the Principles. The Board’s attempts to assert authority were met with alarm by some, particularly some of the current or former faculty who thought they were related to the perceived effort of religious conservatives to wield more influence at the College. A furor erupted. Litigation, a SACS review, a formal faculty complaint, letters, email, public

advocacy, petitions, newspaper publicity, and protests were all part of this intense struggle. While contending with these matters, the College also employed a new president after another candidate first accepted the position, then withdrew.”¹

We continue with the same “new president” today.

Cause for Termination

The College Bylaws state in Article II, Section 2.A., regarding the duties of the President of the College:

“The president of the college shall be the chief executive officer of the college and the official adviser to, and executive agent of, the board of trustees and its executive committee. The president shall be the educational and administrative chief executive of the college, and shall exercise superintendence over all the affairs of the institution. The president shall have such powers incidental to the office as authorized by the board of trustees including, but not limited to the power to dismiss any employee of the college. The president of the college is authorized to perform all acts and execute all documents to make effective the actions and resolutions of the board or its executive committee. Except as otherwise provided in these bylaws, the president shall be ex officio a member of all standing committees and shall have all rights of committee membership except the right to vote. The president of the college may, in the event of temporary absence, designate any person as president pro tempore who shall have the authority to exercise any of the duties and functions prescribed above. In the event of the disability, or emergency absence, of the president, the powers of the office shall vest in the vice president for academic affairs until the board of directors appoints a person to serve as an acting president.”²

In course as the Chief Executive Officer of the College, the President has demonstrated material failures in his role as demonstrated below:

1. Integrity

The foremost failure demonstrated by the President is his utter disregard for the truth. While unacceptable in any organization or personal relationship, as Christians, we are held to a higher standard.³ The cornerstone moral imperative throughout Scripture is honesty. Unfortunately, the President has chosen the Machiavellian approach to leadership. As defined by Oxford English Dictionary, this approach is “cunning, scheming, and unscrupulous...”⁴ and succinctly defined as “the employment of cunning and duplicity in statecraft or in general conduct.”⁵ The President carefully crafts his speech and demeanor to manipulate individuals and groups in order to achieve his desired outcomes.

¹ SACS Special Committee Report 2005

² Louisiana College Board of Trustees Bylaws, Revised 2011

³ [REDACTED]

⁴ [REDACTED]

⁵ Jones, Daniel N.; Paulhus, Delroy L. (2009). "Chapter 7. Machiavellianism". In Leary, Mark R. & Hoyle, Rick H. *Handbook of Individual Differences in Social Behavior*. New York/London: The Guildford Press. pp. 257–273.

Often the President uses facts that are in and of themselves wholly accurate, however it is the context in which he uses these facts to manipulate individuals and groups. Examples of the President's deception and dishonesty are given below:

A. Caskey \$10 million dollar gift for bricks and mortar

In the December 2012 Regularly Scheduled Meeting of the Board, Gilbert Little (hereinafter referred to as "Little") presented a feasibility study for the 2012 Capital Campaign. In Little's presentation he stated there would be a \$10 million dollar gift made by the Caskey School of Divinity (hereinafter referred to as the "Caskey") donors. While Little was unaware, the Caskey donors had rescinded their gift because of internal strife with the President. In fact, during Little's presentation he was never interrupted by the President to correct or amend the presentation.

The President was actually confronted at the board meeting about his deception and prior to the end of the meeting sought to clarify the Caskey donation. However, it was discovered that the Caskey donors had made clear their specific intentions to rescind their suggested gift through a letter sent to and received by the President in October – almost three months prior to the Board meeting.

B. Caskey donors' funding of LC Tanzania

During the December 2011 and March 2011 Regularly Schedule Meetings of the Board, the President brought to the Board a project in which the Tanzanian government would freely donate lands to the College so that the College might begin an educational institution in Tanzania. The President told the Board that the Caskey donors would pay for this venture.

In fact, the Caskey donors never made that commitment, but had instead clearly communicated their desire and intention to *not* be involved in any funding relationship with the Tanzania project. Without notice or authorization, it was later revealed that the President spent approximately \$60,000 in legal expenses paid with restricted dollars given by the Caskey donors on the Tanzania project. The Caskey donors were forced to make the awkward clarification to the President that he should no longer use restricted dollars without their express permission.

C. Louisiana College International Academy (hereinafter referred to as "LCIA")

Prior to the SACS return "site team visit" to the College in the fall of 2012, the President had spurred the College to start an international secondary boarding school on the campus, integrated within the College systems. Dr. Michael Johnson (hereinafter referred to as "M. Johnson"), the SACS regional vice president, gave the College direct instruction to defer LCIA, that is, to cease its operation until SACS approved and authorized the College to proceed with operating a secondary boarding school on the campus.

The President not only refused to heed the directive from SACS, he directly misled the Executive Committee of the Board by stating the College was in complete

compliance with SACS by virtue of the College participating in concurrent enrollment. The President intentionally misled the Executive Committee by stating that SACS did not credential secondary schools and therefore had no oversight to defer the operation of LCIA.

D. LBC related issues

The President has fostered discord and strife between Dr. David Hankins (hereinafter referred to as “Hankins”), Executive Director of the LBC, and Dr. Chuck Quarrels (hereinafter referred to as “Quarrels”), Dean of the Caskey School of Divinity. The President used the issue of Calvinism to pit Hankins and Quarrels against one other, and attempted to pit the Board and its Executive Committee, against Hankins. The President stated numerous times that Hankins had asked to serve on the Academic Affairs Committee to rid the College of Calvinists and the advocacy of Calvinism within the Christian Studies department and the Divinity School. Hankins directly refutes this, and moreover asserts he was tasked to serve on the aforementioned committee for the purpose outlined above at the request of the President and the immediate former Chairman of the Board, Mr. Marc Taylor (hereinafter referred to as “Taylor”).

