

Evidence that Dr. Caywood runs a sexist department and practices favoritism towards Mr. Dutelle and his FI program:

1. In fall 2012 Dr. Caywood did not accept HR Director Jeanne Durr's and Dean Liz Throop's explanation that I handled the student complaint from Oct. 10, 2012 appropriately but instead published his own procedures for handling student complaints and condemned my actions at a department meeting in front of my peers. This led to me being isolated in the department. Other department members know that openly supporting someone against Dr. Caywood is potentially damaging to their career.
2. At the Nov. 15, 2012 department meeting Dr. Caywood made unfavorable comments about Dean Throop and Provost Nimocks suggesting that they blew a student complaint out of proportion.
3. In 2009 Mr. Dutelle used the fact that he had applied with Upper Iowa University to leverage his position in the application process to gain faculty status in FI starting in the 2009/2010 year. His leveraging was instrumental in his ability to get a deal giving him 2 years toward tenure and a salary that appears to be higher than Ph.D. faculty members in the same department. In contrast when Dr. Amy Nemmetz mentioned to Dr. Caywood that she was a finalist for a position with Las Loras University in Dubuque, IA, Dr. Caywood said at least twice to me in early 2010 that "he doesn't accept blackmail and he'll be happy to write her a letter of recommendation for Las Loras." Dr. Caywood brought up the issue of her "blackmail" repeatedly at search & screen meetings in 2010 and again in 2011. 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).
 - a. 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.
4. In fall 2009 Mr. Dutelle wrote his own job advertisement. I was part of the search and screen committee in 2009/10. At various meetings the categories for the job descriptions were discussed and customized to give Dutelle great advantage by narrowly specifying the job description to suit him perfectly thereby discouraging other applicants not meeting those

specific qualifications. A department member (who I will leave unnamed at this point) stated that the member overheard a conversation between Dutelle and Caywood where Dutelle stated that he wrote the advertisement in a way that no one else should be able to apply.

- a. We had 2 other applicants who were very quickly dismissed as potential candidates. As a new department member and new to the academic hiring process I found this odd. My desire, however, was to fit in and do well in the department and I did not express my concerns at that time. Mr. Dutelle was the only candidate invited to campus as a finalist for that position and he was offered the job. In contrast; another faculty position search in 2011 failed to fill the position. