

Timeline - Seeking Justice

In spring 2010 LAE did an investigation on sexual harassment charges brought forward by Dr. Fuller against Dr. Caywood. As a result the Provost Nimocks Den Herder ordered that Dr. Fuller would no longer be required to report to Dr. Caywood, the chair of the department. This shows that serious problems in the department existed before my troubles with Dr. Caywood began.

The following year another accusation of discrimination was brought forward by Dr. Amy Nemmetz. Her applications for a tenure track position in spring 2010 and again in spring 2011 was strongly opposed by Dr. Caywood.

Former Associate Dean Dr. Bunte investigated charges against Dr. Caywood. As a result of that investigation Provost Nimocks Den Herder informed the department at a department meeting that the CJ department had communication problems and ordered us to undergo a communication workshop. The fact that this communication training never occurred shows Dr. Caywood's disregard for the provost's office, shows that he is not interested in improving communications within the department and supports my claim of gender discrimination. I have looked through all the minutes of previous meetings and this discussion is not mentioned. I believe Dr. Caywood removed the comments from the minutes.

On Aug 22, 2012 10:11 AM I sent an email to Dean Throop expressing some concerns (exhibit EZZZI). Perhaps she saw this email as a sign that I am a whiner. I don't know, but she never responded to the email. Perhaps someone had been telling her lies about me?

Nov 17, 2012 I asked Jeanne Durr to start an official investigation into my claims against Dr. Caywood. (exhibit EW)

Dec. 3, 2012 (10-10:30 am): I met with HR Director Jeanne Durr to address the hostile work environment created by Dr. Caywood and the student complaint issue. Jeanne Durr told me: "Tom is Tom," as though I should accept his unacceptable behavior because he has a reputation of mistreating women; "He will calm down again," as though I should just wait for him to begin treating me fair without addressing the problem; "He will retire in about 2 years," as though I should be willing to continue to suffer unfair treatment for another two years. By then Mr. Dutelle would be in position to take over the department and continue my mistreatment.

Dec. 10, 2012 (7:57 pm): I shared my concern of discrimination and some history of the issue with Dean Throop by email. (Exhibit EI)

Dec. 11, 2012 (7:29 am): Dean Throop's response included this statement: "I appreciate your concerns. However, this is an internal department issue and, as the dean, I do not want to interfere in faculty governance matters." (Exhibit EI)

Dec. 11, 2012 (10:30 am): It seemed impossible for me to handle this matter within the department since the problem was that the chair of the department was abusing me. How could I convince him to stop? I was sharing my concerns with my husband and he agreed that there was no way to fix this problem within the department. He asked if I would like him to talk to Dr. Caywood to help him understand my views and maybe to learn his concerns. I didn't know what else to do so I asked Roger to see what he could do. If Dean Throop had not rejected my plea for help my husband would never have gotten involved.

Roger and Dr. Caywood have met at numerous occasions. Both have military backgrounds and Dr. Caywood always seemed very comfortable talking to my husband. At the Dec. 11 meeting topics discussed included: the sexual harassment incident, the fact that I feel intimidated by Dr. Caywood and don't feel comfortable communicating with him, the search and screen chair position issue, the fact that I was concerned that he might withdraw his support of my cyber-security efforts and finally that although I supported him in Cheryl Fuller's sexual harassment claim against him I could now see her point. Roger said that Dr. Caywood seemed disappointed with me but could not articulate a reason why. Roger suggested to Dr. Caywood that it would be good for Dr. Gibson to apologize to me for having involved me in the "experiment" and Dr. Caywood seemed to agree. Though they touched on difficult subjects Roger felt that the discussion was conducted professionally by both men, was a step in the right direction and ended on a good note.

After Roger talked to Dr. Caywood on Dec 11, 2012 Dr. Caywood began acting more cordial to me and I began to feel more positive about working with Dr. Caywood. I told Dr. Caywood "Thank you for taking the time to talk with Roger today. I hope our working relationship will improve going forward." Dr. Caywood wrote to me "You are a valuable asset to this department. I've tried to be supportive of what you are doing. I worry you do too much. We agree in many area and we will disagree as well. I'm looking at the department as a whole." (exhibit EH).

I am still waiting for an apology from Dr. Gibson.

