

Evidence of Disparate Impact of Dr. Caywood's practices of favoritism toward Mr. Dutelle, retaliation on the basis of sex and Mr. Dutelle's unethical behavior:

Whether due to gender bias or kindred spirit may be difficult to prove, but showing that Dr. Caywood favors Mr. Dutelle over me, a female member of the faculty, is easy:

Salary:

I have been teaching 5 courses and supervise multiple directed studies and still make much less pay over base salary than Mr. Dutelle even though I have higher qualifications and seniority. (exhibit ZC)

CJ department minutes of 2-9-2011 Item VI.b (exhibit P) states: "Tom Caywood announced that he and Aric Dutelle would be traveling to Australia this summer to represent the Criminal Justice Department. This was appointed by the Dean." No other faculty member was asked if they would like to go on this trip. Dr. Caywood selected a junior male member of the department to represent the CJ Department. Dr. Caywood did not consider me or offer me this opportunity. The minutes were written to imply that the Dean made the selection. If this is true why was the Dean involved in departmental affairs in 2011, when it benefited Mr. Dutelle, but in 2013 the Dean refuses to get involved in departmental affairs when it could relieve me of retaliation? I believe Dr. Caywood presented his choice of Mr. Dutelle and the Dean signed off on it.

One of Mr. Dutelle's text books was recently revised. UW-Platteville CJ dept. bought the revised books for about \$60,000 in violation of school policy. As I understand, revisions can only be bought after the previous revision has been used for at least 5 years. Mr. Dutelle's book had been used for fewer than 3 years when the new revision was ordered. This shows that Dr. Caywood is breaking university rules benefitting Mr. Dutelle financially by buying his books before policy allows and wasting department funds.

Mr. Dutelle is not qualified to teach the FI seminar, a course required for an undergrad student to graduate, because it requires a PhD. That is why Dr. Caywood teaches the class. I am very

qualified to teach the class but Dr. Caywood does not ask me to. Instead I am assigned lower level and less prestigious classes to teach.

Questioning Dr. Caywood's assertion that Mr. Dutelle is the "Logical Choice for prestigious and lucrative assignments:"

(Exhibit M.a) shows that Mr. Dutelle applied for my current position, which began in Aug 2009, but I was clearly more qualified and that is why I got the job. I believe that Dr. Caywood would have given the job to Mr. Dutelle if there were any way to hide his favoritism from others on the search committee. Dr. Caywood and Mr. Dutelle then conspired in 2010 to create a new faculty position ideally suited to Mr. Dutelle and to give him two years toward tenure. I believe the accelerated tenure was designed to ensure that Mr. Dutelle would be ahead of me in seniority to allow him to advance ahead of me in the department. Even from the beginning of my employment this conspiracy existed. Though I have only become convinced of it recently Dr. Cheryl Fuller warned me of this conspiracy since the beginning of my employment at UW-Platteville. I would likely have believed her sooner had she not tried to coerce me into acting against Dr. Caywood and Mr. Dutelle at a time when I did not have personal knowledge of wrongdoings on their part. I now understand her passion against the two of them but still reject her methods in attempting to get me on her side and refuse to repeat her mistakes.

(Exhibit M.b) shows that Mr. Dutelle was not offered an interview for my position because he had "just started PhD." Mr. Dutelle stated in his 2009 job application that he had completed 28 PhD credits toward his doctorate in Criminal Justice through Capella University, "with an anticipated graduation date of December 2010 (exhibit Y)." He has not completed the program as of July 2013. I can only presume that he was unable to meet the course requirements and terminated his pursuit of a PhD. Though Mr. Dutelle has proven himself to be unable to do what I have accomplished he is still considered by Dr. Caywood to be the "Logical Choice" over me for prestigious and lucrative assignments. He still gets promoted early and he still gets tenure three years early.

Unfair Competition:

In about Feb 2012 I asked Mr. Dutelle to inform me if he became aware of the procedures for signing up to present at the upcoming AAFS symposium since he had been to the symposium in the past. Unknown to me at the time, in May 2012 the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS) emailed notification of the next symposium and procedures for signing up for it. Mr. Dutelle assured me that he had heard nothing and that he would let me know when he learned

of the procedures to sign up. Then in about July 2012 I asked him again if he had information on the symposium and he told me that the deadline had passed. Mr. Dutelle obviously knew of the deadline beforehand since he arranged for Ms. Johnson to sign up for the symposium. He did not tell me of the symposium, I believe, in hopes that I would miss the deadline. I believe he purposely withheld the information about the sign up process and deadline so that I would not be able to present at this prestigious symposium. This was during a time when I considered him to be my friend. I did not expect him to act in this cutthroat manner but he has shown himself to be willing to stoop to low levels in order to get ahead of his competition. Never did he apologize for neglecting to inform me but instead he became angry that I was disappointed in him. Since I missed the deadline I was not allowed to present.