The President stated on more than one occasion that Hankins was trying to use undue influence to have his son, Dr. Eric Hankins (hereinafter referred to as “E. Hankins”), hired as a faculty member, and specially to have Quarrels removed. Hankins also refutes these statements.

The President has attempted to manipulate Hankins and the LBC by removing special restrictions on LBC agencies financing and indebtedness requirements. Instead of communicating forthrightly, the President attempted to have the Board pass recommendations “affirming SACS standards and principles” to achieve his desired end of having the LBC change its bylaws so that the College would no longer be required to have direct oversight over its financing and indebtedness.

E. The Paul Pressler School of Law (hereinafter referred to as the “Law School”)

The President has a pattern of viciously attacking the character of many key individuals who have left the employment of the College, often without a scintilla of evidence to support his claims. Among the most recent of these examples is the gentleman he used to laud as “brilliant” and a “warrior for the kingdom of Christ,” Michael Johnson, Esq. (hereinafter referred to as “M. Johnson, Esq.”). Following the reluctant resignation of M. Johnson, Esq., the Founding Dean of the Law School, the President stated to the Executive Committee that M. Johnson, Esq., had the “worst sewer mouth” he had ever heard. The President intimated that M. Johnson, Esq., colluded with two of his employees to abscond with over \$300,000 from the College. The President stated that M. Johnson, Esq. did not complete the College’s 2012 level change application to SACS timely or correctly, and that M. Johnson, Esq., was the reason the level change request was denied by SACS. Each of these statements and allegations made by the President were foretold by M. Johnson, Esq., and have been

directly refuted, based upon volumes of evidence and witness testimony gathered by M. Johnson, Esq. Further, the President attempted to portray M. Johnson, Esq.'s resignation as a selfish decision to pursue his "dream job" elsewhere, and has publicly blamed the resignation for the Law School's present delays in opening its doors. M. Johnson, Esq. refutes these assertions as well, and has explained the real reasons for his regretful departure in his formal resignation letter delivered to the Board.⁶The President also attempted to violate the duly enacted policies and procedures of the Law School by terminating its contracted employees without notice or due process. The President attempted to relocate the Law School to Pineville without authorization from the Board, and attempted to solicit monies for bricks and mortar from the Caskey donors prior to the Board being aware of any plans for relocation. All of the above actions by the President have had very serious and negative implications for the prospects of future regional and national accreditation for the Law School.

2. Accreditation

The President has shown a willful and wanton disregard for SACS by continuing to remain woefully ignorant of its standards and practices relative to the operating of an accredited college. The President has stated numerous times that he was unaware of some of the changes SACS had made prior to the College's last attempt at reaffirmation. As the Chief Executive Officer of the College, he should know every jot and tittle of information related to SACS – especially in an organization the size of the College. Moreover, it should be obvious that one of any college president's foremost responsibilities is to keep the institution accredited at all times. To fulfill this fundamental priority, he must have acute awareness and understanding of all SACS related information, especially changes which would directly impact our accreditation.

A. 2010 SACS Reaffirmation Denial and Warning

During the Joseph Cole (hereinafter referred to as "Cole") allegations of 2011, we learned from the President that the night prior to the deadline for the mandatory self-study submission to SACS, he and his core senior-level administrators were up until 3 a.m. completing the self-study document. Of course, among the Cole allegations are claims that the President and his core senior-level administrators purposely defrauded SACS by intentionally forging signatures on some evaluations and forging dates on others. In his testimony to the committee investigating these claims, the President stated that surely there

⁶ Dean Johnson explained in his resignation letter of August 2012, he was forced to resign with great sadness and only as a last resort. As one paragraph of his letter summarizes: "Recent developments beyond our control have adversely affected the ongoing efforts of the law school. In particular, the decision in June by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Commission on Colleges, to deny LC's application for 'Level V' status in order to offer doctoral degrees, has been a great blow to the law school's momentum. The denial, which followed the SACS decision in December 2011, to deny LC reaffirmation of accreditation and place it on 'Warning' status for 12 months following the college's decennial review, has forced an inevitable delay for the start of the law school. It has also resulted in an inability to proceed with law student recruitment for the near future, and negatively impacted faculty recruitment and fundraising."

would be “some discrepancies in a 1,700 page document because we were up doing it at 3 a.m. the night before.”

While the forgeries and clear inaccuracies in the report are disturbing, the Board’s investigating committee could not determine culpability prior to the President ending the committee’s active investigation. Aside from the very serious forgery and inaccuracy allegations, a glaring question still remains: Why would the President be completing a process, which should have taken place over three to five years, in the early morning hours on the very date it was to be submitted? This does not indicate the President fully appreciates the necessity of accreditation or the processes by which we achieve and retain accreditation. This does not indicate a President who is prepared and operates methodically and systematically. This does not indicate a President who has fully integrated all college systems into the report if he, and an extraordinarily small minority of his core senior-level administrators, are compiling and completing this report, by his very account, at 3 a.m. on the day of submission.