On Dec 12, 2012 Dean Throop sent an email to Dr. Caywood telling him that Roger's conversation with him was inappropriate and asking him to never engage in such a conversation again (exhibit EZZM-1). Nobody told me that it was inappropriate. Why didn't she ask me to keep Roger out of the discussion? Why didn't Dr. Caywood tell Roger that he couldn't discuss it? Why didn't Dean Throop help me so I didn't need to look for help elsewhere? Dean Throop seems to make the argument that Roger "flouted employment law pretty seriously" by attempting to help improve communication between me and my boss but what has happened to me she condones and supports. There are some pretty serious out of whack priorities here.

In the evening of Jan 24th my husband called Dean Throop's office. He talked to the secretary and asked to be transferred to the Dean. When Dean Throop picked up the phone she said in a very aggressive and stern voice "What do YOU want?" Roger immediately got the distinct impression that she was very angry. He told her that he had called to discuss my situation and the Dean cut him off and informed him that she was not going to discuss the matter with him. Roger was going to let her know that my father had taken gravely ill, ask for some compassion, try to understand why the Dean's emails had been so harsh and hopefully to shed some light on the issue to help the Dean understand my position a little better. But the conversation was cut very short and Roger was not able to accomplish any of the goals of his call. He did learn that Dean Throop was very angry with me, and seemingly with Roger too, although at the time he was not sure why. I don't see why Dean Throop could not have been polite to my husband when he called her. Why didn't she simply inform him that it is inappropriate to discuss these matters with non-employees? Why did she feel the need to speak so harshly to him? Roger suggested that I write an apology to Dean Throop, which I did. Roger is very good at seeing both sides of an issue and he felt that he might be able to help. He is willing to stay out of the discussions if it is inappropriate for him to be involved but he wants to help me because he sees the injustice.

On Jan 29, 2013 (8:15 – 9:15 am) I met with Jeanne Durr and Dean Throop in response to Dr. Caywood's letter (exhibit A) and harsh treatment. I informed them that I wanted to file grievance charges. Jeanne Durr told me that she would send the information to me to make sure that I have the proper guidelines, both, in our handbook and the UW system rules and that she would make sure that I have access to all of those. She twice more during that meeting assured me that she would send the information to me. She never did send me the information promised. Also in the meeting Jean Durr said that it was very appropriate under the circumstances that I document things.

Dean Throop told me that she can't interfere. The reason I took my grievance initially to Dean Throop was that I was under the impression that she was in a position to do something about Dr. Caywood. After she told me that she could not interfere I stopped asking for her assistance and took the next step. I have later found out that Dean Throop does have the power, even the obligation, under LA&E Constitution, Article VI, Section 4, para 1 to hold an election for department chair at least once each three years (appendix VIII). It has been well over three years since our last election so I have made one of the demands in my claim that a new election be held. I have also made one of my demands that if either Dr. Caywood or Mr. Dutelle should be elected that the Dean conduct a new election as allowed in the LA&E constitution, Article VI, Section 4, para 4. I am not bringing this request directly to Dean Throop because she has already made clear her desire to remain outside the decision making process of this issue and seems to believe some defamatory lies about me.

I noticed a change in the way Dean Throop greeted me over the last year. At first she was very friendly waving and smiling when we would meet at Wal-Mart or other places. But over time she began avoiding eye contact and her greetings became much more formal and insincere. I believe someone had been lying to her about me. Dean Throop should be asked what she has heard about me and from whom. Those rumors should then be investigated to see if they are true and Dean Throop should be made aware of the findings. If she was merely trying to distance herself from me for protocol reasons she should have explained that to me. I would understand. By snubbing me I am left to wonder the reason.

Feb. 7, 2013 (8:30 -9 am): I met with HR Director Jeanne Durr to discuss how to handle the hostile work situation.

Jeanne Durr told me that Dr. Caywood "doesn't need to answer your questions. You would like him to answer your questions, but he doesn't need to." She said "he could totally ignore everything that you send him from now till you both retire." "He can continue to ignore you forever." She also said "Tom is probably going to feel battered" by my letter to Dr. Caywood of 1/24/13 (exhibit EZZQ). Since Dr. Caywood is protected from answering my valid questions and addressing the real issues I would like the Chancellor to ask Dr. Caywood the same questions I have been asking. Maybe the Chancellor can get straight answers where I have been blocked. I am not battering anyone. I am trying to expose some serious problems and I am having a great deal of difficulty finding someone in a position to help who will really try to understand what is going on and not pressure me to continue to accept the abuse.

