

Concerning the Cyber Security project/Program:

For months I was allowed to refer to my efforts in Cyber Security saying that the university proposes to build a cyber security program in order to gain funding for it. Then on Jan 24, 2013 suddenly and without warning or explanation my ability to make this claim was cut short. Why is this wording even problematic? Why can't I say: "We propose to build a Cyber Security Program if we get the funding for it?" How does that damage the school? I have never claimed or even implied anywhere that the university has funding for, or final approval for building a full cyber security program. How could I make such a claim when we only have \$7,000 for it? The press release (exhibit ZD), which I didn't write, said that the \$7,000 was to "support the development of a new cyber security program." Is that the wording Dean Throop has issue with, in exhibit ZD? If so, she should have just changed word "program" to "project" and that should have solved the problem. If that was her problem why was she upset with me about it? I didn't write it. Why was support for my cyber security efforts suddenly cut short? Why did Dr. Caywood "hang me out to dry?" (exhibit ZM) He did so in retaliation against me for advocating for and protecting the interests of a student. (exhibit EZL) (exhibit ZM) Someone has been poisoning Dean Throop against me and she has fallen for this defamation and libel.

As Dr. Caywood was aware, the actual monetary grant had already been deposited with the school weeks before. Dr. Caywood, and probably Mr. Dutelle, convinced the Dean of LAE that I had been misrepresenting facts when I had not. His lies to Dean Throop resulted in an embarrassing and defamatory email that was cc'd to an AT&T official and may have ruined my chance of getting additional funding from them. Also, probably as a result of his lies, my name was not mentioned in the official press release celebrating the donation though I was solely responsible for attaining the grant. My name on that press release would have given me valuable credibility in my future attempts at gaining grant money from other sources. I don't see how I can justify spending the AT&T donation on cyber-crime development that no longer has the support of my department chair. I don't see any alternative to informing Wisconsin AT&T that the CJ Department no longer backs my cyber-security endeavor so I must return what is remaining of the donation.

AT&T is owed an explanation. I don't know what to say to Jim Jermain, AT&T Regional Vice President in Wisconsin, about the defamatory email that was sent to them or about the current status of a project I have worked hard to get started. The university needs to explain to Jim Jermain that this mess was caused by Dr. Caywood and that the Dean and HR refused to take my allegations seriously, exacerbating the problem. The embarrassing and defaming email needs to be explained to AT&T and my name cleared of all blame. Too much time has already

passed! This should be done quickly to help me regain the trust of AT&T and hopefully convince them to invest more in a Cyber Security project that could someday flourish into a full Cyber Security Program that will help our Criminal Justice department move forward into this century.

Dubuque Private College started a new Cyber Security program this year. We could have been much further along by now if Dr. Caywood had not withdrawn his support of my efforts. Our CJ department failed to create a Homeland Security curriculum and now Dr. Caywood is fighting to repeat the mistake in the field of Cyber Security. A neighboring college will now compete for potential grant money, faculty and students making our success less certain and causing me professional damage. We will never know if we could have won grant money to fund a Cyber Security Program over the past several months because I was not able to submit any more proposals due to the retaliation I have suffered.

Dr. Caywood and Mr. Dutelle now seem to be demanding that my cyber-crime efforts get the approval from the entire department while indicating strongly that they will not give their approval. None of Mr. Dutelle's initiatives (e.g., course development, donations, material orders) have gone to a department vote since I have joined the department. Neither did Dr. Gibson's NSF proposal on Police Integrity require an official CJ department vote. Nor did my own NSF proposal for a cyber-crime program, which Dr. Caywood signed previous to the student complaint, require approval of the entire department. How can I expect to gain the entire department's approval when two of the four tenured faculty members, including the department Chair, have committed to blocking my efforts? It won't matter how good my arguments are, Dr. Caywood and Mr. Dutelle will not vote in my favor.