In light of the above, the results of the process are not surprising. According to SACS, “...an official decision regarding the reaffirmation of Louisiana College was made at the Annual Meeting of the Commission on Colleges in December 2011. The decision of the Commission on Colleges was to continue the College’s accreditation, deny reaffirmation, and to place the Institution on Warning for twelve months for failure to comply with one Core Requirement (2.5 Institutional Effectiveness), nine Comprehensive Standards (3.2.9, 3.3.1.1, 3.3.1.2, 3.3.1.3, 3.4.11, 3.5.1, 3.5.4, 3.7.1, 3.11.1) and, one Federal Requirement (4.1 Student Achievement). The Commission authorized a Special Committee to visit the Institution.”

B. 2012 SACS Level Change Denial

As a prerequisite to offering any doctoral degree, including the *Juris Doctorate* law degree, it is necessary for the College to be approved at a higher SACS membership level (*i.e.*, “Level V”) than its current status (“Level III”). For a number of reasons related to the goings on in Pineville, the necessary level change application for the Law School authorization was delayed for submission until April 2012. The level change was denied by SACS in June 2012 for a variety of reasons, and SACS officials explained subsequently that the College’s present “Warning” status for its basic accreditation would effectively (and quite logically) prohibit the approval of any level change advancement. It now seems apparent that the President did not read or review the level change application before its submission, and much like the 2010 Reaffirmation, the President and his administration waited until the twelfth hour to provide certain information for the completion of the application.

C. 2012 SACS Warning Extension

SACS authorized a “Special Committee” to visit the College in the Fall of 2012. Upon arrival, the Special Committee still had serious concerns with the way the College undertakes its strategic planning and institutional effectiveness. Following its visit, the Special Committee recommended to SACS that the College remain on Warning status for another year, and included the following eight recommendations:

“CR 2.5 (Institutional Effectiveness), Recommendation 1:

The Committee recommends that the institution provide evidence that it engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.

CS 3.2.9 (Faculty/staff appointment), Recommendation 2:

The Committee recommends that the institution document appropriate approval of its faculty overload policy to include the nine semester hours of overload teaching policy.

CS 3.3.1.1 (Institutional effectiveness-educational programs), Recommendation 3:

The Committee recommends that the institution identify expected outcomes, assess the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provide evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results for its educational programs, to include student learning outcomes.

CS 3.3.1.2 (Institutional effectiveness-administrative support services), Recommendation 4:

The Committee recommends that the institution identify expected outcomes, assess the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provide evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results for its administrative support services.

CS 3.3.1.3 (Institutional effectiveness-academic and student support services), Recommendation 5:

The Committee recommends that the institution identify expected outcomes, assess the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provide evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results for its academic and student support services.

CS 3.5.1 (College-level competencies), Recommendation 6:

The Committee recommends that the institution document that it identifies general education competencies that are college-level and the extent to which students have attained them.

CS 3.7.1 (Faculty competence), Recommendation 7:

The Committee recommends that the Institution document that it has on file the official academic transcripts for the 28 faculty members listed in its institutional audit.

CS 3.12.1 (Substantive change), Recommendation 8:

The Committee recommends that the institution document its notification of substantive changes to the Commission and demonstrate that it takes the actions necessary to ensure timely compliance with the requirements of the Commission's policy on Substantive Change for Accredited Institutions."

The College was able to correct only two of the above recommendations prior to the SACS meeting in December 2012, and the College received only six of the initial eight recommendations according to Dr. Travis Wright (hereinafter referred to as "Wright") in an email to the Board, "LC will remain on warning for the next year and will receive a visiting team in October 2013. LC was deemed out of compliance for the following standards: CR 2.5, CS 3.3.1.1, 3.3.1.2, 3.3.1.3, 3.5.1, and 3.7.1."

As of the date of this letter, the College remains, precariously on Warning. According to SACS procedures, a member institution is only allowed to stay on Warning for two consecutive years. Thereafter, full Probation or Revocation of accreditation must be granted for non-compliance.

3. Strategic Planning

The President does not communicate or demonstrate understanding of strategic planning. The President believes strategic planning is a linear rather than cyclical process. He demonstrates this by failing to integrate all college systems into the strategic planning process. In fact, the Board has not ever participated in active strategic planning other than to rubber stamp what the President brings as an already defined "plan."

The President's plans are most often reliant upon his personal beliefs, assumptions, and suppositions, and are not based upon empirical evidence or data. His inability to strategically plan should be self-evident by his fanciful and delusional announcements of multiple graduate and professional schools all at once.

SACS observed: "First, there is insufficient evidence that the institutional effectiveness process is integrated. The Monitoring Report does not adequately explain how the various parts of the institutional effectiveness process are combined into a coherent whole. There is no evidence that the findings from the unit-level plans are merged or synthesized to gauge progress on the College's overall strategic goals. The College identifies several elements of its institutional effectiveness process including the Office of Quality Management (and institutional research), a strategic planning retreat, unit-level and institutional-level strategic plans, the administrative council, and the board of trustees. However, the institution did not adequately describe how these various parts work together as an integrated whole to assess the College's effectiveness."

4. Leadership & Management

A. *Faculty, Employees, Support Staff, and Agents*

The President has lost the support of virtually all of his employees. Currently, a majority membership of his own Administrative Council has directly stated that they no longer have confidence in the President to carry out his duties in a forthright and meaningful way at the College. The President has created a culture of fear and divisiveness at the College. Because there is no integration found within the organization there are fiefdoms competing for scarce resources—disintegrated, dysfunctional, and discontented.

The President has a famous idiom, “Ignorance can be remediated, but loyalty cannot.” The President demands his employees’ allegiance second only to Christ, and at times, even the preceding order is questionable. Former Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs have used words like “tyrant” and “dictator” to describe the President. They state that he does not receive counsel and that they are not included on planning. They state that their input is not welcomed or valued. They state that constructive criticism is never welcomed or tolerated. They state that the President grossly micromanages day-to-day operations of the College.