During the meeting I told Jean Durr that I just want to know what I did wrong so if I did something wrong I could address it and try to fix it. She responded saying that I "didn't do anything wrong."

Jeanne Durr said she would address my concerns with Dr. Caywood. I again asked how to go about filing a grievance. She recommended mediation between Dr. Caywood. She never provided me with information on how to file a grievance. I had to find the information through other sources.

At the meeting Jean Durr seemed upset that I was pressing the issue. She wanted it to just go away. That would explain her failure to deliver the promised information to me for submitting a grievance package and her delays in arranging mediation. She was impeding my efforts to file a grievance in hopes that I would just give up.

Feb. 27, 2013 (8:46 am): Email to me from HR Director Jeanne Durr stated that she has been busy and will discuss mediation options, between Dr. Caywood and me, with Dean Throop after March 13 (exhibit EZZZC). Delay upon delay. I requested the investigation on Nov 17, 2012.

March 8, 2013 (9 am-10 am): I asked to talk to the Assistant Chancellor Dr. Joanne Wilson. She immediately provided me with information on submitting a grievance package.

March 13, 2013 (10:30 am): I turned in my draft grievance report package to the secretary of Assistant Chancellor Dr. Joanne Wilson.

March 21, 2013 (12:10 – 12:25 pm): I had a meeting with Dr. Joanne Wilson who provided me with a contact person for the grievance committee: Mary Rose Williams, Media Studies.

March 22, 2013: I received an email from Jeanne Durr informing me that Dr. Caywood had not responded to her multiple requests to schedule some time to meet. I informed her that I had initiated grievance procedures. (exhibit EZZZU) (EZZZE)

On April 12, 2013 (12 PM to 1 PM): There was a department meeting. Dr. Caywood has not released the minutes of that meeting. Dean Throop attended that entire meeting for no apparent reason. I got the sense that she was there to “protect” Dr. Caywood against me even though I am the one who needs protection.

On April 12, 2013 (4 PM to 5:45 PM) a Grievance Committee hearing was conducted. In attendance was myself, Dr. Caywood, my husband Roger, who acted only as an observer and supporter, and five board members. (appendix ZM) I requested that the meeting be recorded and I have a copy of the recording. Dr. Caywood admitted that he had acted “poorly” and probably “very poorly.”

April 19, 2013: The grievance committee submitted their findings to the Chancellor (exhibit ZA).

On about April 25, 2013 I posted the EEOC poster (Appendix IV) on my office door because of all the open hostility I was receiving from Dr. Caywood and Mr. Dutelle. The hostility seemed to become less obvious after I posted the notice so it did provide some level of relief.

May 19, 2013 (Day 30): The deadline for the Chancellor to act on the board’s findings came and went with no word from anyone. (appendix VIII) I was anxiously awaiting something that nobody was even working toward.

As of Fri, May 24, 2013 10:46 AM, I had heard nothing from the Chancellor concerning my grievance (Day 35). Since the Chancellor had not responded to the Grievance Committee’s

report within the required 30 days I sent an email to the Board of Regents (exhibit ZA-1) requesting their review of the matter.

Wed, May 29, 2012, 9:04 AM: Provost Nimocks Den Herder, who had been assigned by the Chancellor to handle the issue, telephoned me and apologized that she had not responded within the allotted time and that she did not know that there was a time limit. She told me that she would make a response by Friday.

On Friday, May 31, 2013 7:05:01 PM: I received a response from the Board of Regents (exhibit ZA-3) informing me that the matter was still being reviewed on the campus level.

Friday, May 31, 11:29 PM (Day 42): Having heard nothing from Provost Nimocks Den Herder I sent another email to the Board of Regents (exhibit ZA-4) asking "how long must I wait?" I never received a response to this email.

June 4, 2013: I departed on a two week study abroad trip to Germany.

June 4, 2013 (Day 46): The Chancellor sent a letter to the grievance committee, and mailed a copy to me, asking the committee to make another recommendation within a month. (exhibit ZA-2). 9 month faculty are unavailable during the summer effectively stalling any investigation for three months. This, along with other delays I have suffered in my grievance process, are in violation of Wisconsin statute 111.36(3) (appendix VIII). I asked for a full investigation into this matter on Nov 17, 2012, over seven months ago, and almost no progress has been made. My grievance has been unnecessarily delayed at almost every level including the Chancellor's office.