

My Remarks to the Transcript of Grievance Hearing (exhibit ZM):

My comments concerning the audio transcript are (underlined and enclosed in parenthesis.)

CD I

Track 39: Dr. Caywood: The problem results when I question what she is doing, not that she is doing something. (Dr. Caywood views my complaints as the problem. I am complaining about legitimate concerns. He retaliates against me BECAUSE I dare to ask why he is retaliating against me and in so doing he violates Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (appendix VIII) (appendix IV).)

Track 41: Dr. Caywood: (Speaking of the course proposal that he marked in red ink.) If I wrote it out in, in red pen, it's probably the only thing I had in my hand at the time. (This is ridiculous. Everyone who has been to school knows that red ink is what you hate to see all over your papers. Dr. Caywood knows that red ink sends the message that "I am grading your paper. The more red ink I use the worse your paper is." He has not used red ink for any other paper I have received from him. He used red ink to show his dominance over me, to show me who is boss, because he was angry, to humiliate me.)

Track 42: Dr. Caywood: I think any time a concern is raised she sees it as a challenge to her personally. It's not, I'm responsible for every member of the criminal justice department. Part of that responsibility is looking out for the well being of all of the faculty as well as looking out for what is the best interest as a whole. (A glimpse of what Dr. Caywood perceives as my wrong doing. He sees my mistake as "taking his concerns as a challenge to me personally." That is why he retaliates. He views my complaints as THE PROBLEM and he retaliates against me BECAUSE I complain. This violates Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (appendix VIII) (appendix IV). I do take many of his concerns personally because they are cumulatively damaging my personal, as well as my professional, well being. I am being wronged on a continuing basis and I am not willing to take it anymore. He admits that he is responsible for looking out for the well being of faculty members but he didn't even respond to my doctor's note and request for a window office to reduce eye strain. He is not looking out for my well being.)

CD II

Track 9: Board Member: “Just reading what I read, it did have the feel like the rug was pulled out from under you (Dr. Burton). “ (It feels that way to me as well.)

Track 14: Board Member: “The aftermath of that student complaint seems to be a critical component in our current situation.” (This is correct. The student complaint catalyzed Dr. Caywood into intensifying his retaliation against me.)

Track 18: Dr. Caywood: I had no control over the salaries. I had no control over what was offered to him (Mr. Dutelle) when the person was hired. (It may be true that he had no control over the base salary but he certainly had influence that helped Mr. Dutelle gain two years toward tenure. Dr. Caywood was also in a position to offer Mr. Dutelle lucrative opportunities that allowed him to make almost double the amount I made in pay over base salary in the past two years (exhibit ZC). How can someone with a one year online master’s degree make \$22,000 more in extra annual pay than someone with a full PhD from a prestigious school unless favoritism is involved?)

Track 41: Board Member what are your thoughts about the way that you handled that departmental meeting afterwards subsequent (to the student complaint)?

Dr. Caywood: It was probably handled poorly, on that. Uh, You know if, if a student has a complaint against a faculty member and they come to me I try to say you go talk to the faculty member first. If they make a complaint, if a student makes a complaint about some other faculty member, send them to me. And I will, I think as the chair, I may be wrong but if a student has a complaint against faculty member x they should come to me and say “I have a problem about faculty member x” and then I would check into it, ok? But..

Board Member: Unintelligible... female doesn’t want to talk to a male?

Dr. Caywood: Well, see, I didn’t know that. I didn’t know that!

(This is absurd. He knew very early that the student didn’t want to talk to a male.)

So, was the whole thing handled poorly? Yes. I think, I think, it was handled, you know, I did not handle it very well.

You know, I misunderstood what was going on. I did not see it as sexual harassment and, you know, when we had the meeting with the Dean and HR it was brought to my attention that that's what this is.

(In his email of October 11, 2012 8:19 PM (exhibit EZW) Dr. Caywood wrote "This sounds exactly what he did - pass a note to a student which is a violation of a commonly accepted norm. Particularly inappropriate behavior since we all received the warning from the Dean about student contact." [sic] I told Dr. Caywood on Oct 11, 2012 at 9:31 PM that this issue was about sexual harassment (exhibit EA) long before his meeting with HR and the Dean. This is another of his lies.

And so did I screw up, oh yea, yea. But then, nothing has been done since then either.

(Here are two things Dr. Caywood said that I agree with. He screw up and nothing has been done. I have been stonewalled in my efforts to fix the rampant dysfunction in my department and nothing has been done.)

So I, I and again, I don't know, that's what the student told me. Maybe there was something else and if there was maybe I should have been informed, you know, you didn't do this right.

(What does he think I have been saying all along? What does he think Jean Durr meant when she told him on Oct 17, 2012 (exhibit EZL) that I "acted quite appropriately" and "Please cease further communication on this topic" and "I do not want there to be any perception that we are retaliating against one of our employees for advocating for, or protecting the interests of our students?" He doesn't listen when he is told that he did something wrong, especially when he is told by a woman, and that is part of the problem.)

Track 43: Board Member: It comes across as if you had uhm, legitimate and great concerns about Dr. Gibson's reputation and let's make sure that we get the facts before we move forward. It doesn't come across that you had the same sensitivity for Dr. Burton.

Dr. Caywood: Um huh. Ok. Ok. Sure, I, I think I did I probably handled it very poorly. But, I can't go back. Next time, you know, it will be handled differently.

(Though Dr. Caywood has admitted to handling the situation "very poorly" he has not apologized. He has not made any effort to set things right. He still is angry with my complaints. I fully expect that, given his past performance, he will continue to retaliate against me whenever he thinks he can get away with it. He says he "can't go back." He doesn't see any way to set things right; no apology necessary, nothing he can do to set it right.)

Track 44: Board Member: What I see was that this was, it was the departmental meeting where things really changed um, in the way that Dr. Burton started to see her support from you, specifically um, and the department in general. And I think that that, again, I can empathize with your desire to say, Let's let's, let's deal with what's in house if there's an issue. Or the fact that we screwed up, let's make sure that we kind of deal with it with ourselves before we move out. But it does come across as you you, hung her out to dry.

(This is a correct assessment of the situation.)