Current employees describe a similarly toxic situation. They state that the President comes to Administrative Council, as he has in the past, with plans that he has already constructed, only demanding their vocal and unwavering support. He rejects criticism of all kinds and dialogue is limited to his soliloquys. He demands blind allegiance and support for all plans and endeavors.

The College almost never separates from an employee amicably. The President’s tenure has enrolled lawyer upon lawyer, filing and threatening lawsuits, settling and paying off employees, and creating a public perception not congruent with that of Christ.

The President has had five Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs over his tenure; none willing to stay because of his “tyrannical” and “dictatorial” nature.

B. *Physical Plant*

Under the President’s tenure, the entire budget allocated for maintenance of the 85 acre campus has been a paltry \$75,000 per year. By comparison, the budget for the President’s travel alone has been \$50,000. This is why there are severe mold problems within student housing and other buildings on campus. This is why there are roofs failing and students falling through walkways. This is why there is no hot water in student housing for sometimes greater than ten days. This is why the entire campus appears to be imploding before our very eyes. The Physical Plant is not only malfunctioning and in complete disrepair, it is creating a public health hazard for the students and the general public, and a substantial risk management problem for the College.

In addition to the physical plant, the technological infrastructure is aged beyond repair. Students cannot complete on-line assessments or exams, complete basic research, or have nominal access to the internet because there is not enough bandwidth or technological infrastructure to support the needs of the current number of students.

C. *Vertical Integration*

There is no vertical integration identifiable at the College. Every department and system works independently of every other as separate and distinct islands. They are fiefdoms competing for scarce resources. The President is involved in virtually every decision he deems important, from student life to athletics to academics, however he is only involved in those particular decisions to which he assigns value, or that he can manipulate to impact another of his projects. In other situations, the President is described as aloof, unreachable, and unseen.

This relates to strategic planning because, according to SACS, all planning must originate with the governing body and begin a process starting at unit level, continuing through the administration, and returning to the governing body. Faculty and staff state the President sometimes does not communicate to them or their departments for weeks on end. They report he does not return communication promptly or within a reasonable time frame (sometimes greater than weeks).

D. *Student Recruitment & Retention*

The President does not have a verifiable, evidenced-based plan to remedy the student recruitment and retention problems at the College. Instead, the President sojourns to faraway countries soliciting foreign governments to enter into agreements to send cash-paying students to the College for short periods of times and for special programs.

The traditional student has been on decline at the College for several years. The President cannot communicate how Louisiana out-migration, census data, state-funding, and the current economy impact student enrollment. Instead he diverts to other micro-enrollment programs to allay cash flow problems at the College. The predicament is that these micro-enrollment programs are neither sustainable nor suitable to the College. The immediate problems of recruiting and retaining traditional students remain unanswered by the President.

E. *Fiscal Stewardship*

The President has grossly mismanaged the school's finances. Unfortunately, his focus has been on ego-centric legacy programs instead of sustaining the liberal arts college. For example, because of the President's litigious nature, the College has been embroiled in litigation since his nomination. The Louisiana Athletic Club roof lawsuit has cost over \$400,000 as reported by the President. The Louisiana Athletic

Club roof itself cost about \$200,000. So far, we have spent twice as much as the cost of a new roof in an attempt to replace the roof through litigation. It has yet to be replaced.

Recently, a faculty member was standing in front of Alexandria Hall at the College on a Friday afternoon. He stated he was waiting on the President to return from a faculty meeting in Presser Recital Hall, so he could be told whether or not the President wanted him to be in Tanzania by the following Monday (less than seventy-two hours away). A trip to Tanzania costs between \$5,000 and \$7,000.

Immediately after meeting the aforementioned faculty member, another faculty member only fifteen feet away in Alexandria Hall stated a need for a refrigerator in the English, Journalism, and Literature Department. Because there were eleven employees in this department there was a need for them to be able to store their food for lunch. The estimated cost of the refrigerator was \$300. The refrigerator purchase was denied for lack of funds.

5. Stakeholder Relations

A. Polity

The President uses the LBC as leverage in all of his decision-making. Rather than showing concern for the values of the LBC, he only uses it as a ploy to achieve his next goal. The President has most recently used the specter of Calvinism to create further disunity within the LBC. In addition, he has approached churches telling them of a non-existent \$10 million dollar donation in order to solicit from them donations for the College's newly announced Capital Campaign. The President also engages some of the leaders of the LBC to interfere with the Board, Board policies, and/or employees. Most recently, the President has used members of the polity to engage in further discussions with Tulane University regarding a medical school project. The President also used members of the polity to both circulate tapes of purported Calvinistic teachings and then to chide those who circulated the tapes. At the recent Dr. James Dobson event, he wrote prompts for certain members of the LBC to ask Dr. Dobson, because he was told explicitly that no questions pertaining to fundraising were to be asked.

B. Board of Trustees

Under the President's tenure, the Board has been relegated to serve only as a rubber stamp to the President's agenda. The President does not offer information in a forthcoming or honest manner. Consistently, the President presents the Board only with information he himself deems to be important or relevant to the discussion. The President acts as *de facto* Chairman of the Board and has much influence in selecting chairpersons for Board committees and setting the agendas for Board meetings. Further, the President desires to be the sole arbiter of all communication to and from the Board, including nefariously circumventing honest and open discussion through punitive confidentiality agreements.

The President has exerted undue influence upon the Board, prohibited by the SACS Principles of Accreditation, by meeting with various minority groups of the Board and with individual Board members divulging select information withheld from the entire Board. These meetings are purposed to further the President's agenda during Board meetings and committee meetings. The President selects those he deems friendly to his agenda to have them speak on his behalf.

