

Monday, February 23rd, 2004

The dc2be.com Poll Results:

The poll results were sent to me as individual emails. The identical emails were sent to the Palmer Beacon, PCC Alumni office of Clay Tuttle, and the Palmer Board of Trustees. I do not know what the alumni and board offices chose to do with the results. The Beacon office is tabulating the results separately to ensure validity. Because of the manual nature of the tally, I have chosen to always err on the side of caution and disregard votes of no confidence in which the voters did not identify themselves or did not identify themselves as an alumnus.

Total PCC Alumni to respond: 665

Total Non-PCC Alumni to respond: 324

Total PCC Students to respond: 229

Total Non-PCC students to respond: 39

Confidence in the Board of Trustees:

Of the 665 alumni, **569 voted to support the Vote of No Confidence** (attached document), representing **85.56%** of the PCC alumni responding. Many others voted no confidence, but I chose to only allow those who identified as Palmer alumni.

23 Palmer Alumni voted to support the board of trustees, representing **3.46% of the alumni vote**. 10 non-PCC alumni voted to support the board, representing 3.09% of the non-PCC alumni vote.

Loss of financial support and student referral numbers:

680 individuals voted that they would stop referring students to Palmer College. 422 of those votes came from Palmer Alumni. 258 Votes came from non-PCC alumni. Many stated in the comments that they had referred more than one student to the school previously.

359 individuals voted that they were a donor and would now discontinue their financial support to the school. 320 of these were PCC alumni and 39 were non-PCC alumni.

45 voted that they would continue to send students to the school, and within that group were 21 people who had voted No Confidence in the board and 24 who had voted in support of the board.

32 voted that they would continue to financially support the school, again with 11 who had voted No Confidence and 21 who had voted in support of the board.

Many explained in their comments that they were undecided on their ultimate decision and would wait pending an acceptable explanation of events or renewed trust in the direction the board and administration chooses to take in the coming year. Some demanded reinstatement of Dr. Riekeman or a comparable leader before renewing their support to the school. Many described how they had recently brought their money and student support back to Palmer after seeing the direction and vision supported during Dr. Riekeman's tenure. This support is largely now being withdrawn according to poll comments.

Comments Supporting the Board:

Of the 25 PCC alumni, 10 non-PCC alumni, and 13 students who voted to support the board, the comments were remarkably similar. Some of these individuals reviled the negative press surrounding this crisis and felt it was better to either trust the board or wait for more information to become public before judging. Many expressed a personal distaste for Dr. Riekeman and his vision. The other comments in support of the board applaud the perceived return of less philosophy and more musculoskeletal science to the curriculum.

Comments Supporting Vote of No Confidence:

I wish I could somehow publish all the comments, so you could all judge for yourself how this controversy has ignited the profession. Many comments expressed extreme anger and incomprehension toward the board, and toward Vickie Palmer. Many felt that her ancestors would be aghast by the direction she has seemed to choose for the school as of late. Many were frightened by the future political inferences of possible alliances made and encouraged by board members. Numerous comments expressed concern and contempt for a board that was not legally or spiritually accountable to the alumni and students of the school. A frequent comment lamented the financial damage and loss of Palmer pride likely to remain if no satisfactory statement or rectification of the situation is evident. Finally, many comments praised Dr. Riekeman and what was characterized as the unique leadership qualities he brought to the school.

Student Concerns:

Of the 268 student votes, 229 were from Palmer students. **204 votes called for a restructuring of the Board (89.08% of the student vote). 196 felt the loss of Dr. Riekeman would have an adverse effect on their education (85.58%). 77 students said they would consider transferring to another school and 5 said they will transfer to another school. 65 students stated that they would not transfer.** 13 students voted to support the board (5.68%), and 16 said there was no negative effect on their education (6.99%). Of the 39 non-PCC student and prospective student votes, 5 supported the board.

Final Comments:

The raw data of this vote (I stopped collecting data at 12:00 pacific time on Monday, February 23rd) will remain available for specific questions. Although the final number of Votes of No Confidence may not seem overwhelming, I am told that it is very similar to the number of alumni votes collected in 1997 when the PCCIAA voted No Confidence prior to the resignation of Mr. Patten. Of course, that vote was collected through predetermined avenues of communication established by the alumni association for times of crisis. I welcome the opportunity to use those avenues of communication and vote gathering if the PCCIAA and Palmer Board of Trustees is unsatisfied with the validity of this forum. I would be happy to discuss the methods and results of the poll with any who would like further information.

Chiropractically Yours,

Mary Flannery, DC
Esserboo@hotmail.com
785-343-8108