

**A SUMMARY OF EVENTS LEADING UP TO
THE BREAKDOWN OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
DR. CLAUDIA LIMBERT AND THE ALUMNAE
ASSOCIATION AT MISSISSIPPI UNIVERSITY FOR
WOMEN By: MUW Alumnae**

Events currently unfolding in the conflict between Dr. Claudia Limbert and members of the Alumni Association are focusing on disagreements that arose during negotiations about proposed new By-Laws: By-laws that would empower the President of Mississippi University for Women to impose her will on an independent organization, chartered by the State of Mississippi.

It should be noted that members of the Association negotiated with the University *in good faith* and submitted several versions of the By-Laws for Limbert's review and approval, compromised on a number of points and sought resolution that would *not* trigger her threat to disaffiliate the Association. In return, she refused to work *with* the current Association, refused to provide a written explanation of what provisions of the proposed By-Laws were inconsistent with the Affiliation Agreement, mission and priorities of the University, and IHL Policy, and insisted in the middle of negotiations that they be started all over again. Her resistance to resolving the conflict and the speed with which she triggered the disaffiliation clause, put her hand-picked leaders in place, and removed all references to the Alumni Association from the University web site indicate that *she was never negotiating in good faith*, but always intended to demolish the existing Alumni Association and replace those who questioned and criticized her with hand-picked replacements.

Concerned and caring people have raised a number of good questions about the controversy that need to be answered:

1. What precipitated the conflict between members of the Alumnae Association and the President?
2. What role did Scott Rawles play in the disintegration of the trust between the President and the Association? On what were the charges of sexual harassment and racial discrimination against Scott Rawles based? Who made them? Did the accusers express fear of retaliation? Was there retaliation against them? Why were the Rawles and McDaniel/Ervin terminations handled so differently? Why were Patsy McDaniel and Tracey Ervin fired? Why were the records and files of the Past Presidents and others who criticized her in private emails seized?
3. Why would Limbert dismantle an entire organization because individual members in private emails expressed a desire to have her removed? (Content of emails will be included as an addendum). [This information will be added as soon as possible. Keep coming back and checking for changes and additions. Thank you for your patience.](#)
4. Why were the promises of follow up efforts to strengthen communication with alumnae after the mediation sessions never made?

These and other questions have been asked repeatedly by alumni on the campus list serve, by the media, and now by members of the legislature. To understand how we arrived at the current crisis, it is necessary to begin at the beginning and review the sequence of events that followed. This time line (along with supporting documents) has been prepared to answer those and other questions, to make clear that the Alumnae Association was never driven by any motive other than to serve the best interests of the institution, and to affirm that Dr. Limbert's disaffiliation action is unwarranted and will cause the institution irreparable damage.

The Timeline and supporting documents will trace the Limbert/Alumnae Association controversy from its inception through the Rawles issues, the Ervin/McDaniel firings, the IHL Board Affiliation Agreement Process, and the new By-Laws issues. They will demonstrate a pattern of flawed leadership,

poor judgment, broken promises, missed opportunities, secrecy, denial, evasion, and retaliation on the part of the President.

TIMELINE OF EVENTS

This document is a work in progress and several are working to pull together (for posting) the emails which were supposedly offensive enough to cause Dr. Limbert to plan to disaffiliate the Alumnae Association. In addition, those alumni who are reading it today are sending their additions and a few corrections of typographical errors and timeline errors. So that you will be able to see and even compare corrections and additions to the original document, new material will be added in blue font.

November 10, 2002: Tornado Severely Damages Campus. November of 2002 is a watershed month for MUW and for Dr. Limbert's new presidency. On the tenth of that month a tornado tears through the campus destroying the Health and Kinesiology Building and the attached gymnasium, the Fine Arts Building, and seriously damaging numerous others. The tornado is truly devastating and the fact that no one was killed or even seriously injured is miraculous. But the campus is open again for business in only a week, and most people assume, difficult as the process would be, that MUW would repair, rebuild and rebound as it had many times in the past. [Shortly after the storm, and before power is even restored to downtown Columbus, Scott Rawles arrives in Columbus to begin work at MUW.](#)

November 18, 2002: VPIA Scott Rawles begins work on campus. Beginning on this date as a consultant, Rawles' official date of employment is December 1, 2002.

December 19, 2002: Limbert announces at the December IHL meeting her plan to eliminate intercollegiate athletics. This decision is purportedly linked to the tornado's destruction of the Health and Kinesiology Building. Almost before anyone beyond Limbert's cabinet was aware of the possibility, she asks the IHL board to approve her decision. Although, apparently to soften the blow, she said that the athletic budget would be reallocated "to develop a fitness, recreation and intramural program to serve all its students," this announcement is a shocking blow to the campus and to the community, but particularly to the alumnae, who feel they have been given no opportunity to understand why such a drastic step had to be taken so quickly. Since there is not a quorum at the December meeting, the IHL Board moves the vote on Limbert's request to the January 16th meeting. A campus press release states, "Dr. Limbert said she would use the next month to explain the basis for the decision. 'Although the decision will not be changed, it is personally important to me that all understand why this decision was made,' Dr. Limbert said." The press release continues, "In expressing full support for Dr. Limbert's decision to discontinue the intercollegiate athletic program, Board member Ricki Garrett, a past president of the MUW National Alumni Association, said that 'postponing the Board's action until January will give constituent groups time to digest information and understand why the decision was made.'" [Additional commentary from Ricki Garrett further clarifies this situation. Ms. Garrett says that she had once before stopped the elimination of athletics by sitting down with interim president Lenore Prather, because she knew it was such a damaging and drastic decision. She adds, "We didn't take a vote of the IHL Board that first month, not because there was not a quorum, but because several of us told Dr. Limbert we wanted to give the alums and public time to respond to the issue. She didn't want to wait, Perry especially didn't, but they agreed to it because board members were telling them to do that."](#)

January 7, 2003: VPIA Rawles announces his success. Scott Rawles announces that his first month at MUW, December 2002, had been the single largest month in giving in MUW's entire history. According to Rawles, funds total "more than \$1 million...given, which included a variety of sources, including unrestricted gifts and scholarship endowments." Rawles credits "new" processes set into place at the beginning of December with the increase in giving. Elated at this news, "Connie Kossen, chairman of the MUW Foundation Board of Directors since July of 2002, said 'We're really

excited Mississippi University for Women experienced the largest giving in its history for the month of December." Others were not convinced of the quick success of the VPIA, suspecting that the gifts had been in the giving "pipeline" for years and that the new fundraiser was already showing a tendency to take credit for successes in which he had no part.

January, 2003: Concerned alumni lobby IHL board to delay elimination of athletic programs.

In a letter dated January 12, Cindy Pond asks them to consider "sufficient time to explore funding options" with a "phased approach of creating an advisory board made up of professional athletes, business owners and executives as well as proven leaders in Women's Sports." She asks for a year for such an advisory board and a marketing campaign to gain visibility for MUW sports programs.

January 16, 2003: The IHL Board supports Dr. Limbert's decision to eliminate athletics.

February 7-8, 2003: Dr. Limbert meets with the Alumnae Board at their spring meeting to give a campus report, particularly on the issue of the dissolution of athletics and the possibility of a name change based on a recent marketing study paid for by the Foundation. They express their dismay over the small sample used by the marketing group and suggest other ways to recruit students other than with a name change. One alumna makes a motion to support the current name of the institution. Before the vote, Dr. Limbert, "with a fragile and hurt tone," as one alumna in attendance describes it, says that if the alumnae didn't trust her to do her job, then she should seek to find a different job. Other alumnae stood up to speak then and said that she should not misunderstand a motion which represents a consensus from an alumni group to be an act of mistrust, but rather an official consensus to be put on paper. The motion is defeated by a vote of 17 to 16 with nearly half of the group abstaining. Dr. Limbert spends the remaining spring and the summer traveling the state meeting with alumni and community groups. Many alumnae were relieved at her announcement in September that she would not recommend a name change for the institution since she believes that MUW can be "successful with its current name." The alumni leadership sees this decision as a positive sign that she is listening to them and other friends of MUW. They knew that she had been moving toward a name change based on little to no evidence produced by the flawed marketing study, but she apparently backed away from the change, realizing that so many were against such a radical action. Her decision is seen as a sign she can be reasonable and cautious.

March 18, 2003: President Limbert disbands The Boards of Distinguished Women and Distinguished Alumnae. The action is taken abruptly via a letter from Dr. Limbert. Many alumnae are insulted at the content of the letter which states, "As the Boards became inactive at Dr. Rent's departure, I write you to formalize their dissolution. At some future date, we may wish to reestablish these Boards in a different format. In the near term, we will invest our energy in building stronger bonds with the MUW Foundation Board and the Alumnae Association."

July 25, 2003: President Limbert's responds to alumna request for information regarding SACS accreditation. In July 2003 Elaine Parrish posted a question on the college listserv, noting "I just read its (SACS) report, Accreditation Actions taken June 19, 2003 (Updated 07/03/03), and the "W" isn't listed as reaffirmed. At the very bottom of the report was this entry: "Additional Information: The Commission placed nine institutions on Notice, continued two institutions on Notice and removed two institutions from Notice. Notice is a private sanction." Is the W "on Notice" and are we in danger of losing our accreditation[sic]." President Limbert responded quickly and informed Elaine that the answer was "no" the "W" was not in danger of losing its accreditation. She ended her response with the following: "This kind of reckless innuendo about accreditation does a great disservice to the faculty, staff, students, alumni, and friends of The W. A simple phone call would have answered this baseless concern about accreditation. Instead, an irresponsible and careless insinuation will likely lead to unnecessary fear on the part of those who care about The W." On July 26 Elaine Parrish wrote the President again, thanking her for for "your prompt, if hostile, response. There was no innuendo here. I read the report and I asked a straightforward question...."

August 14, 2003: President Limbert changes the policy for selecting Medal of Excellence Awardees. In August of 2003 the policy is changed to exclude the Alumnae Director from serving on the committee to select the Medal recipients. The memo states, "At the request of the President, the Vice President of Institutional Advancement now chairs a Medal of Excellence committee that makes recommendations to the President."

November 7, 2003: An Alumnae Board member writes President Limbert expressing concerns about VPIA actions. Alumnae Board member Lillian Wade writes Limbert a letter of concern saying, "since [Rawles'] arrival at my alma mater, he has succeeded in insulting and alienating an increasing number of MUW's friends and supporters." Dr. Limbert responds on November 17, 2003, saying that she had spoken to Rawles and asked him "to redouble his efforts to be seen and heard as the strong advocate for MUW that he is and to be careful with casual comments which might show the wrong spirit."

During all of 2003: The Foundation finances become less transparent. Foundation treasurer Mary Helen Hicks is one of the first alumnae to suggest that there might be something wrong with the bookkeeping in reporting Foundation expenditures and earnings. She notices that travel expenses are up considerably. She is also concerned that the Foundation Board is merely expected to vote approval of the documents handed to them at board meetings. She notices that while overall funds seem to be increasing, the level of actual giving is going down while grant funds are going up. The Foundation report ceases to be read at Homecoming. After Mary Helen Hicks finishes her year as treasurer she rotates off the board. Tax Forms for 2003 show about \$40,000 spent in travel supposedly to visit alumnae chapter meetings and donors. This amount is up from \$5600 reported the previous year.

March 8, 2004: Gail Laws meets with Dr. Limbert to express alumni and campus concerns. She tells the President that campus employees feel they cannot come to speak with her about their concerns about Rawles' power because they fear for their jobs.

May 21, 2004. Banking letter expresses concern about move of Foundation funds. At some point, the Foundation made the decision to consolidate its funds into one bank in Columbus rather than continuing to foster community relations between the W and local banks by maintaining accounts at several reputable financial institutions. Despite the Foundation's assurances to Limbert that all banks were given the opportunity to earn a position as the Foundation's sole bank, at least two large banks in Columbus never received notice that the Foundation was seeking to consolidate its accounts until the funds were moved. AmSouth's president Hoot Wilder writes "I remain concerned about the reasons for the move and solicit your leadership in asking for an opportunity for AmSouth to present our case before the Foundation's board..." He continues saying, "Yes, we are upset by the loss of business, but we are more concerned that MUW and the Foundation, by not exploring all the alternatives, might jeopardize a relationship of mutual trust and respect that has existed for years." Neither Limbert nor the Foundation reply to AmSouth's letter from the bank's president asking for clarification of why Foundation funds were removed from AmSouth.