The President has exerted undue influence upon the Board, prohibited by the SACS Principles of Accreditation, by attempting to have its membership disciplined and removed through minority influence. The President has even attempted to manipulate the Board member selection process through the nominating committee of the LBC – seeking to have specific members of the Board commissioned and others replaced.

In the September 2012 Regularly Scheduled Board meeting, the President chose to read a raving polemic he wrote instead of addressing the impending projected loss of \$900,000 to \$1,300,000 in the current fiscal year. Instead of addressing remedies to student recruitment and retention problems, he chose to read a tangential, disjointed, and incendiary polemic. Instead of addressing the state of disrepair and public health issues facing the student body of the College, the President engaged in a mythical contretemps with the President of the United States. The entire President's Address to the Board consisted of reading this incendiary polemic containing no data or information about the state of the College.

C. *Alumni*

The President does not seek to encourage our alumni to support the College. A database (that is rarely updated) contains the names and addresses of alumni who receive only sporadic and poorly planned collateral materials as his excuse for functional engagement and integration into the College. The President does not adequately integrate alumni of the College or draw upon their influence or successes to benefit the College. The President interacts with alumni only on rare occasions, and then only with those alumni who are friendly to the President. He selects only favored persons to participate in meaningful planning or dialogue with the College. The President virtually discounts any alum that may hold disparate views, regarding anything and everything, from the President. In fact, the President, through his negligence to engage and integrate alumni into the College system has further disenfranchised alumni from the College – some relationships that the College may never repair.

D. *Donors*

The President seeks donors to fulfill his agenda and not the best interests of the College. On some occasions, the President has usurped those who developed relationships with a donor and approached the donor for a gift ultimately beyond what had been assessed as attainable. The President did this in the case of the Law School twice – circumventing M. Johnson, Esq. and Little and approached a donor for

twice the original ask. The donor ultimately refused to make any donation and had a letter sent to the College detailing the refusal. The donor was disenchanted with the College because of this encounter with the President. An almost mirrored event occurred in Mansfield, related to the Law School fundraising, just a short time thereafter; then, of course, the Caskey donor's debacles which have been previously discussed.

The President does not fully appreciate how people of wealth operate and the sphere in which they live and move. He is grossly unprepared to interact with any person of wealth, and often engenders discontentment with the College after his encounters. Because of the President's misunderstanding of donor relations and gross nescience regarding people of wealth, he has ostracized millions of dollars from the College and estranged potential benefactors from the College.

E. Media

Unfortunately, the President's ego causes him to crave media attention and such media attention almost always adversely affects the College. In fact, the Alliance Defense Fund, which represents the College in its lawsuit challenging the Obamacare abortion mandate, considered terminating its legal representation contract with the College because of the President's consistent refusal to heed their legal advice regarding media attention. The President was asked multiple times to not make statements to the media, to not hold press conferences, or entertain interviews with the media. However, time and time again the President refused their counsel and directives only to seek one interview after another interview serving only his self-aggrandizement.

The President often makes unilateral decisions regarding media interactions, and even when wise counsel advises otherwise, his desperate need for attention causes him to discount it and engage in more media. This irrational behavior has often been the cause of great angst to his Administrative Counsel and others closest to the President.

The President has had an adversarial relationship with many media sources, notwithstanding the local daily newspaper; he has had such caustic interactions that it directly affects the coverage the College receives. Because the President failed to nurture good and beneficial relationships with the local newspaper, the College suffers broadly skeptical coverage on virtually every story.

F. Community

Instead of being known as a place where all people are welcome, a place of hope and honor, the College as known as an insular, pious, fundamentalist compound. Leaders in the community readily mock the College for all of its failed plans and overt misplaced arrogance. Relationships with local governments and not-for-profits are tenuous and skeptical at best, and most community leaders choose to stay as distant and unrelated to the College as possible because they are worried to

be associated with the College. The President has worked to make the College the punch-line of jokes and the standard comparison for uneducated fundamentalists. In short, the College has become a consistent embarrassment and source of mockery for this community.

6. Health & Wellness

The President's health, wellness, and well-being must be taken into consideration as the performance of a college president is difficult, labor intensive, psychologically dynamic, and inherently stressful. To negotiate relationships with a variety of stakeholders, especially those related and unrelated to a polity, it is imperative the individual have a sound mind and body.

A. Cardiac Conditions

It is well known the President has a cardiac history, even having a heart attack immediately prior to the SACS visit in 2010. Immediately following the heart attack, the President underwent bypass surgery in attempt to remedy his cardiac problems. In addition, the President stated he has had to undergo surgery related to a hernia and has had difficulty swallowing. Further, the President most recently had another heart related surgery to correct on-going cardiac problems.

While it is possible the President may feign some illnesses to engender sympathy and use his condition as a distraction from his clear mismanagement of the College, it should be stated that almost every time the President would incur stress of any kind, he would state his chest was hurting, state his blood pressure had become extraordinarily elevated, or other signs and symptoms of cardiac issues. The President has even stated that he has had to incur additional pharmacotherapy due to these episodic stress-related events.

