

Retaliatory Hostile Work Environment:

UW-Platteville Discrimination and Harassment Policy (appendix VIII)

UW-Platteville Discrimination and Harassment Policy (para IV) states: “A copy of this policy and the procedures for implementing it will be distributed annually to all University of Wisconsin-Platteville students, faculty, academic staff, and classified staff. In addition, educational programs will be conducted regularly to sensitize members of the university community to the issues covered by this policy.” Neither the policy nor the procedures for implementing it were ever distributed to me. Educational programs to sensitize members of the university community to issues covered by this policy have not been conducted at all. In fact, training of this sort was ordered by the Provost in either 2010 or 2011 as a response to Dr. Fuller’s claim of sexual discrimination against Dr. Caywood but Dr. Caywood chose to ignore this direct order. Also troubling is the fact that the Provost did not ensure that the training was conducted. Merely conducting the training now is not sufficient to set this straight because avoidable and severe damages have already been incurred as a result of Dr. Caywood’s insubordination, insensitivity and inaction and he has shown defiance of the intent of the training.

A Thousand Small Cuts in a Hostile Work Environment:

Excerpt from retaliatory hostile work environment lawsuit (Appendix V): “...such claims are based upon acts whose very nature involves repeated conduct: intimidation, ridicule, or repeated insult. Subjecting such an employee to a “thousand small cuts” in the hope that he or she will decide to leave employment is sufficient to lead to liability for retaliatory hostile environment.” This is applicable to my situation.

I was scheduled to depart Madison Airport at 7:24 PM, Mar 20, 2013 for a trip to Germany to visit my mother and help her get through the ordeal of losing her husband, my father, who passed away on Feb 14, 2013. I was going to the country of my birth to bury my father. I informed Dr. Caywood of my trip in an email and verbally on or before Mar 14, 2013. (exhibit EZZZM)” I delivered my proposal to develop a cyber-security course to him on Monday, Mar, 18, 2013. He returned it to Dr. Fuller on Wed, Mar 20 with harsh comments and corrections written in red marker. I didn’t get his comments until late morning on Mar 20, 2013 and spent much of the time I had set aside to prepare for my trip, instead dealing with this unnecessary pressure from Dr. Caywood.

Knowing the details of, and the reason for, my scheduled trip to Germany Dr. Caywood fiercely protected his erroneous assessment that I should remove the topics of “encryption” or he

would not sign the paper. (exhibit EZZZL) Basing his assessment on a discussion with Dr. Van Buren, whose suggestion was “merely to modify the document slightly,” Dr. Caywood sent his hard-nosed ultimatum at 5:25 pm, only two hours before my departure time for an international flight from an airport an hour drive from home. Not only was he unreasonably difficult at a time when I was hurting and rushed but he was dead wrong.

I removed the objective concerning encryption and he signed the proposal. Then when I presented the proposal at the grad council I was asked why encryption was not included in the proposal. The entire grad council unanimously agreed, without debate, that encryption should be one of the subjects addressed in the proposed course. This is one of many examples of the resistance I have been receiving from Dr. Caywood. He makes me ask twice for the things I need. I believe he does this to make things harder for me in the hopes I will leave UW-Platteville. I believe this was retaliation for my efforts in assisting with the student complaint and is in direct violation of Wisconsin Statute 111.36 (appendix VIII).

Dr. Caywood has said on numerous occasions to groups of students in assembly that “we just want your money.” This shows his callousness to the financial concerns of students. He is just as callous to my financial concerns (exhibit EZZZB), my health concerns (exhibit U) and fairness concerns.

Dr. Caywood has said that he was concerned that I am “doing too much.” What I believe he means by these vague statements is that he is concerned that I would outshine Mr. Dutelle if I continue to work hard and yield the results of which I am capable. Why would a boss tell a hard working employee, who wants to work hard, to slack off? For the entire first year I was employed Dr. Caywood encouraged me, almost on a daily basis, to go home early, not to work so hard. Once he told me to go home when I still had a class to teach. I didn’t understand why he encouraged me to work less at the time but I see now that his concern has probably been for Mr. Dutelle and not for me. He probably wanted me to slack off so Mr. Dutelle could more easily bypass me in the department.