In his email of Sept 20, 2012 (exhibit EZZZR) Mr. Dutelle wrote: "Sabina, that (AAFS) was for the faculty presentations. We don't do those. We never have. Our students/faculty present at the Young Forensic Scientists Forum, which is a breakout session. The deadline for that isn't until late nov/early dec as I had said early." First, Mr. Dutelle should not withhold information from me just because he doesn't think I would want to do something that I told him I want to do. Second, Diana Johnson has moderated at the AAFS, so Mr. Dutelle is lying when he says that we have never done those.

Also in his email of Sept 20, 2012 Mr. Dutelle says: "I can't help but read your email to have been a bit snippy and suggestive that you were kept out of something." The email I sent him was worded appropriately and was not snippy at all (exhibit EZZZQ). The fact is that he had been keeping me out of these prestigious events and he became hostile when I asked to be included because he wanted me to stop pushing my way into what he believed to be "his turf." Mr. Dutelle also stated: "I said that I'd let you know and I will." The truth of the matter is, he did not let me know so my concern that I would be excluded was justified. Mr. Dutelle said: "You didn't bring up your interest in going until well after August 1." This is false. I verbally asked him to keep me informed after he returned from his trip to Atlanta the year prior, around Feb, 2012. He wrote: "Please be less quick to judge and justify and instead simply a soft email inquiring next time." Of course he wants me to let him get away with his shady actions as long as possible so he can position himself to take complete advantage. Why should I be slower to judge when I am clearly being abused? He wrote: "Stop by and talk to me if you have concerns." After yelling at me the way he did he expects me to be comfortable just stopping by for a pleasant chat about a sensitive subject? This is his attempt to keep me isolated, intimidated and compliant to his hidden agenda. He wrote: "I don't need another email like this from someone who I consider a friend..." It touched on an issue of concern and that is what upset Mr. Dutelle. He doesn't want his scheme to be uncovered so he attempts to intimidate me to keep me from asking questions that will expose his unethical behavior. His email was a harsh response to an appropriate expression of disappointment. His verbal abuse was an even harsher attempt to intimidate me.

Around June 1, 2012 I spoke with Mr. Dutelle on the phone. I mentioned to him that I had been offered a job in Washington DC and his response surprised me. He asked why I didn't take

the job. He said it was a great opportunity and that I should really consider it. He seemed disappointed that I would be staying around. I remember being baffled that a “friend” would be so disappointed by my decision to stay. If his interests were to keep a good colleague in the department I would have expected him to be glad that I turned down the offer.

Some of Mr. Dutelle’s book writing and promoting seems to have been accomplished on department time. He was given release time that he seems to have used to write his books. Verifiable fact: he used university personnel on paid university time to type his book. He used students to help in writing the book. Will the students or university receive royalties from sales of his books? He used university funded trips to promote his books with book signings. One of his books is titled “Ethics for the Public Service Professional.” Mr. Dutelle should be held to a higher standard of ethics considering he wrote a book about ethics (see <http://www.amazon.com/Ethics-Public-Service-Professional-Dutelle/dp/1439824908>).

Mr. Dutelle seems to have a good reputation as a hard worker and go getter. Let me shed some light on this. As the recipient of many unfair advantages Mr. Dutelle has been able to write books after he attempted and failed to earn a PhD. He, and apparently Dr. Caywood seem to believe that writing text books trumps earning a PhD which requires extensive studies, testing and research. He has been given release time that has given him the freedom to do many, seemingly “extra” works such as trips abroad, poster day displays, book signings etc. Consider that he has been teaching only an average of two to three courses and most, if not all, of his “extra” works have been paid, and some double paid. His other achievements are not as glowing as they seem when compared to the accomplishments of someone who has been teaching five courses while putting together a study abroad trip, bringing many student presentations to poster days, arranging television news events, etc. If I had been given the paid free time and support Mr. Dutelle has enjoyed I’d have finished my books by now and I’d be much closer to having a full Cyber-Security program up and running in our department and I would most likely have gained a sizeable grant for a proposed cyber-security program by now.

Mr. Dutelle has abused university resources by taking advantage of his favor with Dr. Caywood. He places his own interests ahead of the university. I believe he would continue his pattern of abuse for personal gain if given the chance. Mr. Dutelle must be put on notice that future attempts to undermine me will be punished by higher authority. Though I believe he has much to offer the department I don’t believe he will cooperate with me unless a clear signal is sent that continued attempts to undermine me will not be tolerated. I would question his ability to cooperate with me in the future if he does not receive firm correction. Mr. Dutelle’s arrogance and inflated sense of self-worth and entitlement seem to be part of his core belief structure.

Dr. Caywood did not accept HR Director Jeanne Durr's explanation (exhibit EZL) that I handled the student complaint appropriately. He published his own procedures for handling student complaints (exhibit EZO-1) and condemned my actions at the Nov 15, 2012 department meeting, embarrassing me in front of my peers. This contributed to my isolation within the department. Other department members know that openly supporting someone against Dr. Caywood is potentially damaging to their career. Dr. Caywood unfairly pressures faculty and staff into falling in line with his agenda rather than using good leadership.

Also at the Nov. 15, 2012 department meeting Dr. Caywood made unfavorable comments about Dean Throop and Provost Nimocks Den Herder suggesting that they blew the student complaint out of proportion. He still didn't accept that it was a serious issue.

Dr. Caywood seemed to hold a grudge against Dr. Nemmetz for being close to Dr. Fuller. Because of their severe disagreements in the hiring process for the tenure track research and theory position both Caywood and Fuller had to excuse themselves from the process in early 2010. The search was declared a failure and Dr. Caywood asked me to chair the search the following year. From the beginning of my search Dr. Caywood made very clear to me that Dr. Nemmetz would not be an acceptable choice. "If you want to do well in your DRB evaluations you should not take sides with Dr. Fuller," he said. (Conversation in Dr. Caywood's office on 9/22/2010 at approx. 8:45 am).

For several years I have felt a lot pressure to balance my professional relationships with Dr. Caywood, who holds great sway over my career, and Dr. Fuller who has been my graduate online program supervisor and was a member of the CRST. By walking this thin line with the highest of professionalism and objectivity I have been placed in the bad graces of both of them at various times. Dr. Fuller used unfair pressure on me in an attempt to coerce me into siding with her against Dr. Caywood and Mr. Dutelle. I am beginning to see why she did this but she acted inappropriately. I am not doing anything unfair, unethical, illegal or inappropriate. I am fighting for my rights and will continue to do so honorably.

At the FI search in spring 2012 Mr. Dutelle commuted the FI position from a faculty to academic staff position and hired a candidate with an M.S., Danelle Bemis over a candidate with a Ph.D., Dr. Rachel Mohr, who was very interested in the position. I believe Mr. Dutelle wants to keep competition low in the department until he can garner enough power that bringing in more competitive candidates won't hurt his chances of advancing.

In 2010 Dr. Amy Nemmetz did not receive any summer internships from Dr. Caywood. She complained when it appeared she would also be overlooked in 2011. Dr. Caywood had assigned Mr. Bob Roberts, who had accepted a position with Sponsored Programs and was no longer a member of the CJ department, approx. 8 internships (about the same number as Dutelle, Lomax, Burton, Ross, Elmer). Dr. Caywood reassigned 2 of the interns to Dr. Nemmetz after her complaint. Dr. Caywood explained to me that Amy was assigned fewer interns because she was already paid very well over the summer through the undergraduate online program. In contrast however, after Dr. Nemmetz transferred to another department Dana Cecil, a recent master graduate who was handpicked by Dr. Caywood to replace Dr. Nemmetz as undergraduate online coordinator, received the same number of interns as Dutelle, Lomax, Burton, Ross, Elmer, Gibson and Johnson. I pointed out this disparity to Dr. Caywood in an email dated June 1, 2012 (exhibit EZZZK). Rather than solving the problem he replied "...if you are unhappy I understand the need to relocation." [sic] Dr. Caywood seems to give the new females in the department favorable treatment so he can focus his bullying on one female at a time keeping her isolated from the others. This is typical bullying behavior and now it is my turn in the hot seat.

In photos of the homecoming banquet and other social functions as well as other types of advertising that should highlight the entire CJ department equally Mr. Dutelle and his FI program are predominantly featured and depicted in a way that implies that they are the major focus of our department. CJ has more students and more instructors than the FI program. Dr. Caywood is not distributing credit fairly.