June 15, 2004: Demonstration School Closed. An article in the Commercial Dispatch reports that "Superintendent Lester Beason informed school board members that the district received a letter from officials at MUW last Friday notifying city educators that it could no longer subsidize the operation of the Demonstration School. Beason recommended that the school board request permission from the Justice Department to move the Demonstration School students to Franklin Academy Elementary School. 'We tried to find all kinds of ways to continue what we have been doing at the Demonstration School, but in the end, we just couldn't make it work. This was not a decision we made lightly. I wish we could continue, but the money just is not available. I have to be committed to the university first,' Dr. Claudia Limbert, MUW's president, said this morning." The community and the campus are shocked the Demonstration School is not considered by Limbert to be a part of the university's educational program. Campus faculty attempt to lead a campaign to keep the school open, especially since it is the only level five school in the city school system, but fail in the attempt. "The decision was made on behalf of the faculty; however, no one asked the faculty what they wanted," History professor Tom Velek says after the school board meeting.

Summer, 2004: Complaints about Scott Rawles' behavior escalate. Alumnae Board member Bettye Van Vulpen states that she was visiting in the Alumni Association Office "when a student assistant was there. While I cannot totally reconstruct the conversation, I remember that it was about Scott Rawles making racial and sexual slurs and innuendos which had been heard by this particular student. I told Patsy that I certainly hoped she was documenting this [information] because she could be hung out to dry if this came to light and she knew about it." Van Vulpen concludes that "Patsy said she most certainly was documenting these things." By June of 2004 there had been enough complaints heard from alumni, faculty, and administrators to warrant a special meeting of concerned alumnae. This group of 18 met in Jackson to determine a strategy for pointing out the seriousness of the problems with Rawles. They decided that a smaller group would meet with Dr. Limbert and let her know about the damage Rawles was causing in her administration.

August 20, 2004: Six past presidents of the Alumni Association meet with Dr. Limbert. [Adelaide Fletcher, Gail Laws, Lynne Curtis, Jan McSpadden, Beverly Jones, Elizabeth Guin]

On August 20, 2004, the past presidents express extreme concern about Rawles' behavior and also concerns about his expenses. Minutes kept by past president Jan Guthrie McSpadden state "At this meeting we first praised her efforts on behalf of our university, then brought up concerns which we had received from division heads and faculty regarding Scott Rawles: [that he was] alienating and antagonizing the community; micromanaging areas of campus over which he had very little expertise, and showing little regard for alums. We also expressed concern that long-standing events were being neglected or destroyed, such as the Book & Author Dinner, the Overby Forum, and the Boards of Distinguished Women and Alumnae. We said he gave the appearance that he was not being forthright about finances or being a good steward of finances, and that he was generally damaging to the university. We concluded by saying that it seemed that he was in control rather than herself. We requested that he be asked to leave quietly, and then we requested a follow-up meeting. Finally, we requested certain financial documents--SR's expense records, especially--and she did not deny this request."

August 26, 2004: Dr. Limbert responds with letter discounting their concerns. Dr. Limbert had promised the past presidents a follow-up meeting. However, instead of a follow-up meeting, she sends them a letter on August 26 discounting their concerns, saying "the person that you describe and the one with whom I work every day are not the same....Mr Rawles is a highly qualified, well-respected professional whose character, ethics, and record of accomplishments at MUW are most remarkable. He has my full, unquestioned support." In addition, she says that Scott Rawles had been a deciding voice in helping her decide against a name change, implying they should be grateful for his influence. An additional request for a follow-up meeting is denied by Limbert.

Jan McSpadden attempts to follow up on the group's requests. McSpadden says, "we were never given the financial documents we had requested, so I called the comptroller's office about a month later and spoke directly to the comptroller requesting the records, stating that with the starting of school, it was probably an oversight that I had not received the records. The next morning Dr. Limbert called and then Foundation chair Connie Kossen called that afternoon, both wanting to know why I had requested the records. Dr. Limbert was 'hurt' that I should do this. I later called the state auditor Phil Bryant's office and talked to Phil Bryant and Jesse Bingham in that office about the need for an audit at the W. I was told that they would red flag that audit when it was time to do the audit, but I never heard any results."

July 11, 2005: The group of past presidents request the help and advice of alumna Lydia Quarles. On July 11, 2005, Ms. Quarles, an attorney and one of three commissioners at the Mississippi Workers' Compensation Commission, says that it appears to her that Rawles' statements to Patsy

McDaniels and Tracey Ervin constitute sexual harassment. She suggests they report Rawles to the appropriate campus official. According to the current online MUW Employee's Handbook, MUW's Sexual Harassment Policy defines sexual harassment as "unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature." The third type of sexual harassment detailed in the definition is "such conduct [that] has the purpose or effect of unreasonable interfering with an individual's academic or work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive learning or employment environment." The Handbook includes examples of sexual harassment. Number 5 states, "a course or pattern of conduct, particularly, comments of a sexual nature or sexually explicit questions, jokes or anecdotes, which embarrass or humiliate a student or an employee." Under the heading "Protection Against Retaliation," the policy states as follows: "Retaliation against a complainant, whether by the alleged offender or from another source, is considered harassment. It will be treated as if it were a complaint for harassment itself." Section I, pp. 41-2. This policy is not dated; therefore it can not be determined definitively whether this policy was in place during Rawles' tenure [2002-2005]. The EEOC definition of sexual harassment was in place at that time, according to another online document dated September 12, 2002, but that document does not contain the examples of retaliation language or the policies and procedures for reporting sexual harassment.

September 26, 2005: Alumnae ask Dr. Crofts to address the Rawles issues. On September 26, 2005, the past presidents group meets with outgoing Interim Commissioner Dr. Richard Crofts two days prior to his leaving the IHL position. Their meeting follows Crofts' visit to MUW to meet with campus groups to investigate problems with Limbert's leadership and her VPIA Rawles. Numerous campus leaders, including the Deans of the colleges, had shared their belief that Scott Rawles' behavior and Limbert's reliance on his advice had damaged her reputation and ability to lead. They expressed concern that he had seriously damaged her relationship with the institution's alumnae. Crofts supposedly reports his findings to incoming Commissioner Dr. Tom Meredith.

Dr. Meredith visits campus. Meredith does visit MUW, but not to investigate. He meets with Dr. Limbert and tours campus buildings. He comments positively to the press about Limbert's successes. She sends an email to campus expressing her pleasure at how complimentary Meredith was about the campus.

September 29, 2005: Lydia Quarles sends letter to Perry Sansing, under the Mississippi Public Records Act, requesting travel and phone records connected with Mr. Rawles' employment and Foundation financial records detailing his fund-raising activities. Lydia Quarles says that Perry Sansing, in a phone conversation, assures her that "the University was treating the requests that I sent to Mr. Rawles as a request under the Mississippi Public Records Act, and that Vice President Miller would be following up with me relative to my requests."

October 4, 2005: Perry Sansing sends a letter to Lydia Quarles saying essentially the same thing he said in the September 29th phone conversation.

Welty Weekend October 13-15, 2005: Limbert receives bonus. During the October meeting of the Foundation Board, Limbert is voted a \$25,000 bonus.

October 21, 2005: Rawles is reported for sexual harassment. Patsy McDaniel meets with Perry Sansing and Nora Miller to report offensive sexual language Scott Rawles has said to her and to others

in her presence. Sansing assures her he will investigate.

October 24, 2005: Tracey Ervin reports sexual harassment. In a meeting with Perry Sansing and Nora Miller, Tracey Ervin details numerous examples of sexual language and innuendo Rawles has spoken in her presence. For example, in April, 2005, Rawles said to Ervin that he "could count the number of penises in the room on one hand," implying that there were too many women in the room. In a meeting which included both McDaniel and Ervin, he told a story that his son walked in on two people in bed in a hotel room and the next day his son said "that man looks tired and the girl looks skanky." In a staff meeting where McDaniel and Ervin were present which took place just after Mag Chain, he said that the graduates were "grabbing for ovaries." Ervin said Rawles often made comments about his daughter's friends who had "big boobs."

Rawles' racist remarks: In their meetings to report the sexual harassment, McDaniel and Ervin also express their discomfort in hearing him make racist remarks. For example, in a meeting of president's cabinet members and other administrators he commented that "we have enough blacks around here to ward off the flies." He was referring to the fact that they had not opened the windows in the room to alleviate the heat because the windows were not covered by screens. In another meeting of administrators, a division head reported to them that when one of the people in the room went to raise the window and the blinds he said, "Don't worry about that, this is the W--we have black people to do that." They refer Sansing to others to question who have heard Rawles make sexist, sexual, and racist remarks. He says he will investigate.

Patsy McDaniel has requested that we correct the timeline here and add additional clarification. Their meeting with Perry Sansing and Rawles' resignation the same day was on the 26th rather than the 28th as previously stated. She also says that Sansing met first with them to tell them that their complaint, in his opinion, did not rise to the level of sexual harassment. He also told them that they shouldn't do anything to jeopardize Rawles' future and his reputation. McDaniel and Ervin disagreed with Sansing's opinion and expressed their concern about Rawles' ability to retaliate. Ervin said that her father had urged her to use attorney Jim Waide to file a sexual harassment suit. McDaniel added her opinion as a warning to Sansing about the consequences of keeping Rawles on at MUW since eventually the responsibility would fall on him and Dr. Limbert for not terminating him for illegal behavior. Sansing left their office and within two hours Rawles' resignation had been announced, according to McDaniels.

October 26, 2005: Scott Rawles officially resigns but retains full salary and other benefits until June, 2006. On the same day that MUW Legal Counsel Perry Sansing meets with Patsy McDaniel and Tracey Ervin to inform them that his internal investigation has led him to conclude that their complaint against Rawles did not rise to the legal definition of sexual harassment, Rawles resigns as VPIA saying he plans to return to South Carolina to spend more time with his family. He says that his last day at MUW will be December 31, 2005. In their conversation with Sansing, McDaniel and Ervin say they fear that Rawles will retaliate against them since he will be their supervisor for two more months. Sansing assures them there will be no retaliation. Privately, Rawles has negotiated with Dr. Limbert to be paid his full salary through June 30th, 2006, to retain the MUW vehicle he has been driving until that date, and to continue to use a university cell phone. Perry Sansing informs past president Lynne Curtis that Rawles' contract with MUW will extend through June. This agreement with Rawles is made in spite of the fact that, as Limbert later says during mediation between herself and the alumni leaders, Rawles was "banned from campus" in December 2005.

October 27, 2005: Rawles announces his departure to his staff and the need to call to task

those who made allegations against him. Rawles emails his staff informing them that he will be leaving MUW. The email clearly implies a threat of retaliation against McDaniel and Ervin. He says he is leaving first to be closer to his family and secondly, "to no longer be the target of false and malicious accusations made by people I need not identify for you." He continues, "the allegations raised were lies and half-truths intended to damage me. The people who have made these false allegations should be called to task for those attacks and that remains an action available to me. But please do not allow their absents [sic] of loyalty or committment [sic] to the cause to effect [sic] your dedication to all we are doing. Your work and accomplishments prove they are misguided and limited every day."

October 28, 2005: Tracey Ervin, at the request of Alumni Association President Meredith Berry Talley, sends donor information by email to Talley, Lydia Quarles, and Gail Laws. Talley informs Ervin that she had asked for her class's giving records from the Foundation Office, but had been denied. [Additional information has been added to clarify and correct Ms. Talley's description of her request: Ms. Talley writes, "I never requested specific class information from the Foundation Office. Thus, they never denied my request since there wasn't one. I did have several conversations with Scott Rawles about documenting alumni giving. I also appealed to him to be less secretive and more transparent about fundraising efforts. I received a letter regarding our class scholarship from Margie Slemp, our class president and a personal friend. I was on the phone with the Alumni Office while opening my mail and commented about the letter. Tracey questioned the amount quoted in the letter and looked it up on Raiser's Edge. She realized that other classes had been misinformed regarding their classscholarships and wanted to see if the information matched what was in the letter. She then sent emails \[to the three women\] with the information she found."](#)

October 31, 2005. Lydia Quarles writes second "Records Request" letter. Lydia Quarles writes Perry Sansing a second "Records Request" letter detailing again the 16 specific documents she previously officially requested, including travel records for Mr. Rawles, employment contract for Mr. Rawles, list of all alumni visited by Mr. Rawles, cell phone records and expenses for Mr. Rawles, and documentation of "in-house assessments of the dollar-investment return on MUW, Foundation or Alumni Association for donations and/or contingent donations."

November 21, 2005: Past presidents group meet in Jackson. Earlier in the day Dr. Limbert, in phone conversation with past president Gail Laws, repeatedly apologizes for allowing Rawles to interfere with the relationship between the university and the alumni. The past presidents' group meets that evening and decides to ask Lydia Quarles to send a letter to Dr. Tom Meredith.

November 23, 2005: Letter sent to Dr. Tom Meredith from Lydia Quarles. She conveys the following requests from the past presidents' group: 1. "consider postponing Dr. Claudia Limbert's evaluation until after the first of the year and that you consider a personal visit to the MUW campus to interview faculty, staff and students." 2. "that you be provided with a copy of the correspondence that was mailed to Perry Sansing on behalf of the Past Presidents' Committee on October 31, 2005." 3. "consider additional information that was conveyed by Dr. Limbert to Ms. Laws for dissemination at the past presidents' meeting on the 21st when you evaluate Dr. Limbert's performance." She writes that her records request to Perry Sansing has had only a minimal and dissatisfactory response. For example, although cell phone records are provided, almost all calls are "redacted" or blacked out. The University immediately turns ownership/payment of those phones over to the Foundation so that the Foundation can claim any future requests need not be honored. The Foundation takes the position that its documents are not public records subject to a Public Records Act request.

Alumni Leaders become increasingly angry and more frustrated. Requested records are not forthcoming, except in very limited form, and Perry Sansing says that Foundation records are not public because the Foundation is separate from MUW. They exchange numerous emails suggesting additional ways to get information about the Foundation finances and express anger that Limbert and Sansing

appear to be deliberately hiding information that they know is public record. Having little confidence in Limbert's ability to lead MUW, given her previous blindness about Rawles' offenses and her refusal to question any of his financial practices, they discuss among themselves their hope that Limbert's contract will not be renewed.

January 9, 2006: Lydia Quarles sends letter to Dr. Meredith reminding him that he has been made aware of serious problems at MUW and that the past presidents group want to avoid negative publicity for MUW: In reply to his suggestion that she and the other alumnae are trying to create negative publicity for Dr. Limbert, she writes, "I would definitely like to resolve the issues raised by Dr. Limbert's leadership without creating a public forum. This is why the past presidents' committee, which has hired counsel, has not yet filed a lawsuit. I agree with you that if things were 'misunderstood' or 'untrue' publicity would be unfortunate; it would be all the more unfortunate if it were understood and true – which a number of individuals with keen legal minds (myself not included in this assessment, although I agree) have concluded is the fact. Members of the past presidents' committee would, indeed, like to speak with you at your earliest convenience. A number of the past presidents have suggested the 16th or 17th as viable dates."

February 15, 2006: Limbert's contract is renewed for four more years. Journalist John Mott Coffey writes that "after getting what she called the board's 'slam dunk' of approval" for a four year contract and stating that she was "looking forward to doing more at Mississippi University for Women," a week later the president "acknowledged that she was thinking of leaving." In the next few weeks Limbert is a finalist for three presidential positions at other institutions. She is not selected for [the Oklahoma position and either is not selected or withdraws from the other two searches](#). She announces her renewed satisfaction with her position at MUW.

March 8, 2006: Past Presidents Lynne Curtis and Gail Laws meet with Limbert. Curtis and Laws meet for lunch with Limbert to resolve their differences, clear the air, and make plans to work together. The two past presidents also make plans with Limbert for a similar meeting with the larger past presidents group. During the discussion one issue brought to Limbert's attention is that when the Foundation's money was moved to one bank, there had been incorrect information from the Foundation about all local banks being approached about the opportunity to hold the Foundation funds. Two local bank presidents, Bart Wise and Hoot Wilder, specifically told Laws and Curtis that they had not been approached and were therefore unhappy with MUW. Limbert writes down the bank presidents' names and seems visibly upset that this omission had occurred. She tells Curtis and Laws that she will personally talk with them. To date, she has not contacted either Mr. Wise or Mr. Wilder.

April 21-23, 2006: Homecoming weekend. Betty Lou Jones is installed as Alumnae Association President.

April 24, 2006: Limbert raids the Alumni Office. On Monday, after a successful Homecoming weekend, Limbert and Sansing order the confiscation of the computer hard drives in the Stovall House Alumni Office and the confiscation of files kept about a group of past presidents. The past presidents' files confiscated are of those women who have questioned Limbert's leadership and judgment. It is important to know that Dr. Limbert has never indicated to McDaniel that she is displeased with McDaniel's behavior. In addition, Dr. Limbert never asked McDaniel to "rein in" Ervin's actions, even

though she apparently is dissatisfied enough with both of them to have them locked out of their offices and their computers and files confiscated. The raid takes place nearly six months to the day that McDaniel and Ervin reported Rawles' sexual harassment to Sansing. According to regulations, they would have had to file suit against Rawles within six months of their report (180 days), or lose their chance to do so.

April 28, 2006: Both women are put on administrative leave. The previous day, outgoing IHL Board president and MUW alumna Virginia Shanteau Newton is honored on campus as MUW Woman of the Year for 2006. Although Limbert has assured the past presidents group that she had full support of the IHL board in her treatment of McDaniel and Ervin, Ms. Newton tells Ricki Garrett in a phone call she had been told nothing about the situation. During the following week Sansing, Mary Margaret Roberts, who had been second in command under Rawles, and computing service employees comb through the emails on the hard drives searching for evidence of insubordination. They uncover copies of emails they consider damaging, emails shared among the past presidents' group and copied to Patsy McDaniel and Tracey Ervin. In addition, they uncover emails Tracey Ervin wrote to some of the past presidents group, and also the email sending the supposed confidential donor records.

May 1, 2006: Past presidents' letter to alumni. The past presidents group sends a letter to the alumni membership informing them of the treatment suffered by McDaniel and Ervin. Television and print media carry news about McDaniel and Ervin's ousting, including numerous angry letters to editors.

First week in May , 2006: The Foundation hires the Godwin Group to discredit alumnae. Linda Ross Aldy sees Danny Mitchell, the CEO of The Godwin Group, at an event, and he tells her he "needs to talk" to her and to Ricki Garrett. She and Garrett meet him at his office. He informs them that he has been hired by the Foundation to do damage control on the McDaniel/Ervin issue. He then tells them that they need to back off on their criticism because they and other prominent alumnae (whom he mentions by name) would be hurt by bad publicity. In their opinion, his words are deliberately threatening. Aldy and Garrett tell him that they stand by everything they have said publicly and in emails and that they will not back off. They leave his office without further discussion.

May 1, 2006: Limbert sends message to campus and alumni list serves: She says, "The University is currently reviewing operations of the University's Alumni Office. The process is ongoing. Therefore, it would not be proper to comment at this time. Once the review is completed, the University will take appropriate action if necessary."

May 3, 2006: McDaniel removed as Director and Ervin fired. Patsy McDaniel is informed by Perry Sansing that she is removed as Director of Alumnae Affairs. He asks her to resign, and she refuses. In a separate meeting, Tracey Ervin is told by Sansing that she has been fired for sharing "confidential Foundation information" with unauthorized persons. She is so distraught that she has to be treated in the emergency room at Baptist Hospital. The diagnosis is a lupus flare-up brought on by severe stress. Limbert does not speak with either woman.

May 5, 2006: Faculty letter. The MUW Faculty Senate sends a letter to Limbert reminding her that McDaniel is a tenured professor of library science. McDaniel is told that she will retain her faculty position, but later learns that this means a reduction in salary. Since she has been aware for several

years that she would earn more money in retirement than she did working full-time, McDaniel is tempted to resign, but she continues to work rather than capitulate to Limbert, who obviously wants McDaniel to leave campus permanently. After a month, McDaniel retires.

May 11, 2006: Past presidents group along with other concerned alumnae meet with Dr. Meredith. Meredith assures the group that he will assist in mediating between them and Dr. Limbert. They agree to "remain silent" while the plans for mediation are worked out.

May 12, 2006: Attorney hired by Foundation attempts to recover "confidential files." During the alumni group's ongoing investigation of the Foundation practices, they had requested some donor information from Tracey Ervin and she had emailed them information to which she had access through her computer. This information about who gave what amount to the Foundation is the shared and supposedly "confidential information" for which she was fired. On May 12, 2006 the lawyer demands the return of these files from Quarles, Talley and Laws, who are puzzled that they had not merely been asked to return the information. After a lengthy search through their emails, those who still have it return the information and officially assure the lawyer that they have not shared or duplicated any of the material.

May 23, 2006: Limbert sends "spin control" letter to alumni. Advised by The Godwin Group, PLLC, a Jackson public relations firm recently hired by the University to help with damage control, Limbert mentions the recent increase in enrollment and the diversity in student population along with MUW's continued high rank by US NEWS and WORLD REPORT and KIPLINGER'S. She then states that "You may be aware of recent changes in our Alumni Office. We hope to move MUW's alumni relations efforts forward and expand our circle of involvement to reflect the great diversity among male and female alumni of all ages and ethnicities." This letter reflects the decision of Limbert and her administration to imply that the current Alumni Association is not diverse in gender, age, or ethnicity.

June 2, 2006: First attempt at mediation. On June 2, 2006 a scheduled mediation meeting takes place including Limbert and her cabinet, concerned Alumni, and Foundation Board members. Dr. Sally Clausen, a mediator suggested by Dr. Tom Meredith, leads the meeting. Little is resolved, and further meetings are planned when this one ends. Alumni Association president Betty Lou Jones, Foundation Chair Connie Kossen, and President Limbert make a joint statement to the press saying, "Today, over 30 representatives of the Foundation Board, the Alumnae Association and the administration team of Mississippi University for Women met for a day-long retreat. Progress was made in setting goals and objectives for the future of the university. We will continue to work together with future meetings and actions toward solutions to achieve these goals and to move forward in supporting the university that we all love."

June 14, 2006: Second mediation meeting. Mediator Clausen meets with a smaller group. Alumna Kym Gore agrees to take minutes, the complete text of which follows:

"Present:

Dr. Sally Claussen [sic], Facilitator

Dr. Claudia Limbert, President (Administration)

Dr. Eddie Betcher, Foundation Chair (Foundation) (via telephone)

Alumni:

Betty Lou Jones, Alumnae Association President

Jimmie Moomaw

Betty Ruth Hawkins

Kym Gore

Ricki Garrett

Susan Puckett

Gail Laws

Minutes:

Dr. Claussen opened the meeting at approximately 3:20 P.M. by stating that she had, as a result of the first meeting which took place on June 2, 2006, returned to facilitate this second meeting between the Alumnae and Dr. Limbert, as the President of MUW, with a representative of the Foundation present. Dr. Claussen further stated that she believed this meeting was important if the administration and alumnae were to resolve their issues and begin working together. Giving the alumnae the opportunity to be heard by Dr. Limbert directly was an important step in that process.

Dr. Limbert stated that she was happy to attend and to listen to alumnae concerns.

Betty Lou Jones thanked Dr. Claussen and Dr. Limbert for the opportunity to meet. She stated that this meeting was necessary in order for the alumni to move forward. She added that the meeting also was necessary in order for there to be a proper "give and take" among the three parties (administration, alumnae, and Foundation) and in order for the parties to accomplish their respective goals. She then turned the meeting over to Jimmie Moomaw, who had been designated as spokesperson for the group.

Jimmie Moomaw stated that prior to the first facilitated meeting, the designated group of alumnae had met and prepared a list of goals/objectives.

Dr. Claussen stated that she viewed the prepared statement as a sign of the alumnae group's organization and preparedness.

Jimmie Moomaw prefaced the reading of the goals and objectives with the following statements:

1. The Alumnae are present for these meetings because they love the "W" and because these meetings are necessary for true resolution. Addressing the causal factors that led to the rift among the three groups and the effects of those factors is a necessary part of the healing process and is important for resolution.

2. During the first meeting, Dr. Claussen asked each group to list three or four goals. The alumnae listed the following goals, recognizing that the alumnae had no real power to effectuate these changes:

1. Review and revision of the University's termination policy to include a system of progressive discipline that complies with the current policy of the AAUP (American Association of University Professors). The alumnae feel that this is a necessary goal, given the manner in which the University removed Patsy from her position as Alumni Director and terminated Tracey. These terminations were conducted in a very public and humiliating manner. In contrast, the former VPIA, who was facing serious allegations of improper conduct, was allowed to resign and leave campus, while maintaining his salary, Foundation vehicle, and cell phone. This disparity in treatment is disturbing, as is the media coverage that was triggered by the Administration's decision to publicly terminate Patsy and Tracey.

2. Appointment of a new alumnae director. The alumnae would like to see this position filled as quickly as possible, with the input and approval of the alumnae. The alumnae strongly prefer that a "W" graduate fill that position. Jimmie also pointed out the unique position that the alumnae director holds as an employee of the University whose job is to work with and for the alumnae, rather than for the administration only.

Dr. Limbert interjected that she wants the alumnae to actively participate in the replacement of the alumnae director by helping to recruit and interview candidates.