B. Signs and Symptoms of Antisocial/Psychopathic Personality Type

The signs and symptoms of Antisocial/Psychopathic Personality Type are best described as follows: "This category not only includes the disinhibition and irresponsibility component but also that of meanness, that is, the traits related with lack of sensitivity or lack of remorse, manipulateness and predatory aggression."⁷

"...arrogant and egocentric, seek power over others and manipulate them or take advantage of them in order to inflict harm and to achieve their objectives. They are insensitive and show a little empathy unless these coincide with their interests. They show disdain for the rights, property or safety of others, and do not feel guilt or remorse about the harm they cause. They act aggressively or sadistically towards others in pursuit of their personal interest and seem to obtain pleasure or satisfaction when dominating, humiliating or degrading others. They also have a superficial charm and capacity to please when it is convenient to their purposes.

⁷ <http://www.ehu.es/echeburua/pdfs/Personality%20Disorders%20in%20DSM-V.pdf>

They show little conventional moral principles and tend to deny responsibility for their acts and to blame others for their own failures and defects.”⁸

Unfortunately, the President demonstrates the signs and symptoms of this disorder on a regular, verifiable basis. Further, the DSM-V proposes new indicators or domains to classify these personality disorders and is described below:

“a. Manipulativeness: Frequent use of subterfuge to influence or control others; use of seduction, charm, glibness, or ingratiation to achieve one’s ends.

b. Deceitfulness: Dishonesty and fraudulence; misrepresentation of self; embellishment or fabrication when relating events.

c. Callousness: Lack of concern for feelings or problems of others; lack of guilt or remorse about the negative or harmful effects of one’s actions on others; aggression; sadism.

d. Hostility: Persistent or frequent angry feelings; anger or irritability in response to minor slights and insults;”⁹

Regrettably, these are the signs and symptoms that numerous current and former faculty, staff, employees, trustees, students, alumni and other stakeholders have noticed and become extraordinarily concerned about. Other characteristics continue:

“a. Emotional liability: Unstable emotional experiences and frequent mood changes; emotions that are easily aroused, intense, and/or out of proportion to events and circumstances.

b. Anxiousness: Intense feelings of nervousness, tenseness, or panic, often in reaction to interpersonal stresses; worry about the negative effects of past unpleasant experiences and future negative possibilities; feeling fearful, apprehensive, or threatened by uncertainty; fears of falling apart or losing control.

c. Separation insecurity: Fears of rejection by – and/or separation from – significant others, associated with fears of excessive dependency and complete loss of autonomy.”¹⁰

And further:

“a. Impulsivity: Acting on the spur of the moment in response to immediate stimuli; acting on a momentary basis without a plan or consideration of outcomes; difficulty establishing or following plans; a sense of urgency and self-harming behavior under emotional distress.”

And further:

“a. Hostility: Persistent or frequent angry feelings; anger or irritability in response to minor slights and insults.”

⁸ <http://www.ehu.es/echeburua/pdfs/Personality%20Disorders%20in%20DSM-V.pdf>

⁹ <http://www.dsm5.org/Documents/Diagnostic%20Criteria%20for%20Personality%20Disorder%20%28Comparison%20of%20DSM-IV%20DSM-5%20old%20DSM-5%20new.pdf>

¹⁰

- “a. Grandiosity: Feelings of entitlement, either overt or covert; self-centeredness; firmly holding to the belief that one is better than others; condescending toward others.
b. Attention seeking: Excessive attempts to attract and be the focus of the attention of others; admiration seeking.”

C. *Signs and Symptoms of Intermittent Explosive Anger Disorder*

“Intermittent explosive disorder (IED) is a behavioral disorder characterized by extreme expressions of anger, often to the point of uncontrollable rage, that are disproportionate to the situation at hand.”¹¹ The President, on multiple occasions, has demonstrated the inability to control his emotions, exploding into an uncontrollable rage. This has been observed by many trustees, students, and current and former employees of the College.

7. Spirituality

The President does not appear to have a clear, definitive, and understandable theological viewpoint. Many times the President appears to merge Calvinism and Oneness Pentecostalism. He evidences belief patterns of Charismatics and Southern Baptists. While a diverse theological perspective is laudable, the problem arises when the President takes extraordinarily particular theological stances. It becomes very difficult for the President to articulate his theological stances, in particular those related to Calvinism, because of his own apparent conflation of theologies.

Furthermore, the President does not demonstrate “fruits of the Spirit” found in Paul’s Letter to the Galatians. Beginning in Galatians Chapter 5 Verse 14:

“¹⁴For the whole Law is fulfilled in one word, in the statement, ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ ¹⁵But if you bite and devour one another, take care that you are not consumed by one another. ¹⁶But I say, walk by the Spirit, and you will not carry out the desire of the flesh. ¹⁷For the flesh sets its desire against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are in opposition to one another, so that you may not do the things that you please. ¹⁸But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the Law. ¹⁹Now the deeds of the flesh are evident, which are: immorality, impurity, sensuality, ²⁰idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, outbursts of anger, disputes, dissensions, factions, ²¹envying, drunkenness, carousing, and things like these, of which I forewarn you, just as I have forewarned you, that those who practice such things will not inherit the kingdom of God. ²²But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, ²³gentleness, self-control; against such things there is no law. ²⁴Now those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires. ²⁵If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit. ²⁶Let us not become boastful, challenging one another, envying one another.”

¹¹ McElroy SL (1999). "Recognition and treatment of DSM-IV intermittent explosive disorder". *J Clin Psychiatry* **60 Suppl 15**: 12–6. [PMID 1041880](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1041880/)

In fact, instead of fruits of the Spirit enumerated in Verse 23, the President exhibits the opposite fruits found in Verses 20-21: strife, jealousy, outbursts of anger, disputes, dissensions, factions, and envying.