For my recent trip to Washington, D.C. my first request for funding on Jan. 15, 2013 at 9:12 am was denied by Dr. Caywood with the explanation that the department covered part of the costs of a conference in Chicago on Sept. 27-29, 2012, where 3 of my students presented and I gave 2 presentations. It appeared to me that Dr. Caywood was not willing to fund the trip until Diana Johnson (FI) requested funding as well. While Diana Johnson was able to tap into both the FI and the CJ account for funding, my students were only given partial coverage from the CJ foundation account. At the conference 2 of my students presented and only 1 of the 2 traveling FI students sponsored by Diana Johnson (FI) presented. We were equally assigned \$200 per faculty and \$250 per student (Jan. 22, 2013 11:33 am) from CJ which was not enough to cover the costs. While I cannot say for sure I would expect that research into funding for this trip will reveal that Diana Johnson also received funding from FI giving her more money though she produced fewer presenting students than I did. Double dipping is not fair unless both pots

of money are made available to both CJ and FI faculty and students. This shows favoritism of the FI program over CJ and benefits Mr. Dutelle indirectly.

In Feb 2012 I emailed 3 PACCE projects for Dr. Caywood to sign. His reason for not signing the request initially was "My concern is you are doing too much." If he thought I was doing too much he should have tried to make things easier for me rather than harder by delaying the approval of my request. This is another example of an unnecessary hurdle I had to jump.

For spring semester of 2012 I was granted a sabbatical with an FDRA grant which required the school to release me from all duties so I could fully pursue my research in domestic terrorism. Dr. Caywood wrote a letter for the FDRA grant proposal in early 2011 guaranteeing "Dr. Burton's grant award period will be devoted solely to research and scholarly activity as described in her proposal document." and "Dr. Burton will not be called upon to serve in a faculty governance or service activity which conflicts with the project work." (exhibit W) While I was on sabbatical, however, Dr. Caywood, on Feb. 24, 2012 (9-10 am), called on me to develop a short study abroad program to Germany so CJ students could explore the German CJ system. He argues that he didn't force me to do the study abroad trip but that is irrelevant. The letter he wrote guarantees that I would "not be called upon" and he did call upon me to do the work. I have a strong work ethic and when my boss calls upon me to do a job I do it to the best of my ability. Dr. Caywood told me there might be funding (which never materialized) so I could travel to Germany, my home-country, and prepare for the trip in person. This assignment put me in a difficult position as the preparation for the study abroad trip was a very time consuming undertaking for me. I worked on the trip preparations since March 2012. Also during my sabbatical Dr. Caywood assigned me over 60 advisees. This shows his disregard for his commitment to release me from work and demonstrates his efforts to undermine my accomplishments.

Although we have over 600 students in the CJ program and 175 in the FI program we are a very small faculty. Our DRB and several of our Search & Screen Committees have had to rely on the service of non-CJ faculty. The CJ department has struggled to attract and retain Ph.D.s for its program and at times has had to rely on under-qualified adjuncts (e.g., holding only a BS degree). Nonetheless, Dr. Caywood does not appear very interested in hiring and retaining qualified Ph.D.s. If a faculty member disagrees with him, and especially a female, they are likely

to hear him say something like “you can go somewhere else if you don’t like it here.” (exhibit EZZZK) In recent years our department lost qualified Ph.D.s like Dr. Susan Hilal, Dr. Amy Nemnitz, Dr. Joe Lefevre and others. Dr. Fuller also explored outside employment and I feel pushed to do the same.

My pursuit of a cyber-security program tailored for law enforcement, my promotion to Associate Professor and my request for tenure appear to have spurred Mr. Dutelle into hostile action against me. All my endeavors into cyber-security have met with Mr. Dutelle’s resistance and he became cold to me when I applied for tenure. I believe there is ample room for a thriving Cyber-Security program as well as an FI program and that one does not detract from but could add to the other if cooperation, common ground and equal opportunity become the hallmarks of our department.