Dr. Claussen emphasized the importance of this agreement as a step forward.

All parties agreed that putting a "W" graduate into this position was a top priority.

Jimmie further stated that while Patsy and Tracey's reinstatements were the ideal solution from the alumnae perspective, the alumnae recognized that this solution was unlikely and that any action going forward rested with the University and with Patsy and Tracey (with their attorney's assistance and advice).

Dr. Claussen clarified that the alumnae position was that the alumnae recognized that they could not lobby for reinstatement. Betty Lou Jones added that Dr. Meredith's position on this issue was clear and that the alumnae had determined that pursuing reinstatement was not a viable option.

3. Reinstatement of the functionality of the alumnae office. The alumnae feel that the current operation of the alumnae office is inefficient. The alumnae have no doubts that Drs. Mims and Garrett are doing the best job that they can, but as a practical matter, both women have some physical limitations that inhibit their ability to operate the office.

Betty Lou Jones added that she has certain needs and expectations from the Alumnae Office and feels loathe to ask for the help that she needs due to those limitations.

Dr. Limbert stated that both Carol and Becky were available to help as well. Additionally, the search for a new director was underway and was moving forward quickly.

Ricki Garrett added that another impediment to the efficient operation of the Alumnae Office was the lack of a smooth transition in leadership. Due to the manner in which the administration dismissed Patsy and Tracey, Drs. Mims and Garrett were unable to get the training that they needed to be able to operate the office.

As a side note, Jimmie Moomaw added that the homey atmosphere of the office had disappeared due to the sign-in requirement. Many alumnae saw the sign-in book as threatening or as questioning the alumnae right to be in Stovall.

Dr. Limbert stated that both Dr. Mims and Dr. Garrett viewed the sign-in book as a guest book and as a means to ensure that all alumnae needs were met, but that she would ask that the sign-in book be removed immediately.

4. Improve transparency and accountability of the Foundation. While the alumnae recognize that they have no power to effectuate changes in the operation of the Foundation, the

presence of alumnae on the Foundation board and the fact that alumnae are a source of revenue for the Foundation render these concerns relevant. The alumnae feel that the change in the Foundation's leadership, particularly the election of Dr. Eddie Betcher as Foundation Chair, is a step in the right direction.

Among the alumnae concerns are the management of the funds. Specifically, alumnae have requested a more detailed breakdown of funds. Several alumnae have requested information regarding the "Miscellaneous" spending of the Foundation and have received no response.

Additionally, the Foundation by-laws need work. The current by-laws contain no standard operating procedure and no conflict of interest policy (other than the vague statement that such a policy shall exist). The current by-laws also have permitted extension of the service of the outgoing Chairperson, short notice (or no notice) of meetings with no previously published agenda, and possible conflicts of interest with regard to board members and University contracts. Kym Gore added that there also appear to be some issues with regard to the discretionary spending permitted by the Chair and the VPIA (\$10,000.00 increments with no cap) and by the Executive Board (\$25,000.00 increments with no cap), as well as the small number of members required to make a quorum (1/3) and the even smaller number of members necessary to amend the by-laws (a majority of the 1/3 quorum).

Dr. Betcher stated that he saw no problem working with the alumnae to explain, in general terms rather than specifically, how the Foundation operates. He added that a majority of the Foundation Board are alumnae, but that the Foundation is independent of the University. He knows of the concerns and believes that they can be addressed (by-laws included), although the process will be time-consuming and is not a quick fix.

For clarification, Dr. Betcher stated that the list of Foundation Board members recently distributed to some of the alumnae is incorrect. Currently, the Board contains 38 members with voting privileges. A majority of the members are alumnae.

Ricki Garrett asked whether, when proposed changes to the by-laws were made, a stipulated period of time would be set aside for consideration of those changes. Dr. Betcher responded that he did not know but that any change to the by-laws would not be made lightly.

5. Revise the Alumnae Director position to return the position to one that directly reports to the President, rather than a position that reports to the VPIA. The alumnae feel that this change would elevate the status of the position and likely would have prevented many of the problems that exist today.

Dr. Betcher stated that there were two ways to look at this request. While having the Alumnae Director report directly to the President would elevate alumnae status, it would also create a problematic precedent with other departments, whose directors did not report directly to the President.

Betty Ruth Hawkins explained to Dr. Claussen that the history of the "W" had, in the past, required a direct link to the President. She elaborated briefly on the closure/merger fight of the mid-80s and the Ayers fight against consolidation in the mid-90s. She added that the direct report to the President also assisted in re-establishing trust between the Alumnae and the President.

Jimmie Moomaw interjected that this goal of the alumnae was simply a request that the position be returned to its original status. Prior to the arrival of Scott Rawles, the Alumnae Director did report directly to the President.

Kym Gore added that she believed that, by structuring the position of the Alumnae Director as a report to the VPIA rather than the President, the University pigeonholed the Alumnae as a "bank." This structure ignores two of the stated missions of the Alumnae Association – namely, to recruit students and market the University.

Dr. Betcher also added that the current structure allowed the President to rely on one person – the VPIA – to oversee the support of the University (the PR office, the Alumnae Office, and the Foundation).

Dr. Claussen asked to table the issue. Speaking from the perspective of a University President, she would not negotiate the structure of the University's administration. She stated that she understands that the selection of the new VPIA is key to re-establishing trust, that the faith of the alumnae has been shaken. If the proper person is installed in the VPIA position, many of these issues may resolve themselves. She then asked about the progress of the VPIA search.

Dr. Limbert reported that candidate Mark Hudgins took another job based upon his family's preferences. The other two candidates also withdrew their names for personal reasons. When pressed, Dr. Limbert admitted that the upheaval on campus didn't help retain the selected candidates.

3) Additional concerns/goals/objectives not addressed in the first meeting:

1. The Alumnae would like to request that the Foundation conduct an independent audit of the Foundation records for the last three years (during the period of Scott Rawles' tenure as VPIA).

Specifically, there are questions about the use of money for the benefit of the University and some day-to-day expenditures, namely the decision to hire a law firm and public relations firm to handle the recent upheaval.

Dr. Claussen suggested that the Alumnae communicate those details and concerns to Dr. Betcher.

Dr. Betcher explained that some expenditures could not wait until the next meeting. Accordingly, the Executive Committee members needed some latitude to approve spending.

Dr. Claussen interrupted the discussion to state that she believed the Alumnae's concerns were touching on the details of running an organization. Some of those concerns were addressed in the prior discussion of the by-laws, which Dr. Betcher had already agreed likely required some changes.

Dr. Betcher added that he understood the concerns of the Alumnae and the emotions attached to these issues. He recognized the need for change but reiterated that change would take time and that the decisions of the Foundation would not always be popular with the Alumnae.

The Alumnae acknowledged that certainly some disagreements would arise with the Foundation, and that in no way did the Alumnae expect the Foundation operate according to any agenda other than the best interests of the University. Knowing that the Foundation operated on an open records policy would eliminate much of the Alumnae's concerns.

2. The Alumnae would like to establish their right to obtain 501(c)(3) status, even if they do not choose to take such status at this time.

Dr. Claussen stated that she felt adamantly that the Alumnae should table this issue for a long period of time. Speaking from the perspective of a University President, she would not permit the Alumnae to take such a step under these circumstances. Before the 501(c)(3) conversation continued, it was imperative that the lines of communication and trust be firmly re-established.

Jimmie Moomaw re-iterated that the alumnae were not necessarily interested in pursuing 501(c)(3) status. However, given that the mere discussion of the 501(c)(3) apparently precipitated the upheaval in the Alumnae Office, the alumnae were concerned that the Administration was attempting to stifle the growth and strength of the Alumnae Association.

Dr. Limbert said that the Alumnae's perception was simply not true. Although she could not comment on the termination of Patsy and Tracey, the Alumnae Association's February 2006 discussion of the possibility of obtaining 501(c)(3) status was in no way related to recent events.

Dr. Betcher stated that, from his perspective, if the alumnae wanted to achieve certain goals, such as a tax-deductible dues structure, he believed that the Foundation could work with the Alumnae Association to achieve that goal. He believes, however, that classifying the Alumnae Association as a 501(c)(3) would create multiple streams of income that may confuse donors and inhibit the Foundation's ability to raise funds for the University.

Betty Lou Jones added that, when the 501(c)(3) was discussed in February 2006, the Alumnae Association determined that it was not prepared to go forward. The perception that the Administration was so vehemently opposed to the idea, however, raised some concerns.

Individual Concerns:

At this point in the meeting, Jimmie Moomaw concluded her presentation and stated that the Alumnae group wished to open the floor to allow its members to voice their individual concerns:

Gail Laws voiced her disappointment with Dr. Limbert's relationship with the past presidents of the Alumnae Association. She referenced a lunch on March 8, 2006, in which she and Lynne Curtis met with Dr. Limbert and extended an olive branch to her. Gail Laws also wanted Dr. Limbert to know that the past presidents have not met to discuss Dr. Limbert's ouster and that there is no organized attempt to push Dr. Limbert out of her position. The entire purpose of the March 8 luncheon was to acknowledge the renewal of Dr. Limbert's contract and to move forward and establish a good working relationship between the Administration and the Alumnae Association.

Dr. Limbert responded that she had heard rumors and seen emails that, in fact, some meetings had occurred. Gail Laws re-iterated that no such meetings had taken place.

Dr. Claussen added that this particular instance raised the larger issue regarding the lack of communication. She suggested that Dr. Limbert could have picked up the phone and called Gail Laws when these reports and/or emails came to her attention. Dr. Limbert stated that she agreed and would do so in the future.

Gail Laws also stated that she feels that the Administration has discouraged the enthusiasm of the past

four Alumnae Association Presidents. The past four Presidents have entered office with "fire in their bellies," a fire that most University Presidents would welcome. Instead of embracing these women and their enthusiasm, however, the past presidents feel that Dr. Limbert has discouraged and excluded them. Alumnae have not been invited to functions to which they should have been invited as a matter of course and courtesy. Specifically, Gail Laws referenced the Welty Gala, which in the past has been coordinated by the Alumnae Association and the Foundation and served as a huge source of revenue for the Foundation. When Scott Rawles entered office, however, he eliminated the Alumnae role in the Gala. In 2003, the Gala lost over \$40,000.00, and the VPIA refused to accept the Alumnae's suggestions for improvement and offers of assistance.

Ricki Garrett added that the former VPIA did not appreciate the Alumnae and, in fact, antagonized them. He intentionally raised a barrier between the Alumnae and the President. She contended that his need for control triumphed over the best interests of the University.

Dr. Claussen commented that Scott Rawles appeared to be a large factor in the rift between the Alumnae and the Administration.

The alumnae agreed with her assessment and added that much of the problem stemmed from the fact that Scott Rawles still worked for the "W", despite the Administration's contention that he was "gone."

The alumnae stated that Scott Rawles still maintains a position of power and has input into the operation of the University that he should not have.

Dr. Limbert interjected that she has people (i.e. alumnae) who are coming to her and telling her that they do not agree with the position taken by the Alumnae Association.

Dr. Claussen stated that three-way communication among the Alumnae Association, the Administration, and the Foundation was critical to overcome those issues.

Dr. Limbert asked who she should believe when the Association was saying one thing, but individual alumnae were saying another. The Alumnae commented that Betty Lou Jones had been elected to serve as President of the Alumnae Association. Accordingly, Dr. Limbert should feel comfortable that Betty Lou Jones served as spokesperson and point person for administration-alumnae communications.

Dr. Claussen also stated that this sort of miscommunication and rumors led to paranoia on the Administration's part and that the Alumnae should remember that they were not the only constituency to be considered. The Alumnae agreed with that statement.

Ricki Garrett voiced her concern that the perception was that the alumnae office issue was retaliation

for Patsy and Tracey's decision to report Scott Rawles' behavior. It was also perceived that Scott Rawles still exerted a large amount of influence on both the Administration and on the Foundation. At that point, Gail Laws (?) added that the outgoing Foundation Chair, Connie Sills Kossen, had stated that she maintained a close relationship with Scott Rawles and that she would continue to do so.

Ricki added that whether that perception was accurate or not, perception is reality.

At that point, Dr. Claussen stated that she was under the impression that Scott Rawles was "gone." The Alumnae disagreed, so Dr. Claussen asked Dr. Limbert if Scott Rawles still worked for her. Dr. Limbert responded that he "works for MUW" and added specifically that he was "finishing up some paperwork." Dr. Claussen then asked Dr. Betcher if Scott Rawles still worked for the Foundation. Dr. Betcher also responded that Scott Rawles "works for MUW." Dr. Limbert stated that Scott Rawles has no day-to-day influence.