The things that seem to upset Dr. Caywood are that I ask for what I rate and that I complain about things that are not right. He seems to want me to accept unacceptable treatment and quietly allow my career and health to be injured and hampered unjustly.

Dr. Caywood told me, early in my employ, that he felt that women’s income was secondary to men’s income because women are more of a supportive earner. He felt that a man’s income should be primary and that men should earn more.

He told me in fall semester 2012 that I would be the “token woman” on a committee.

Dr. Caywood has gone on paid trips to conferences in California where he did not present but visited his son in Los Angeles. He went on a paid trip to Australia with no tangible benefit to the school. Yet I was not given the promised opportunity to visit Germany to arrange for the students’ visit for my short study abroad course for the summer of 2013.

(Exhibit O) is the press release that reported the check presentation for the \$7,000 AT&T grant which includes a photo of the presentation. In the photo Dr. Caywood stands proudly in an obvious show of his support. Yet only a few days before the photo was taken he told me I did not have his support (exhibit A). Why is he in the photo if he doesn't support what I am doing? These are conflicting signals. How can I work with or for someone who acts this way? I still don’t know the status of support for a cyber security project from my chair. I don’t know, he won’t really tell me. This uncertainty threatens not only my cyber-security project but all my other aspirations as well.

From June 4th to June 19th 2013 I traveled to Berlin, Germany with a group of students in an exchange program that Dr. Caywood called on me to do but did not assist me in any way. He did nothing to advertise the event; he did nothing to help me in preparation and never asked of the status of my efforts. I put together, in cooperation with the Brandenburg, Germany Police, a fantastic trip that exposed our students to the amazing culture, history and policing techniques of Germany and shared with them our policing techniques and exposed revealing differences between the ways our two countries handle crime. I am now forming plans to host a German delegation for next summer but I wonder whether I can count on support for the exchange event from my chair. Worst case would be that he pledges his support and then pulls the rug out from under me at the most inopportune moment as he has done with my efforts in Cyber Security.

During my Germany trip, and due to my expertise in cyber security, I was asked to be part of a think tank for the United Nation’s Hackers Profiling Project (exhibit ZN). The day our delegation departed Berlin, June 19, 2013, President Barack Obama gave a speech at the famous Brandenburg gates in Berlin where me and my delegation had stood the day before. In that speech President Obama said at 3:42 PM: “We are stronger when all our people, no matter who they are or what they look like, are granted opportunity and when our wives and our daughters

have the same opportunities as our husbands and our sons.” I am asking you to make us stronger by following through on our Commander in Chief’s intent.

An interesting difference between our US law enforcement staffing and that of Berlin is this: 30% of the Brandenburg police are female while in America less than 13% are female. In the higher levels of policing in Brandenburg 50% are female while in America’s higher levels of policing the ratio is less than 13% female. I have fallen prey to the mentality that prevents America’s advancement into women’s equality and weakens the fabric of our society. The mentality goes beyond a weak willed and backward thinking boss to those who are in position to do something about it but sit idly by with deliberate indifference, and to those who take advantage.

A few of the questions Dr. Burton asked Dr. Caywood and his responses, or lack of response:

Wed, Mar 20, 2013 12:18 PM I asked: “Why do you question my expertise?”

I received no reply.

Tue, Oct 16, 2012 04:53 PM I wrote to Dr. Caywood: “I just got a note that the news-team will come to campus between 12-12:30. We’ll be leaving for the Forensic House after 1 pm. Would you like to join us?”

I received no reply.

Thu, Oct 11, 2012 09:31 PM I asked: “Was I part of the experiment and included in the human subject form?” (exhibit EZZZY)

I received no reply.