Mr. Dutelle’s support of me has waned over the last 2 years as I have spread my wings of professional aspirations. The news of AT&T’s support of my efforts seemed to upset him. He articulated at several occasions his disapproval of my pursuit of cyber-security. I suspect because he thinks it could rival or even overshadow his FI program. Much of the letter Dr. Caywood sent me on Jan. 24 (exhibit A) contains wording and thoughts that Mr. Dutelle said to me at a private meeting I had with him in his office on Nov. 19, 12-12:30 pm. He said: “You’re not an expert in cyber-security.” I responded to him that I am listed on a proposal to the EU as an expert in this field, have studied it extensively and formerly worked in Intelligence. He retorted: “Let’s not get nitpicky. Do what you were hired to do. You were not hired to create a new program, you were hired to teach.” Wording, timing and writing style all indicate that Mr. Dutelle wrote Dr. Caywood’s letter of Jan 24, 2013 (exhibit A). It seems that Dr. Caywood and Mr. Dutelle are conspiring against me. Mr. Dutelle’s claim that I am not an expert in Cyber Security is further diminished by the fact that during my study abroad trip to Germany in June 2013 I was asked to serve on an elite U.N. research team working on Hacker Profiling.

Mr. Dutelle was a police officer at a department outside of Denver, CO, for 5 years. He then got a 1 year online master’s degree in a Forensic Investigation program from a school in Southern California. Clearly his qualifications in academia are inferior to mine. I was the first woman accepted into Federal Law Enforcement in Germany. I worked in intelligence (counter-terrorism, counter-intelligence), am trained in forensic psychology and offender profiling and worked with the psychological office of the police in Munich, Germany. I have consulted on high profile cases. I received my Ph.D. from one of the top research schools in the U.S., the University of California, Irvine, and studied under Binder, Loftus, Petersilia, Skolnick/Dombrink,

Pontell, Currie and Gottfredson. I also worked and taught at the largest police academy of California, the Regional Police Academy of Los Angeles County; worked with the Los Angeles Police Department and several other southern California police departments as part of a program to implement and monitor community policing programs. I co-wrote and partially taught the Cultural Awareness Training developed for CA state commission POST. I am in my 18th years of teaching in higher education. I have taught at this school since 2009 and my many accomplishments are shown in my DRB file. Nonetheless, when it comes to prestigious assignments; Mr. Dutelle is Dr. Caywood's "logical choice?" That seems like favoritism and/or sexism to me.

I was a victim of sexual harassment in the past so I understand the damage that is possible by the event suffered by the student who came to me for help. The "experiment" that Dr. Gibson conducted on the student could have a number of negative effects on an impressionable young woman. For example, had she decided to call the phone number in an attempt to connect with the professor socially and was then told of the "experiment" she could have been very embarrassed each time she came to his class. If she had just kept it to herself and not sought my assistance she could have forever thought that Dr. Gibson was "into" her and this could have created psychological complications. Any way you look at the possible consequences of his actions it is clear that Dr. Gibson's "experiment" was inappropriate and potentially damaging to the young woman. It has certainly created severe damage to me by catalyzing Dr. Caywood into retaliation against me. The fact that Dr. Caywood chose to retaliate against me for my reaction to this event rather than reprimanding Dr. Gibson for his actions shows that Dr. Caywood does not have sensitivity to the real problem.

During the entire fall semester, 2012, Dr. Caywood showed little interest in supporting or advertising my Short Study Abroad Trip to Germany in June 2013 for students to explore the German criminal justice system, a program he called on me to develop in March 2012. I worked several months on putting the program together, securing German state subsidized food & lodging for our students at a German Police Command College/Academy. The trip was very successful and now it is time for us to reciprocate. Unfortunately I can't count on Dr. Caywood's support.

Dr. Caywood's critique of my proposal (exhibit C) (exhibit C.a) seems to have as a main point that the course proposal objective of "encryption" was too technical for a Liberal Arts course. Disregarding, for a moment, the fact that he was shown to be wrong by the grad council let's focus on his motivation. His motivation seems to be that because we are in Liberal Arts we should exclude technical subjects, leaving those subjects for other departments that are better suited and keep our focus on critical thinking and theory. Now let's apply this same valid argument to other courses taught in our FI program.

Our FI course on insects, taught by Diana Johnson, is quite technical and really should be taught by BILSA but Mr. Dutelle faced no objection to this highly technical study when incorporating it into our department. The FI program on forensic photography, which is also a technical course, spans a full semester while the FBI offers the same certification in a two day workshop. Mr. Dutelle gets great evaluations from his students in this class because it is an easy and fun class, but it gives no real advantage in the work place. These are not critical thinking or theory classes but they were approved easily. Why is my course proposal subjected to a different standard? Mr. Dutelle has been on the curriculum committee for about 7 years and has taken unfair advantage of his position to create fun curriculums that he can teach easily and will get him good student evaluations. Dr. Caywood applied a stricter standard to my proposal because he is angry with me for my handling of the student complaint and for complaining about the many dysfunctions of our department.