The alumnae then raised the issue of Rawles' continued salary, use of a Foundation vehicle, and use of a Foundation cell phone. Dr. Limbert responded that "hindsight is 100%" and that while a lump sum payment might have been the better option, lump sum settlements in higher education were not the usual protocol.

Dr. Limbert also stated that Scott Rawles had no influence or input on the decision to terminate Patsy and Tracey.

Kym Gore stated that the Alumnae need communication and consistency from the President. The W's President needs to take a stand on issues and stick to that position.

Betty Ruth Hawkins concurred and stated that when a constituency, such as the Alumnae, loses faith in the "personality" installed in an office, they must be able to take faith in the process. The "W" needs a President who is consistent, who is "the same today as she is tomorrow." If the alumnae had that, they could support the President on almost any issue.

Jimmie Moomaw added that the Alumnae needed a dialogue with the President. The alumnae feel that Dr. Limbert has a "press conference" approach to her communications, rather than allowing "Q&A sessions."

Ricki Garrett also commented that Dr. Limbert has a tendency (albeit a natural one) to react defensively to alumnae. She cited the issue of the name change, which was raised soon after Dr. Limbert took office. When the alumnae suggested a different approach to raising enrollment, Dr. Limbert's initial reaction was that "she was the President, and if they didn't like her approach, she would leave." Dr. Limbert didn't recall that particular incident but thanked Ricki Garrett for her comment.

With regard to the upcoming Alumnae Board meeting, Dr. Limbert stated that she would attend Friday night and Saturday morning. Betty Lou Jones confirmed that Dr. Limbert would give her regular report on Saturday morning. Betty Lou Jones added, however, that she was going to have to communicate the recent events (in a general sense) to the Alumnae. The silence that accompanied the first meeting had to be broken because the alumnae were looking to her for a report. Dr. Claussen and Dr. Limbert agreed.

Dr. Claussen suggested that Dr. Limbert make her prepared statement as planned. She then suggested that Dr. Limbert "put down her notes," apologize for some "grievous errors" that she had made, and then invite the alumnae to ask her questions. She acknowledged Dr. Limbert's caveat that she could not discuss a personnel matter, but added that Dr. Limbert should be upfront and communicative. Dr. Limbert agreed.

Future meetings:

The group agreed that the next meeting should include Dr. Meredith, Dr. Limbert, Dr. Betcher, and the Alumnae approved for the first meeting.

Thereafter, the Alumnae and Dr. Limbert should agree to regular meetings, in which other alumnae would be invited to attend, so that the dialogue could continue.

It was agreed that Betty Lou Jones, Dr. Betcher, and Dr. Limbert would coordinate their schedules to Dr. Meredith's, with tentative plans to meet in mid-July.

With that, the entire group thanked Dr. Claussen, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:00 P.M. -Minutes prepared by Kym Gore."

On June 23, 2006, these minutes were sent out to all of the attendees of the second mediation. The assumption was that the members would suggest corrections and revisions if needed and that Dr. Clausen would forward the minutes to Dr. Meredith. However, Clausen called Gore and said that she had gotten phone calls from Betcher and Limbert, who were unhappy with Gore's transcription of the meeting. She suggested that Gore withdraw the minutes and act as though they were never sent to the attendees. Gore stated to Clausen that she, Clausen, was in charge of the mediation and the minutes and she had the prerogative to request that the minutes be withheld. However, Gore was satisfied that the minutes were accurate, did not receive any suggested changes from the participants, and therefore left the text of the minutes as originally prepared.

June 16, 2006: Meeting to discuss the emails. In response to the Commercial Dispatch's Freedom of Information Act request for the emails confiscated during the Alumni Office raid, Perry Sansing and

Dr. Limbert request a meeting with Alumnae Association President Betty Lou Jones to discuss the release of these emails. Alumna Kym Gore also attends the meeting. Dr. Limbert presents Betty Lou Jones with a select number of emails and advises that while she hates to publicize them, she has no other alternative but to release these emails and a large number of other emails retrieved from McDaniel and Ervin's computers in order to comply with the Dispatch's request. Although these emails aren't officially from the Alumnae Association, they are from active members of the Association. It is important to point out that the administration treated this Alumni group and the Foundation group differently, although according to the IHL, these two groups have essentially the same status. The administration still refuses to release the Foundation's records or Rawles' financial records in response to the earlier FOIA requests, but releases the emails detailing the discussions amongst the Alumnae who had sought to reveal Rawles' mismanagement and illegal harassment. The administration's double standard in releasing information indicates that the Foundation does indeed have something to hide and that Limbert and Sansing continue to cover it up. Gore questioned Perry Sansing about his reasoning in determining that these emails from *private* individuals that were not directed *to* a university employee (McDaniel was just copied on some of the emails) and were obviously *not* about university business could be considered "public records" under the state's public records request act. Sansing said that because the emails were routed through a university computer, they became university records and, therefore, public records. Gore then asked why that wouldn't apply to Foundation records. Under the terms of the Foundation's operating agreement, the *University* supplies employees, salaries, office space, and all office equipment (including *computers*) for the Foundation. His response was vague and unsatisfactory. After Betty Lou Jones and Gore talked to the alumnae whose emails were to be released, the alumnae opted not to fight Sansing's interpretation and let the emails be sent to the Commercial Dispatch.

June 16-17, 2006: The Alumni Board Meeting. Although mediator Sally Clausen and Limbert had agreed during the first mediation that Limbert should meet with the Board members, answer questions, and apologize for "grievous errors," Limbert does not follow through as promised. After a few minutes of a question and answer session, Limbert, becoming visibly agitated by the questions, leaves apparently to answer a cell phone call. She is gone so long from the meeting that the group adjourns for lunch. She does not return. Several of the members present say that they suspect that the phone call was staged, and that she could not and would not continue to answer questions of the group.

July 12, 2006: Meeting of the Lowndes County Alumni Chapter. The Lowndes County Chapter meets for a luncheon and program on campus. Bridget Pieschel gives an update about the activities at the Southern Women's Institute, and President Limbert gives a campus update. Chapter President Jan Ballard praises Gail Laws, recent recipient of the Chapter's Celebration of Service Award at Homecoming, a celebration Limbert did not attend. She also praises alumna and chapter member Patsy McDaniel, who is present, for her years of service to MUW. After the meeting, Limbert complains by phone to Dr. Meredith that the chapter meeting made her uncomfortable and that members did not treat her well. Other members and Association president Betty Lou Jones, who who were present at the meeting, remember that Dr. Limbert was treated very politely, and Jones informs Dr. Meredith of her recollections.

July 14, 2006: Limbert dismisses members of the Inter-alumni Council. On July 14, 2006 current MUW alumni members of the IAC receive letters dismissing them from service and naming a new group of members. Limbert has made these appointments, even though it is not within her power to do so. The MUW IAC members comprise a standing committee of the National Alumni Association Board. Its membership is appointed by the Alumni Association president, not the MUW president. In addition, though this year is MUW's year to provide a president for the the IAC, Limbert asks Dr. Meredith to skip the W this year and move the presidency to the next institution in the alphabetical list.

The search for a new Director of Alumni Affairs. Association president Betty Lou Jones has to make repeated requests for information from Limbert about the upcoming July interviews for the new director, although she was promised an active role in the search. Limbert lies to Jones about how far the search has already progressed, even though interview dates have been scheduled for some candidates. Several days later Limbert is obviously irritated with Betty Lou Jones when Jones calls again to find out the dates and times of the upcoming interviews. This behavior violates Limbert's assertion during the June 14, 2006 meeting that she planned to organize a search committee for the position and involve several alumni, including Jones, in the process to actively recruit and interview candidates.

Fall, 2006: Affiliation agreement negotiations. The fall begins with the attempt between the Alumni Association and Dr. Limbert's administration to negotiate an affiliation agreement between the Association and MUW. While unhappy with the numerous concessions Limbert expected from the Association, the board members continued meeting and revising the agreement, trying to reach accord.

October 19, 2006: The University hires Cal Mayo as outside attorney and advises the Association to seek legal advice. In an email to the alumni board members, Betty Lou Jones explains that "about forty-nine minutes after we sent Dr. Bouse our recommended changes to the original document, we received notice from Cal Mayo, an attorney from Oxford, that he had been retained by the University to represent them in the matter of the affiliate agreement. Due to the information in that email we felt it necessary to hire an attorney to represent the association's interests. We moved quickly to retain the services of the Mike Moore Law Firm in Jackson." After expressing her concern at the expense of hiring a lawyer, she said however that she had received "some pledges from Alums and feel confident that many other Alums will come to the aid of the legal defense fund" She continued, "Due to the serious and significant impact of this situation and the University's decision to retain outside counsel rather than use the University's in-house counsel, we felt we had no alternative but to retain legal counsel. The Board met today in Columbus for the Fall Board Meeting. During the discussion of the proposed affiliation agreement, it was emphasized that the Alumnae Association has always been in favor of signing a fair and balanced agreement that complies with the IHL mandate. After lengthy discussion, the Executive Board voted to authorize its Executive Committee to continue good faith negotiations through our attorney to arrive at an acceptable agreement that serves the best interests of the University by 12:00 noon, October 25, 2006, the new deadline that Dr. Limbert has recently insisted we meet. If you desire to give your input, please email Betty Lou Jones at bebestuartjones@aol.com or call me at 601-917-4344. I look forward to hearing from you. I will keep you informed by email as the negotiations progress. Thank you for your interest in the W." She concluded her update with a reference to the fall board meeting: "As Ann Teague so aptly quoted from the Book of Isaiah today at the Board Meeting, 'May we all come to a place of reason.' "

October 25, 2006: The Association capitulates to Limbert's demands and signs the Affiliation Agreement under threat of disaffiliation: By the end of October, a final draft of an agreement is sent by Limbert to Betty Lou Jones with the implication that it had to be signed or the Association would be disaffiliated. The Board Members agree to severely limit the control of their own organization and vote to sign the agreement on October 25, 2006, rather than risk the consequences of the threatened disaffiliation. In signing the affiliation agreement, the alumni give up the right to raise any funds or ever establish their status as a 501(c)(3) organization. They allow Limbert majority control to place persons on the nominating committee for new officers and give Dr. Limbert final approval on all awards given by the Association. They also agree that any person employed by the IHL system may not serve on the Alumni Board. This means that MSU employees Lillian Wade and Lydia Quarles must be removed, even though Wade is president elect, and that past president Alma Ellis, employed by USM and president of the past president's committee, must also be removed. Disappointed, but determined

to make the best of a bad situation, the Board Members began work on the new bylaws required by the terms of the Affiliation Agreement. The drafting of the bylaws leads to the final break of the relationship between Dr. Limbert's administration and the MUW Alumni Association.

January 14, 2007: Betty Lou Jones sends a summary report of the weeks of negotiations to the Alumni Board members. In this emailed update she writes, "I have for two days been trying to decipher everything and I think now I can give you a time line and outline of where we are (if we ever know where we are). The Affiliation Agreement was signed in October and approved by the IHL on November 15. I asked for clarification from Dr. Meredith about when the sixty day time deadline was effective. After communicating with Dr. Meredith, Dr. Limbert, Dr. Bouse and Jan Miller it was confirmed that our deadline was January 15, 2007. I began working with the bylaws committee and many of you and rushed to get a document ready to present to the University in early December so that we would have time for negotiations before the deadline. There was no official committee meeting, just communication by telephone and email and with our attorney Jonathan Compretta with the Mike Moore Law Firm. By the way, he has been wonderful. On December 6, Gail Laws, Elaine Evans and I met with Dr. Bouse and Jan Miller at the Alumni House and went over the document we proposed. I believe that I sent this to all of you by email. We went over the document word for word and several changes were discussed but nothing decided because of course he had to get back to Dr. Limbert for her input. Let me emphasize here that at this meeting they never came forth with a document of their suggestion, never mentioned that ours would not work, only that some considerations would need to be made, and even though Jan Miller had told me on the phone before the meeting that she had some sample constitutions from other Universities and from Main Street programs, did she ever bring up the subject or bring any of these forward for any kind of discussion at our meeting. We left the meeting under the impression that they would take the recommended changes back to Dr. Limbert for approval and get back with us. We did not hear from them for several days so I called Dr. Bouse and told him that with the upcoming holidays I wanted a plan in place so we would not miss the deadline. We agreed that we would meet in Columbus on Friday, January 5, at two o'clock in the afternoon. In the meantime on December 12, I sent Dr. Limbert a letter requesting that she request that the IHL allow Lillian, Alma, and Lydia to continue to serve on the board and in their positions until April and that Lillian be allowed to move up to the President slot as had been the plan for the past two years. I think I sent you a copy of the letter that I sent to Dr. Limbert. On December 20 I received a letter from her dated December 15 denying my request. We put everything on hold during the holidays waiting to see what their recommendations would be and allowing everyone to celebrate the holidays without having to deal with this matter.... On Thursday, January 4, I received from Dr. Bouse a draft of their recommendations. Several things had been added or changed that were not acceptable to me and after discussing it with several bylaws committee members and executive committee members I learned that it was not acceptable to them either. I also discussed the matter with Jonathan and he agreed that some of their requests were out of line. I went to Columbus on January 5 at two o'clock as planned and sat down with Dr. Limbert and Dr. Bouse and discussed the document word for word. (Dr. Limbert had a three o'clock appointment and had to leave at 2:50) I explained calmly to them that we did not feel that the affiliation agreement should be mentioned in the Constitution but that it should be in the Policies and Procedures. Dr. Bouse stated that if Jonathan felt that and could come up with wording that was acceptable that he felt that would be okay. I told them that we wanted to keep the office of President-elect because it allowed for a consistent leadership succession plan and that it had worked well for many years. I also told them that we could not accept the fact that the nominations from the floor would have to receive a 3/4 vote. They explained that the 3/4 vote would be necessary for the candidate to be placed on the ballot and that then the vote would need to be a majority in order for the officer to be elected. There were several other points that we discussed and some changes were agreed upon. The plan was that we should take the document and discuss it with our group and with our attorney and I would return on Friday January 12 to discuss it further. I kept reminding them that we wanted to be sure and meet the January 15 deadline. On January 11, I emailed them our response. Dr. Bouse called me later that day to tell me that I should check with him in the morning because I may not need to come to Columbus because Dr. Limbert could not approve the document that we presented. I told him that I thought the purpose of me coming to Columbus was to discuss the needed changes. He then told me that Dr. Limbert was just worn out and that she had to go home sick that day and that is why she did not call me herself. I then told him that if she was sick and could not meet on Friday that I understood. We made an agreement that if I did not hear from him by 8:00 a. m. on Friday that I would go to Columbus and meet with them. (I was determined that I was going to Columbus because I was not going to allow them to say