In their book, *Toxic Faith*, sold at Lifeway and other outlets, Stephen Arterburn and Jack Felton explain: “Religious addiction is developed in a toxic faith system. The following characteristics differentiate it from systems, churches, and ministries committed to growing people in faith and developing their relationship with God:

A. ‘Special’ claims

- i. The leaders of toxic faith systems claim a special pipeline to God which places them at a level above all the others in the church which creates an atmosphere of unapproachability. The leader can use this superiority to manipulate the followers who either believe and obey or suffer the consequences.
- ii. In the toxic system, the minister will set him/herself up as having a special destiny or mission that can be performed by no one else. This special anointing or calling many times is nothing more than the pathological need to be valued or esteemed. He/she can also posture special powers from God like the ability to supernaturally heal.
- iii. The victimized followers, seeking a closer relationship with God but focusing more on the addicted leader than on God, lose contact with God and often fall away from faith permanently. Misguided loyalty allows the delusions of the leader to grow and destroys the faith of the loyal.
- iv. The only hope for everyone involved is for the leader who claims to be God's special officer to be forced into accountability or dethroned to protect other potential victims.

B. Authoritarianism

- i. Churches and ministries are started and grown through the vision of a strong leader. The authoritarian leader comes to power because a driven personality accompanies talent and charisma. A toxic system arises when that leader moves into a free rein style with no real accountability. Often, this ministry is the first experience of authority for the leader.
- ii. Those who work in this setting find themselves either agreeing with the direction of the ministry or leaving. There is no room for compromise since the dictatorial leader believes that everyone should submit to his rule without question. Those who fear for their jobs or feel they may not be able to find similar jobs will comply with the leader rather than challenge certain decisions or actions that appear to be wrong. The leader and the people, therefore, mutually deny their accountability structures and wave the option of having safeguards in the system.

C. An ‘Us Versus Them’ Mentality

- i. Religious addicts are at war with the world to protect their terrain and establish themselves as godly persons who can't be compared to other persons. They see themselves in the cutting-edge ministry and other people need to come into the light.

- ii. Those in the exclusive society believe they are serving God but they are serving a person, and that person's concept of what should be and should not be.
 - iii. Any scrutiny of the ministry is seen to be an attack from the enemy.
- D. Punitive in Nature
- i. The minister addicted to power punishes and purges the system of anybody who would upset the status quo.
 - ii. To outsiders, the whole ministry appears negative and punitive, out of balance, and distorted from the love, acceptance, and forgiveness freely given by God and his Son.
- E. Overwhelming
- i. Service People get burned out by the service demands of the system which feeds on compulsive personalities.
- F. Followers in Pain
- i. Many religious addicts in the system are physically ill, emotionally distraught, and spiritually dead because they are looking to the leader and ministry to give them what only God can give.
- G. Closed Communication
- i. Communication is from the top down or from the inside out. Those at the top no longer hear the perceptions and needs of the people. The addicts on the inside no longer care about the needs of the people on the outside.
 - ii. Someone in the system has the job of shielding the leader from the truth by placating those who disagree and satisfying those who want a direct voice to the leader. The lieutenant is never to tell the leader anything but what he/she wants to hear.
 - iii. The organization eventually becomes ineffective because it loses touch with the people it is designed to serve, just like a father loses touch with his children.
- H. Legalism
- i. What you do is more important than who you are. Performance is everything.
- I. No Objective Accountability
- i. This is the key to a toxic faith system. If religious addicts were in healthy, accountable relationships with others, toxic faith would not be allowed to flourish.
 - ii. A person accountable only to God is a person out of control.
- J. Labeling
- i. Labeling attempts to dehumanize persons so that dismissing them or their opinions is much easier. Rather than say that John Doe has made a negative comment, the addict proclaims that they are "traitors" or have a "critical spirit." The labels become rallying points under which the other followers can be moved to action to squelch a revolt. Once the label is in place, it becomes more difficult to see that person as a human with real needs and the potential for good judgment.

- ii. Because it is difficult to rally against rational, thinking people who have different views, labels must be used to polarize the opponents and energize the followers to fight against those opponents. The enemy is "shot" so the underlying issues that need to be considered can be avoided."¹²

When a reasonable person reads through these characteristics, should they be involved, on any level, with the College, or have interacted with the President, it becomes evident the College exhibits these characteristics as led and promulgated by its leader, the President.

Conclusion

It should be clear to any reasonable and prudent person, having even limited interaction with the College and the President, that the current state of the College is toxic, divided, and perilously close to ultimate failure, and that unfortunately the President has caused this state of the College and is responsible for this toxicity, and should be held accountable for his mismanagement, irresponsibility, and sinful behavior. The President should be immediately dismissed and the College should then immediately make a public apology to those the President has harmed during his tenure.

In addition to a public apology, the College should make remuneration and restitution (any documented, reasonable and fair market value expenses and costs) as a gesture of goodwill and appreciation of our responsibilities, to those individuals who left the College because of the President's failures to manage the College as contracted.

It is vital to remember that in a generation no one will remember the name of the President. While it is possible that people will remember the College, one thing remains certain: the name of Christ will still be known. Our actions have directly, adversely affected the name of Christ. We have brought shame upon His character, upon His name, and possibly even caused people to be eternally separated from Him by our reticence to act. Our hearts should be pained as we have not only done a disservice to our students, our employees, the LBC, the community, and our myriad other stakeholders – we have publicly done a disservice to Christ by impugning His name with every misdeed and cruel remark made in the name of Christ.

The College is a ministry of the LBC. As disciples of Christ, leading a ministry under His name, we must be extraordinarily sensitive to every word and deed proclaimed and completed. Our sensitivities must not wane because of actual or perceived power assigned to position or authority, nor should our sensitivities wane because of actual or perceived value assigned by duty or vocation. Rather, our sensitivities should escalate as our responsibilities are greater.