Jun 01, 2012 10:00 PM I wrote to Dr. Caywood about some of my ideas about internships, seniority and other issues. At the end of the email I thanked him for providing an environment where we can safely vent our grievances and for taking my issues seriously in future discussions, in the hopes that he would do those things. Instead he wrote back ill conceived arguments why he should keep doing things the way he has been doing them and wrote that “If you are unhappy I understand the need to relocation.” [SIC] (exhibit EZZZK) He wrote later

(exhibit ZI) that he saw my email as a “veil threat.” [SIC] Even through his poor command of the English language you can see that he is saying “I don’t want you here.” His answer to an employee bringing up valid concerns is to tell them to get a job somewhere else. It has worked for him before. The senior staff of our university enables this sort of behavior by allowing it and opposing me for shedding light on the abuse. Their deliberate indifference has caused me delays and prolonged suffering in a retaliatory hostile work environment.

Aug 28, 2012 10:49 AM:

I submitted topics for the coming department meeting in an effort to bring light onto some issues that needed to be addressed. (exhibit EZZZJ)

I received no email reply but Dr. Caywood didn’t seem to like my topics at all. He seemed upset with me and did not address my topics at the meeting. I was intimidated so I did not bring up the topics at the meeting. Dr. Caywood has long intimidated me into accepting mistreatment. I usually chose to be quiet in the sake of good relations rather than fighting for less important/urgent issues. This was one of those occasions. Dr. Caywood seemed upset so I let the issues rest. Though they were, and are, important issues that need to be addressed I was not ready to address them at the time in the face of his obvious displeasure.

On about Oct 15, 2012: I delivered a doctor’s note to Dr. Caywood’s mail box, Dated Oct 12, 2012, saying that I have “conjunctivitis and very sensitive dry eyes. These symptoms would improve if patient was able to use more natural light rather than the fluorescents. I appreciate your consideration for this employee in transitioning her to a different office as space allows.” (exhibit U) One of my eyes was flame red for months. There was no white in the eye at all. Ask around, it was hard to miss. If you made eye contact with me you saw it.

I received no reply. He never asked me how my eyes were doing. He never mentioned it at all. I still suffer in an office with fluorescent lighting. His lack of compassion was manifestation of his anger toward me and demonstrates his childish way of dealing with what he perceived to be attacks on his authority. I still don’t attack his authority. As long as he has the title “Department Chair” I will follow his legal instructions as best I can. If I disagree with his decisions I may argue my point but never have I disobeyed his legal mandates. Never have I ignored his questions or requests. By ignoring me he insults me and makes getting to the bottom of problems impossible.

January 24, 2013 3:45:09 PM (exhibit EZZQ):

In this response to Dr. Caywood's letter (exhibit A) I wrote "So tell me what you want me to do. I am ready to tell AT&T to give their money to a different school if that is what you want" and "If you are withdrawing your support please do so in writing so I know what to tell AT&T about this check presentation. If you have withdrawn your support for the course development we should not accept the grant."

I received no reply but Dr. Caywood was at the check presentation.

Because of his unwillingness to support my cyber security efforts I cannot justify using the AT&T grant money and will probably need to return it next fall. This is a big embarrassment for me.

I am concerned for my other projects as well. I am unsure whether I can continue the efforts I have put into the restorative justice program that I brought on campus last year, which resulted in research opportunities for our students and in 15 students going through mediation training and ultimately being certified restorative justice mediators. I am unsure if I can further pursue the cold case project that I have been working on with 25 year FBI veteran Steve Moore, who asked me to be part of a team of retired FBI agents and assist in evaluating unsolved murder cases. Mr. Moore also invited me to be part of a new planned television series called "On Further Review." The TV producers and Steve Moore would like me to be one of their academic advisors and film me and my students working on cold case research. Will Dr. Caywood suddenly withdraw support for these or the Germany student exchange program I am working on? If history is a guide then yes.