that I failed to show). I had several conversations with Jonathan and others that night and we agreed on some allowances that we could make and some that were not negotiable. Jonathan talked to Mike Moore who agreed that there were some changes that were not acceptable. Jonathan also called Cal Mayo who told him that the University was disappointed in December that we had not come up with a totally new document. (Of course that was the first time we ever heard that complaint.) Cal Mayo told Jonathan that he would email Perry that night about the situation.

I did not hear from Dr. Bouse so I went to Columbus on Friday. When I got there we sat down and I noticed that there were no papers in their hands. We sat down and this is what Dr. Limbert said: 'Betty Lou, we gave you a document that we could approve and when you sent it back you had made changes. It is clear that this process is not working. I remember that Dr. Meredith told us back in the summer that this is a new day and we must operate like it is a new day. We have had to totally redo some things and I think we need to start totally over on this constitution. I keep remembering that Dr. Meredith said it should be a new day and Dr. Meredith is watching and so is the board so I want Gary to come to Meridian next Tuesday and meet with you and begin working on a totally new constitution using the document that Jan Miller drew up and showed you in December. So we will just extend the deadline until January 31st and work on a new document.' My first response was very calm and nonemotional: 'Dr. Limbert we have spent a lot of time on this document, don't you think we could discuss this and use this?' She straightened her back and dug in with 'NO, we must have a new day and a new document.' I said to Dr. Bouse, 'Well, could I see this document that Jan Miller drew up?' He said 'Well, you should have it. I said, "No, I have never seen it, and if you all wanted us to consider it why did you not show it to us the day we met at the Alumni House?" He said, "Well if she mentioned it to you and you did not ask her to see it I guess she assumed you did not want to use it.' I said, 'Dr. Bouse, I was never told about a document that she drew up only that she had sample documents from other Universities and I felt that our existing constitution could be changed to be in agreement with the affiliation agreement.' I then asked if he had a copy of that document and he said that he did not and he would have to go back into his embedded emails and try to retrieve a copy. I then said, 'Well I am supposed to be in Natchez on Tuesday but I will see if I can change the meeting and meet with you in Meridian, but at the latest I need to see that document on Monday night so I can go over it before we meet.' He agreed to email it to me before Tuesday and that we would meet in Meridian on Tuesday if I could work it our with my previously scheduled meeting. (It was very interesting to me that Dr. Limbert never considered that I might have plans on Tuesday.) I left and was in my car by 10:40 a. m. so you can see this was not a long or productive meeting. I can not believe that they let me drive one and a half hours to be told that we were not going to use the documents we had been working on. Of course, I think they were expecting a more explosive reaction from me but I surprised them by being calm and cool. I left the meeting and called Jonathan Compretta and several of you. The decision was made that he would call Cal Mayo. The plan now is that Jonathan and Cal Mayo will work on the document. I will not meet with Dr. Bouse on Tuesday. You can draw your own conclusions from the above scenario. Personally, I think she is looking for a deal breaker and she does not want to work this out and she wants a reason to dissolve our association. However, if the deal gets broken I want her to be the one who breaks it and I will hang in there until the end if that is what you want me to do. I am sending you a copy of emails between Cal Mayo and Jonathan Compretta for your information. I am also sending you the last document they sent us and the last document we sent them. Please let me know your thoughts. Betty Lou"

In spite of Betty Lou Jones' efforts to remain at the negotiating table, exchanges between the two lawyers were unsuccessful.

The texts of the lawyers' letters and emails and the draft of the bylaws are included below:

From: "Jonathan Compretta"
<jc@mikemoorelawfirm.com> To: "'Cal Mayo"
<cmayo@MAYOMALLETTE.com> Date: Thu, 25 Jan 2007
11:45:13 -0600 Subject: MUW Alumni Association's
Proposed Bylaws

Cal:

Based upon the draft bylaws that you provided, the Alumni Association would like to submit the attached proposed new bylaws for the University's approval. I have indicated changes with blue font and deletions with strikethroughs. I have highlighted two (2) sections that we have not changed but do have questions/concerns noted in red font.

We believe that the changes made to the University's draft are consistent in all respects to the Affiliation Agreement yet maintain the independence of the Association, as is required by IHL policy.

I am scheduled to be in the office for the rest of the afternoon, but will be out-of-state tomorrow. I will be available by cell phone tomorrow if you need to call me, that number is (859) 948-2886.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks,

Jonathan

Jonathan Compretta

Mike Moore Law Firm, LLC

-----Forwarded message -----From:
jc@mikemoorelawfirm.com To: "Mayo, J. Cal"
<cmayo@mayomallette.com> Date: Wed, 31 Jan
2007 17:26:35 +0000 Subject: Request for
Meeting and delay of deadline Cal:

I left you a message, but wanted to send an email as well. We would like to request that Pres Limbert extend her deadline on agreeing on By-laws at least until the Assn board is scheduled to meet on February 16th. We make that request because if Pres Limbert will only accept the By-laws as sent to us in your last email then the Assn Board wants to have an opportunity to meet and vote on whether or not to accept her proposed By-laws. Also, we feel this may give us more time to try to come to an agreement.

Additionally, the Assn through IHL Counsel has requested a meeting with Dr. Meredith, the Assn President, and Dr Limbert, as well as you and I to try to come to an agreement. We hope that Dr. Limbert would support having such a meeting.

Please let me know if Pres Limbert would agree to these two requests.

-Jonathan Sent via BlackBerry from
Cingular Wireless

Bylaws Draft from J. Compretta:

**BYLAWS OF MISSISSIPPI UNIVERSITY FOR WOMEN ALUMNI
ASSOCIATION**

ARTICLE I – NAME

The name of the association shall be "Mississippi University for Women Alumni Association".

ARTICLE II – PURPOSE

The purpose of the Mississippi University for Women Alumni Association (the Association) shall be to cooperate with Mississippi University for Women (the University) in establishing and maintaining a quality relationship between the University and its alumni, former students, and friends; to serve the University through awards and other appropriate recognition to students, alumni, and faculty for their contributions to the University and community; to promote the general welfare and interests of the University by alumni service to the University; and to attract, organize, and encourage graduates, former students, and friends throughout Mississippi and the world to advance the University's mission.

ARTICLE III – AFFILIATION AGREEMENT

The Affiliation Agreement between the University and the Association, dated November 15, 2006, is attached as Appendix 1. The Association, its Board of Directors, and its Executive Committee are bound by the terms and conditions of the Affiliation Agreement. Any and all official actions taken by this Association, its Board of Directors, and its Executive Committee must be consistent with such Agreement.

ARTICLE IV -- MEMBERSHIP

1. Any person who has attended MUW for a semester or more shall be an alumnus and shall be eligible for active membership in the Association.
2. An active member of the Association shall be an alumnus who has paid national dues to the Association.
3. The Executive Committee of the Board of Directors may select honorary or other individuals as associate members of the Association. In addition, any friend of the University may join the Association as an associate member by payment of national dues to the Association.
4. Only active members of the Association may vote and be eligible to hold office in the Association or serve on the Board of Directors of the Association.

ARTICLE V – MEETINGS

1. There shall be an annual business meeting of the Association set by the Board of Directors.
2. A special meeting of the Association may be called by the Association President or at the written request of twenty-five active members. Written notice of the time, place, and purpose of the meeting shall be given to all members at least two weeks in advance.
3. The Association President, working with University's Office of Alumni Relations, shall give proper notice of the annual business meeting to the general membership. The Association President shall provide the University President reasonable notice of any regular, annual, or special meetings of the Association including, but not limited to, meetings of the Board of Directors and any committee (including the Executive Committee). The University President or the President's designee shall have the right to attend any of these meetings.
4. The minutes of any regular, annual, or special meetings of the Association including, but not limited to, meetings of the Board of Directors and any committee (including the Executive Committee) shall be on file at the University's Office of Alumni Relations and available upon request.

ARTICLE VI – QUORUM

1. A majority of the total number of members shall constitute a quorum for transaction of business at any Board of Directors meeting.
2. A majority of the total number of members shall constitute a quorum for transaction of business at any Executive Committee meeting.
3. Proxy voting is not permitted for the conduct of any regular, annual, or special meetings of the Association, including but

not limited to, meetings of the Board of Directors and any committee (including the Executive Committee).

ARTICLE VII – BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1. A Board of Directors, consisting of the elected officers (president, president-elect, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer), parliamentarian as named by the Association President, committee chairs, former Association Presidents, the presidents of all alumni chapters, and other members as appointed by the Association President, shall govern the Association. Other campus personnel or students may serve with the approval of the University President.
2. Ex-officio, non-voting members of the Board of Directors include the University President, the Vice President of Institutional Advancement, the Director of Alumni Relations, the chair of the MUW Foundation, and any alumnus serving on the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning. Other campus personnel or students may serve on the Board of Directors only with the approval of the University President.
3. The Board of Directors, by majority vote of all members, shall have the power to remove officers or committee members who are not performing their duties and for other good cause.
4. The Board shall meet four times a year – in the fall, winter, spring and summer. It shall hold additional meetings at the call of the Association President or upon written request of 25% of its members.
5. There shall be an Executive Committee composed of the elected officers, and the immediate past president of the Association. The University President, the Vice President of Institutional Advancement, and the University Director of Alumni Relations shall serve as ex-officio, non-voting members of the Executive Committee. Between meetings of the Board of Directors, the activities of the Association shall be managed by the Executive Committee. Any reference to the Board of Directors in the affiliation agreement applies to the Executive Committee's exercise of the Board's powers. The Committee shall ordinarily meet on the University campus unless a more convenient location is determined to be more acceptable to the Committee members and its meetings shall be called by the President of the Association or by four members of the Executive Committee.
6. All Association Board Members must sign a Conflict of Interest Policy (in the form attached as Appendix B) before their service on the Board can begin.
7. Unless permitted to do so by the IHL Board, through a request from the University, no IHL employee shall hold a voting position on the Association Board of Directors or Executive Committee. However, an IHL employee can serve on the Association Board of Directors or Executive Committee as an ex-officio non-voting member. Ex-officio non-voting members of the Association Board of Directors or Executive Committee shall not count toward determining the presence of a quorum.