I am reminded of the haunting and piercing words of Jesus found in Matthew 23 Verses 1-23:

"¹Then Jesus said to the crowds and to his disciples, ²"The teachers of religious law and the Pharisees are the official interpreters of the law of Moses. ³So practice and obey whatever they tell you, but don't follow their example. For they don't practice what

¹² Toxic Faith

they teach. ⁴They crush people with unbearable religious demands and never lift a finger to ease the burden.

⁵Everything they do is for show. On their arms they wear extra wide prayer boxes with Scripture verses inside, and they wear robes with extra long tassels. ⁶And they love to sit at the head table at banquets and in the seats of honor in the synagogues. ⁷They love to receive respectful greetings as they walk in the marketplaces, and to be called 'Rabbi.'

⁸Don't let anyone call you 'Rabbi,' for you have only one teacher, and all of you are equal as brothers and sisters. ⁹And don't address anyone here on earth as 'Father,' for only God in heaven is your spiritual Father. ¹⁰And don't let anyone call you 'Teacher,' for you have only one teacher, the Messiah. ¹¹The greatest among you must be a servant. ¹²But those who exalt themselves will be humbled, and those who humble themselves will be exalted.

¹³What sorrow awaits you teachers of religious law and you Pharisees. Hypocrites! For you shut the door of the Kingdom of Heaven in people's faces. You won't go in yourselves, and you don't let others enter either.

¹⁵What sorrow awaits you teachers of religious law and you Pharisees. Hypocrites! For you cross land and sea to make one convert, and then you turn that person into twice the child of hell you yourselves are!

¹⁶Blind guides! What sorrow awaits you! For you say that it means nothing to swear 'by God's Temple,' but that it is binding to swear 'by the gold in the Temple.' ¹⁷Blind fools! Which is more important—the gold or the Temple that makes the gold sacred? ¹⁸And you say that to swear 'by the altar' is not binding, but to swear 'by the gifts on the altar' is binding. ¹⁹How blind! For which is more important—the gift on the altar or the altar that makes the gift sacred? ²⁰When you swear 'by the altar,' you are swearing by it and by everything on it. ²¹And when you swear 'by the Temple,' you are swearing by it and by God, who lives in it. ²²And when you swear 'by heaven,' you are swearing by the throne of God and by God, who sits on the throne.

²³What sorrow awaits you teachers of religious law and you Pharisees. Hypocrites! For you are careful to tithe even the tiniest income from your herb gardens, but you ignore the more important aspects of the law—justice, mercy, and faith. You should tithe, yes, but do not neglect the more important things. ²⁴Blind guides! You strain your water so you won't accidentally swallow a gnat, but you swallow a camel!

²⁵What sorrow awaits you teachers of religious law and you Pharisees. Hypocrites! For you are so careful to clean the outside of the cup and the dish, but inside you are filthy—full of greed and self-indulgence! ²⁶You blind Pharisee! First wash the inside of the cup and the dish, and then the outside will become clean, too.

²⁷What sorrow awaits you teachers of religious law and you Pharisees. Hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs—beautiful on the outside but filled on the inside with dead people's bones and all sorts of impurity. ²⁸Outwardly you look like righteous people, but inwardly your hearts are filled with hypocrisy and lawlessness.

²⁹What sorrow awaits you teachers of religious law and you Pharisees. Hypocrites! For you build tombs for the prophets your ancestors killed, and you decorate the monuments of the godly people your ancestors destroyed. ³⁰Then you say,

'If we had lived in the days of our ancestors, we would never have joined them in killing the prophets.'

³¹"But in saying that, you testify against yourselves that you are indeed the descendants of those who murdered the prophets. ³²Go ahead and finish what your ancestors started. ³³Snakes! Sons of vipers! How will you escape the judgment of hell?"¹³

How many more camels will we swallow? How much longer will we cause sorrow by our inaction and refusal to stand for the values of Christ? Every day that we wait, every day that we slumber, every day that we tarry, we devalue our testimony and injure the very name of Christ. As A.W. Tozer wrote, "It might be a shock to some of us if we could know why we are disliked and why our testimony is rejected so violently. Could it be that we are guilty of a deep sinfulness of disposition that we just cannot keep hidden? Arrogance, lack of charity, contempt, self-righteousness, religious snobbery, fault-finding--and all this kept under careful restraint and disguised by a pious smile and synthetic good humor. This sort of thing is felt rather than understood by those who touch us in everyday life. They do not know why they cannot stand us, but we are sure that the reason is our exalted state of spirituality! Perilous comfort. Deep heart searching and prolonged repentance would be better. Yet let us not assume that if we are persecuted it is because of our faults. The opposite may be the fact. They may hate us because they first hated Christ, and if that is so, then blessed are we indeed. The point is, let us take nothing for granted. We may be better than we think we are, but the likelihood is not overwhelming. Humility is best."¹⁴

Today, let us choose what is right, let us prayerfully consider our role as trustees understanding that we have duty, a holy obligation to the College, its employees, and its students. Notwithstanding our moral obligations we also have legal obligations – three most certain legal obligations – the duty of care, the duty of loyalty and the duty of obedience. All of these are solemn fiduciary responsibilities and obligations made to the College—not to a person—but to the College.

Today, let us choose to honor Christ, and let us choose to act as a Board having no other allegiances but to the person of Christ and His ministry.

Best Regards,



Heath M. Veuleman
Trustee, Louisiana College

¹³

¹⁴