**Senators present**: Linda Cowan, Lihua Chen, Greg Chase, Judy Stechly, Ken Sexton,Aaron Huffman, Herb Minch, Matthew Inkster, Jim Haizlett, Jeff Pfister, Aaron Harper, Jeremy Larance, Sheli Bernstein-Goff, Corey Reigel, Ronny Warrington, Tracy Zang, Fuhua Chen, Jon Serra, Matthew Zdilla, Dave Blowers, Rick West.

**Absent members:** Susan Herrick (*arrived as meeting about to adjourn*), Robin Capehart (*President*), Brian Crawford, (*Provost*), Frank Noble *(BOG Representative),*

**Administrators and Honored Guests:** Jim Stultz, **(***Vice President of Human Resources),* Sylvia Hawranick Senften *(ACF Representative)*

**Honored Guests***: (Some writing on sign-in sheet was illegible, see attached copy of the Guest Sign-in sheet.)*

*The meeting was called to order by Senate Chair Linda Cowan at 12:00 pm in Fine Arts Room 325.*

Linda called the meeting to order and brought the Senate’s attention to the Action Item.

**Action Item:**

Motion by Jeremy Larance : “ *I make a motion of: “Faculty Senate vote of no confidence in the president of WLU*.” The motion was seconded.

**Discussion of motion:**

Jim Stultz was asked to speak due to his unique position of having been a former Board of Governors (BOG) member from 2008- 2011 and since then employed by WLU as the Vice President of Human Resources. Jim stated that his first point was regarding observations from a position of loyalty to the university. He stated that he has noticed that the BOG has a perception of reality that is not really what takes place on campus. The BOG only hears the positive aspects from the administration. Although the three members of the BOG with direct contact within the university give their opinions at the meeting, he stated that he now takes their concerns much more seriously than he did when he was actually a member of the BOG. He believes that if the BOG had a more accurate picture of what is truly happening, they would try to get more information. His second point was that from his viewpoint, the students and faculty members are key and that management does not give them enough credit. He believes that the management should put the needs of the faculty first above the administrators. In his experience in healthcare management, he does not think that one can use the same decision-making process as with that of manufacturing widgets, for example. Administrators should be prudent and practical, but also put the value of the student and education first. He stated that he believes that the second most important administrator on campus should be the Provost as a link to faculty and what they need in order to provide quality education for our students. While the CFO is an important part of the process, there may be too much emphasis on the finances and less on the student. A question was asked of Jim as to whether he believes that the president is negligent in his duties, knowing the contract and expectations of the position. Jim replied that he thinks the board must make the determination of negligence. Yes, some actions were inappropriate and caused embarrassment and a degree of hardship on the university, and that: “The ethics violations are matters of fact, not possibilities.” He also stated that the WV Ethics Commission investigation was complete and thorough and will be decided in April.

Discussion continued and included the ethics of the use of paid sabbatical leave in order to job hunt and also that the faculty were not able to find the president’s report on his sabbatical in the BOG minutes. Jim stated that he believes that the nature of a Sabbatical leave is that it should be to create something of educational value that promotes higher education or *“improve competence of the president”* during the three month period of Sabbatical leave. He said we would have to make our own decision regarding the appropriateness of its use. This was given to the president as a matter of contract and was a legally entitled benefit. A question was asked regarding the impact of a vote of no confidence. Jim replied that he has never worked in an organization in which such a vote was possible. He stated the BOG respects the opinion of the faculty members, as they are the key to our students’ success. He believes that the BOG would listen to the voice of the faculty.

Sylvia recapped Jim’s statements in that the voice of the faculty was discounted when Jim served on the board, and that he is now saying that the BOG would listen to faculty concerns. She stated that she is not seeing this. Jim replied that they never had an occasion where the ‘grumblings’ were raised on an issue of major concern. This issue is completely different because of the media coverage and the charges. It is a different time and set of concerns. He stated that the BOG listens to the Student Body President when he has something to say.

The student Body President, Evan Newman, stated that he is proud to serve on the BOG and informed the meeting that there is a BOG meeting scheduled for March 11th at 4:00 pm. He suggests that we have a representative attend in order to inform the BOG of our decision. If we wait to make a decision, then the next BOG meeting will be in June.

A question was asked of Linda as to the follow-up actions after a vote for the motion on the Senate floor of: ‘*Faculty Senate vote of no confidence in the president of WLU.*’ The senator stated that no specific actions would actually be taken following the vote on this motion. Linda replied that she would inform Frank Noble, our BOG representative of the action.

A motion was made to close the debate and seconded. The motion to close debate was approved unanimously with no opposed or abstentions.

The vote on the motion of ‘*Faculty Senate vote of no confidence in the president of WLU.*’ was taken by paper ballot, with the ballots counted by the Faculty Senate Secretary, and observed by the Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate. The result was 13 Yea; 6 Nay; and 2 abstentions. According to Article 6 Section 8 of the Senate by-laws, the motion passed.

A motion was then made by Jim Haizlett to make a motion for a full General Faculty meeting to explain the decision of this Faculty Senate vote. Jeremy Larance seconded the motion. The vote for this motion was 17 Yea and 1 Nay with 3 abstentions.

A discussion was held regarding the specifics of how the General Faculty meeting would be run on Wednesday. Linda cited Policy 206 and stated that since the Provost declined to call a General Faculty meeting, she is planning to run the meeting since it was called by Faculty Senate vote today.

A senator called the question and a vote was taken on the motion for*: “A full faculty meeting to discuss the procedures of this meeting and to explain our decision.”*

The voting results were as follows: 18 Yea; 0 Nay; with 3 abstentions

Two other motions were made and not seconded as follows:

*A motion was made to vote no confidence in the Board of Governors.*

*A motion was made for a vote of no confidence in Brian Crawford as Provost.*

A student was recognized by the floor who spoke against the corruption evident on campus and the decisions that students do not agree with, such as the proposed new fees for students taking more than a full time load of credits, and the ethics of using desperately needed funds elsewhere. She expressed grave concerns that if the president is using funds for purposes not for the university, and that if these unethical actions continue, it could invalidate her degree.

A motion was made to adjourn and seconded. The motion passed.

*Meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm*

Respectfully Submitted

Tracy Zang,

Faculty Senate Secretary

*2 Attachments:*

*1. Faculty Senate sign-in sheet*

*2. Faculty Senate Guest sign-in sheet*