ARTICLE VIII – OFFICERS

1. The officers of the Association shall be president, president-elect, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, and parliamentarian.
2. The term of each office shall be one year and begin upon election at the annual business meeting of the Association and terminate at the end of the next annual business meeting.
3. No officer shall serve two consecutive terms in the same office, unless filling an unexpired term.
4. The duties of the officers shall be:
 1. The president shall preside at meetings of the Association, the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee and fill vacancies on the Board of Directors by appointment for the remainder of the term of the vacating member. With the exception of the Nominating Committee, the Association President serves as an ex-officio member of all Association committees.
 2. The Association President or the Association President's designee (i) shall represent the Association at official University functions, (ii) observe at meetings of other organizations when it serves the interest of the Association, and (iii) sit as a member of the Board of the MUW Foundation and the Medal of Excellence Search Committee.
 3. The Association President should execute the mandates of the Association and perform all duties usual to the office. The Association President shall make a report at the annual business meeting of the Association and shall include in that report

recommendations for the coming year. Upon completion of the term of office, the Association President shall become the immediate past president and serve on the Board of Directors in perpetuity and on the Executive Committee for one year, provided that active membership in the Association is maintained.

4. The president-elect shall understudy the president and shall succeed the president at the end of the term of office. In the event the office of the president is vacated, the president-elect shall also serve as president for the unexpired term. At the end of the term of office, the president-elect shall establish and report to the Board of Directors a one-year plan of action for the succeeding year. The president-elect shall assist the president in the general conduct of the work of the Association and shall, in the absence of the president, perform all duties of the office.

5. The vice-president shall perform duties as assigned by the Association President. In the event the office of Association President is vacated, the vice-president shall serve as president-elect for the unexpired term. The vice-president shall assist the Association President in the general conduct of the work of the Association and shall, in the president's absence, perform all duties of the office.

6. The secretary shall record the minutes of the Association's annual business meeting, and special meetings and all Board of Directors and Executive Committee meetings. The secretary shall keep a record of members present at the meetings of the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee. Minutes of any meeting of the Association, the Board of Directors, or the Executive Committee shall be written and sent to the presiding officer of the meeting within ten days of the meeting. A copy of the minutes shall be sent to the Director of Alumni Relations for distribution to members of the Board of Directors.

7. The treasurer shall make a financial report to the Board of Directors and Executive Committee at each meeting and to the Association at its annual business meeting.

8. The parliamentarian shall advise on points of parliamentary procedure upon request. A decision may be appealed in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*, except as herein may be provided otherwise.

ARTICLE IX– COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

1. With the exception of the Executive Committee and the Nominating Committee and the Association President shall name the chair and members of all standing and special committees and shall designate the duties thereof.

2. Standing committees shall include:

1. Admissions and Recruitment
2. Career Development and Support
3. Bylaws
4. Finance and Foundation Relations
5. Legislative
6. Diversity
7. Male Alums
8. Young Alums
9. Public Relations
10. Nominating
11. Advisory
12. Homecoming/Golden Girls

3. Standing committees representing organizations within the Association include, but are not limited to:

1. The Past Presidents
2. Inter-Alumni Council
3. Student Ambassadors

4. Special committees shall be appointed by the President of the Association to further the goals of the Association and to support the University. Special committees may include, but are not limited to:

1. Alumni Trips
2. *Southern Grace* Cookbook Sales and Promotion
3. Faculty Recognition

4. Social Clubs
5. Traditions
6. International Student Liaisons

5. The University Director of Alumni Relations shall serve as an ex-officio member of all committees.

5. The Chairs of all standing committees shall be Board members and shall serve for the length of their Board term. The Chair of the Nominating Committee will be selected by the members of the Nominating Committee and must be an Association Board member.

5. Membership on the Inter-Alumni Council shall consist of five representatives, one who shall represent the Alumni office staff and two alternates. The Inter-Alumni Council Representatives shall be selected by the Association President.

ARTICLE X – ELECTIONS

1. The president, president-elect, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer shall be elected by a majority of the active members in attendance voting at the annual business meeting of the Association. The election will be conducted by prepared ballot with the names of the members nominated by the nominating committee with proper space left for writing in nominees from the floor.

2. Within thirty days of the election or appointment of new officers of the Association, the Association President shall submit to the University President the names of the officers and the members of each standing or special committee. The names of any new Board members must be sent to the University President within thirty days of appointment.

3. The officers shall serve for a period of one year. Installation of officers shall be held during the annual meeting of the Association at Homecoming.

4. The Nominating Committee shall be comprised of seven members, with four members appointed by the University Director of Alumni Relations and three members appointed by the Association President. The Nominating Committee will present nominees for all officer positions. The committee shall use its best efforts to achieve racial, gender, and generational diversity in the selection process. The process for nominations for Association Officers shall be an inclusive process designed to achieve representation that reflects the membership of the Association.

5. The Nominating Committee will present nominees for approval by the Association. Nominations from the floor will be solicited before a vote is taken on each office.

6. The Association may adopt a process for conducting elections by regular or electronic mail, provided that the process provides a fair opportunity for all active members to participate in the election.

ARTICLE XI – BYLAWS

1. A proposed bylaw shall become effective only upon the recommendation of the Board and the affirmative vote of two-thirds of those active members at the annual business meeting, or special meeting, of the Association at which it is presented.

2. The Association bylaws shall not be amended unless the University President provides written approval of the proposed amendment.

ARTICLE XII – PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

The rules contained in the current edition of *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* shall govern the Association in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with the bylaws and any special rules of order the Association may adopt.

ARTICLE XIII -DUES

1. National dues shall be set annually by the Board of Directors at the business meeting of the Association

2. National dues shall be paid directly to the MUW Foundation. Dues will be transmitted to the MUW Foundation by the

University's Office of Alumni Relations together with the name and address of the member making payment of dues. A record of the members paying dues and amounts will be kept in the University's Office of Alumni Relations and the MUW Foundation. Members paying dues will be encouraged to indicate on the memo line of their check that the payment is for Alumni Association dues. Dues payments shall be deposited into an Association account and accounted for in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. All disbursements from the account will be made at the direction of the Executive Committee of the Association and for the exclusive benefit of the Association.

3. The Association President may elect to give notice of annual dues assessment and methods for payment in each issue of *Visions* magazine.

ARTICLE XIV -AWARDS

1. Before an award or honor is presented by the Association, written approval must be received from the University's Vice President for Institutional Advancement (VPIA). No public announcement of any award or honor can be made without written prior approval of the VPIA.

2. Subject to Section 1 of this Article, the awards that may be presented include but are not limited to the following:

1. The Outstanding Faculty award is a monetary award presented by the Alumni Association President jointly with the Mortar Board President each year at Graduation. The award recipient is chosen by Mortar Board and the Alumni Association.

2. From one to five Alumni Achievement Awards are given each year to honor alumni. One Young Alumni Achievement Award is presented annually to a recent graduate. The criteria for both awards is the same: recognition for those who have made contributions of time, effort and service to the University, our state, or our country; however, the Young Alumni award winner must have graduated within the last 10 years. Each year the Alumni Association solicits nominations for these awards. Nominations may be made by Association members or alumni chapters. Nominees will be asked to complete and return an information form mailed to them by the University's Office of Alumni Relations. Award winners must be present at Homecoming to receive the award. The award winners are selected by a committee from the Past Presidents Committee selected by the President of that committee.

These Bylaws were approved at a meeting of the Mississippi University for Women Alumni Association on _____, 2007.

Approved for Submission to Association Members, By:

_____ By: _____

Name: Betty Lou Jones Name: Claudia A. Limbert

Title: President, Title: President, Mississippi University for Women Mississippi University for Women

Alumni Association Date:

_____ Date: _____

Final letter to Limbert's Lawyer Cal Mayo from the Association's Lawyer Jonathan Compretta:
January 31, 2007

J. Cal Mayo, Jr. Mayo
Malette, PLLC 428 North
Lamar Boulevard Post
Office Box 1456 Oxford, MS
38655

Dear Cal: Based upon our conversation today, I am under the impression that President Claudia Limbert not only refuses to approve our proposed By-laws but refuses to explain to the Association what provisions are not consistent with the mission and priorities of the University, the Affiliation Agreement, and IHL Policy. Additionally, it is my understanding that she refuses to extend her arbitrary deadline of today for her approval of the proposed By-laws. You also made it very clear that she intends to breach the Affiliation Agreement and to disaffiliate the alumni Association from the

University. It is our firm opinion that these actions and anticipated actions constitute bad faith on the part of President Limbert and the University. IHL Policy and the Affiliation Agreement expressly mandate that the Alumni Association is an independent entity. The Affiliation Agreement further requires that the Association submit to the University President for her review and approval a new set of By-laws. In good faith, the Alumni Association has submitted numerous drafts of proposed Bylaws for President Limbert's review and approval in accordance and consistent with the provisions of the Affiliation Agreement. Instead of following the provisions of the Affiliation Agreement and in good faith reviewing and approving the By-laws, President Limbert is attempting to dictate the By-laws of what is supposed to be an independent entity. Certainly in a university setting we can find a better definition of independence. The Alumni Association renews its request that President Limbert review the By-laws as presented and either approve such or in the alternative provide Alumni Association a written explanation of what provisions are not consistent with mission and priorities of the University, the Affiliation Agreement, and IHL Policy. The Alumni Association which is made up of thousands of alumni who have supported the University through these many years deserve a written explanation of why President Limbert refuses to approve provisions allowing the organization to govern itself or why she is dictating provisions to prevent these alumni from choosing their Association's leaders. How could this be too much to ask? To require an individual to garner 75% of the affirmative vote of the members just to be placed on the ballot for election as an Association officer runs contrary to any democratic election process and will be an obstacle to achieving diversity in the Alumni Association's leadership. This is just one example of terms that President Limbert has attempted to dictate to the Alumni Association without any written explanation or justification. This type of requirement would not pass any test of fairness, independence, or racial and gender neutrality. Furthermore, these types of requirements raise troubling questions in a University system such as Mississippi's. It is our sincere hope that President Limbert will reexamine her position and acknowledge that the Alumni Association is an independent entity and as such has the right to determine how it is governed within the terms of the Affiliation Agreement and consistent with IHL Policy. Sincerely, /s/

Jonathan Compretta
Mike Moore Law Firm
Enclosure
cc: Dr. Thomas Meredith, IHL Commissioner
IHL Board of Trustees

First Message from Betty Lou about impending Disaffiliation:

MUW Attempting to Disaffiliate from its Alumni Association

MUW President Claudia Limbert is taking steps to attempt to disaffiliate from its Alumni Association. MUW President Claudia Limbert wants to end the institution's official relationship with our 117-year-old association. This is a disgraceful attempt to try to end two long months of negotiations between the association and Dr. Limbert's office to construct an operating agreement with the university for the next five years. The members of our association have supported the "W" through a variety of times — from wars to electing Governors to fighting merger and closure issues. As leaders of the association, the Executive Committee and I took our responsibilities of negotiating an agreement for this group very, very seriously and believed we were negotiating in good faith. It is now apparent that Dr. Limbert's motives were never to reach a workable agreement. I cannot express the sadness I feel over this. IHL policy and the affiliation agreement approved in November between MUW and its alumni association clearly mandates that the association is an independent entity. The alums have met the required obligations. Dr. Limbert has refused both compromise and explanation. We are not aware of any other association in the state being asked to surrender their independent status, cease fundraising efforts, relinquish control of its nominating committee and voting procedures, and to allow the university president to direct the constitution and bylaws. There is no precedent or warrant for this action. This is a transparent, punitive maneuver by Dr. Limbert to silence the voices of her critics. Had she exerted this much effort, expense and thought into adequately performing her duties as president of the university, she would have won our respect.

With or without affiliation as an association, we are still alums. Our support will remain strong and involved. Administrations come and go, membership in the long blue line is forever.

Second Message from Betty Lou Jones:

Subject: MESSAGE FROM BETTY LOU

To: LAldy1@aol.com

Dear Fellow Alums,

Never in a million years did I ever think that I would be sending you this message. Today is a sad day in the life of MUW and the Alumni Association.

For many years the Alumni Association has been a special entity whose purpose was to support the University we all love as a partner with the University. For many months we have been struggling with the same University to achieve former positive working relationships. We have negotiated and compromised through several activities with the goal of moving forward. We signed an affiliation agreement with the University as required by the Institutions of Higher Learning on October 25 and it was approved by the IHL on November 15.

Since November 15 we have been working on proposed constitution and bylaws. On December 6, I met with Dr. Bouse and Jan Miller. Gail Laws and Elaine Evans met with us also. We carried a proposed draft to this meeting which we went over word for word for three hours. At the end of that meeting we agreed that they would take this draft to Dr. Limbert and her staff for consideration.

On January 4, the University sent us their proposed changes to that draft. On January 5, I met with Dr. Bouse and Dr. Limbert and for over an hour we discussed that draft. There were several items that we agreed to change and there were several items that we agreed to consider further.

After conferring with the bylaws committee and the executive committee, on January 11 we submitted to the University a draft that we approved. On that same day they advised me that this draft was not acceptable.

On January 12, I went to Columbus to meet with them to discuss provisions that needed further consideration. When I arrived in Dr. Limbert's office she told me that this was a new day and that we needed totally new documents. I asked if we could discuss the areas that were in question but she advised me that we needed to start all over. She told me that the process was not working and even though I was there willing and able to discuss anything and everything she insisted that we had to start over. Dr. Bouse stated that there was a new document that Jan Miller had drafted. I told him that I had never seen that. I asked why that document was not shown to us nor discussed with us at any time before that day. He stated that since we had not asked to see it he guessed that Jan Miller felt we did not want to use it. I said that we did not know about it so how could we ask to see it. When I asked to see it he told me he would have to find it in his embedded emails.

Dr. Limbert on January 12 extended the deadline from January 15 until January 31.

Since that time we have negotiated through our attorneys. The document has been reviewed and changed several times. However there were several provisions that we felt needed further clarification. On January 29 we requested an explanation of the provisions that were in question. This was not forthcoming. A message was sent that either we sign or be disaffiliated.

We requested a meeting with Dr. Meredith and this was refused. We also requested an extension of the deadline and this was refused.

Having no other recourse we contacted legislators who in turn requested a meeting with Dr. Meredith. We had that meeting today. (Prior to this meeting we received notice that the University was proceeding with the disaffiliation.) Those in attendance were Senator Jack Gordon, Senator Videt Carmichael, Senator Alice Harden, Senator Terry Brown, Senator Terry Burton, Dr. Tom Meredith, Jonathan Compretta, our attorney, Linda Ross Aldy, Donette Lee, Jan McSpadden .and me. We talked for an hour with the final request from us being that the disaffiliation letter be rescinded and that Dr. Meredith encourage Dr. Limbert and her attorney to sit down at the table and negotiate the bylaws with us and our attorney.

Later in the afternoon we received notification : "The University respectfully declines your request to rescind the termination notice. It is best at this time to end the discussions and to move forward with an orderly transition from the existing relationship into a new alumni association for the University."

I want to go on record that at no time have I ever indicated that we were unwilling to negotiate. We simply have requested an explanation of provisions of our proposed By-Laws with which the University had concerns.

As late at 12:00 noon today in our meeting I was continuing to ask that Dr. Limbert come to the table to discuss the problem provisions. I also stated to the whole group that I was one who would always hold out hope that resolution could be reached.

I issued a statement to the press after we received our communication from Mr. Mayo at 2:42 p.m. this afternoon. We had been contacted by the press earlier in the day and as we have reacted throughout the negotiations we refused to talk to them. Only after the communication rejecting our requests did I issue a statement to the press and to you.

Please contact me for any other information you may need.

We continue to ask you to contact your legislators and the IHL Board Members in order to request intervention in this terrible situation.

We have tried everything we know to do to avoid this present situation and we will continue to seek ways to preserve our organization. Please pray for us and please join us in our efforts.

Prouder than ever to be a part of The Long Blue Line!!!!

Sincerely,

Betty Lou Jones

February 1, 2007: Dr. Limbert gives notice that she is beginning the disaffiliation process:

Under the terms of the Affiliation Agreement signed on October 25, 2006, either party may cancel the agreement (disaffiliate from the other) after 60 days' notice. As Betty Lou states in her email above, she and attorney Jonathan Compretta received official notice that Limbert is beginning the disaffiliation process at 2:42 P.M. on January 31, 2007. The next morning, Dr. Limbert releases a statement to the campus and alumni listserves through Jill O'Bryant. That statement reads, in its entirety, as follows:

The University has informed the MUW Alumnae Association of the University's intention to disaffiliate the Association from the University.

On October 25, 2006, MUW President Claudia A. Limbert and Alumnae Association President Betty Lou Jones signed an affiliation agreement as required by the IHL Board. In this agreement, the Association agreed that its by-laws would be submitted to the President for her approval within 60 days of November 15. The University and the Association had meetings and began exchanging drafts of by-laws in December. After reaching an impasse on several provisions before the January 15

deadline, the University extended the deadline to January 31 in an effort to reach an agreement.

At that time, the Association president decided to have its counsel negotiate for the Association. Counsel for both the Association and the University exchanged more drafts and had more discussions. The same impasse regarding the same provisions was reached on January 31.

Dr. Limbert said, "MUW alumni have helped make MUW a nationally recognized and respected University. We are now at a critical point in the institution's history. Our alumni are worthy of an alumni association driven by higher expectations and new ideas, programs, and services. The University, with the support of the MUW Foundation and a new alumni association, will be poised for more success than ever before. It is important that the University have a healthy, supportive and future-focused alumni association that is committed to working with the University. We must move forward together."

Portions of this statement, together with Betty Lou's prior press release, are quoted in a Commercial Dispatch article titled "Limbert to axe 'W' Alumnae Association" on February 2, 2007.

February 2, 2007: Limbert announces the formation of a committee, headed by Andrea Godwin Overby, to select new association: Within a few hours of her first statement announcing her intention to disaffiliate from the current, 117-year-old Alumni Association, Limbert issued the following press release:

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE Feb.
2, 2007 Contact: Anika Mitchell
Perkins
(662) 329-7124**

Overby to chair MUW Alumni Association Advisory Committee

COLUMBUS, Miss. --Mississippi University for Women President Claudia A. Limbert announced today that Andrea Godwin Overby, a 1968 alumna and a past president of the MUW Alumnae Association, will serve as chair of the MUW Alumni Association Advisory Committee. To be comprised of 10 MUW alumni, this committee will recommend to the University administration the focus and structure that the MUW Alumni Association will take. In addition to the other members of the committee chosen by Overby, the University's director of Alumni Relations, Jan Miller, will assist the committee in its work.

This week, the University announced its intention to disaffiliate from the MUW Alumnae Association, an independent membership-based organization. The need to reconstitute the alumnae association arose from the dismissal of two employees in the University's Office of Alumni Relations after an investigation of that office. In 2006, the University administration learned that former alumni office employees may have engaged in conduct detrimental to the University. An investigation uncovered a concerted effort by current alumnae association officers and board members, working with former alumni office employees, to undermine the University and the MUW Foundation.

For example, a current alumnae association officer wrote to the former alumni director in December 2005: "I am looking for a candidate to sue the [MUW] foundation." In another message to current alumnae association officers and board members, a current alumnae association officer said: "I may have found a really good way to get at the [MUW] foundation" by alleging that it violated federal law. The alumnae association officer's allegation was based on a misunderstanding of Foundation operations. In addition, a former employee in the University's Office of Alumni Relations distributed to

three current alumnae association officers and board members confidential donor information from the proprietary files of the MUW Foundation.

Current alumnae association officers and board members also engaged in an effort to pressure the IHL commissioner and IHL Board to remove the MUW president before the end of her contract. This effort was revealed in a November 2005 email from a current alumnae association board member, who referred to "the goal of the past-presidents' group" to have Dr. Limbert removed. This plan was also reflected in a January 2006 statement by one current alumnae association board member to another: "In essence, we have gotten rid of the [former VPIA] . . . now we are going after [Dr. Limbert]."

The evidence uncovered in the University's investigation of the alumni office, only a portion of which is mentioned above, led not only to personnel decisions but has also demonstrated the need to define more precisely the relationship between the University and the alumnae association. In addition, there are operational problems with the conduct of the alumnae association. For example, there are current alumnae association officers and board members who are not actually members of the alumnae association, an apparent violation of the association's present by-laws.

In August 2006, the IHL Board mandated that each university enter into an agreement with each of its affiliated entities. The terms of the affiliation agreement, which the MUW Alumnae Association previously signed, and the proposed by-laws are designed to address the problems uncovered during the investigation of the alumni relations office.

It is important to note that Andrea Godwin Overby is closely connected to The Godwin Group, the public relations firm hired by the University after the public removal of Patsy McDaniel and the public firing of Tracey Ervin. It is clear to the leaders of the Association that Limbert never intended to reach an agreement with them regarding the by-laws and that her plan to create a new alumni association has been "in the works" for a very long time.

CONCLUSION: The road that led to this point, the release of this timeline, has been a long, emotionally arduous journey. At all times, the alumni leaders and the Alumni Association have striven to work with Dr. Limbert for the best interests of the "W," an institution that all alumni involved love dearly. From the beginning, alumni, both individually, and later, on behalf of the Association when the Association was forced to become involved after the raid of the Alumni Office, have striven to work with Dr. Limbert directly and privately, despite the increasing frustration of concerned alumni who wanted the silence to be broken. The Association now believes that the time for silence and working behind the scenes is over, as Limbert has declared war on the alumni. The Association also believes that now is the time for those alumni seeking answers and information to see the full chain of events that led to the disaffiliation.

Ultimately, the goal of the Alumni Association leaders continues to be to bring Limbert to the table, to negotiate with her, and to reach a workable agreement that will allow the Association to continue to support the University for the remainder of Limbert's tenure and beyond. Most important in all of this is our beloved "W" and her long, blue line. Let us never lose sight of that fact.

MUW Alumnae

MUW should stop this messy fight now (2/7)

Wednesday, February 7, 2007 11:40 AM CST

Over its 120-year history, Mississippi University for Women alumni have rallied over and over again for their school. More than once toward the end of the 20th century, they stormed the Legislature to keep the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning from shutting the university's doors.

Leading the charge was the MUW Alumnae Association, which -despite the school's coed student body -continues, like the university itself, to bear a feminine-gender name out of deference to the school's history as the first public college for women in America.

But the Alumnae Association's long-standing love affair with its alma mater seems headed for the skids after President Claudia Limbert decided last week to initiate disassociation proceedings against the organization and create a new alumni association.

A press release -which is more a litany of past complaints than a news article -issued Friday by the MUW public affairs office goes into some detail on Limbert's reasons for cutting off the old alumni group and creating a new one.

One reason cited was that current alumni officers and board members had urged IHL Commissioner Thomas Meredith and IHL Board members to remove Limbert as president. Also cited were efforts by current alumni officers and board members to "undermine the university and the MUW Foundation." The press release noted one current alumni officer wanted someone to sue the Foundation, the university's independent fund-raising organization.

Limbert uncovered the disgruntled MUW graduates' comments when she impounded the university's alumni office and its computers last year. That same investigation led her to remove two university employees from their positions in that office.

The dismissal of alumni office employees certainly is Limbert's prerogative as their employer, but the alumni association is not a university office nor or its members university staff members. Rather, the MUWAA is a private organization, made up of volunteers who graduated from the college and through love for their alma mater have chosen to give their time and money to support the school.

But now Limbert has decided to fire them as well. She has insisted on ground rules for the alumni organization that will ultimately replace its officers with a slate hand picked by her supporters.

Some individual officers of the Alumnae Association may have showed a lack of support or respect for Limbert, but it's hard, if not impossible, to find any college where alumni are 100 percent behind the administration.

Universities have a long history of valuing independent thought and the freedom to voice differing opinions, so it is disturbing to see Limbert cite these past differences as arguments for dismissing the Alumnae Association. If, during her investigation of the university alumni office, Dr. Limbert found legal issues were breached by specific alums, she should pursue the offenders through the courts, but severing ties with the entire association is an arbitrary and heavy-handed action.

Limbert's disavowal of the MUW Alumnae Association, like her lockdown of the university alumni office last year, is a draconian measure that creates an unnecessary public relations nightmare for MUW.

In divorcing herself and the university from the Alumnae Association, Dr. Limbert has made an ill-advised decision, one that smacks of an unwavering desire for control at all costs, regardless of how a protracted fight with MUW alums could affect the future of the school.

The best thing for MUW would be for both sides to return to the bargaining table and forge a compromise that everyone can live with. Alumnae Association President Betty Lou Jones said Tuesday she was willing to meet "any time, anywhere, any place" with Limbert to work things out.

"A lot of feelings have been hurt unnecessarily and we don't have to continue doing that," Jones said. "Come to the table and let us negotiate; don't cut us off from the opportunity to come together and solve this."

Surely that could still be done before the 60-day deadline to dissolve the current alumni group and form a new one has passed. Giving the heave-ho to The W's long-term supporters is in no one's best interests, least of all the university's.

February 9, 2007: Jan Miller leaves Achievement Award nominations at Lynne Curtis' office:

Jan Miller took the folder of Alumnae Achievement Award nominations and left them at Lynn Curtis' office with a note to call her. She told Lynn that they would not be doing the awards this year and said if they were to be done we would have to do them. She gave Lynn no reason for this action.

After the preceding segment was posted, Lynne Curtis received a call from Jan Miller wanting to clarify what she had told Lynne. Jan did not say the awards would not be given; she said that her office would not be mailing the nominations out to the Past Presidents for review and that if the nominations were mailed it would be up to Lynne to do it.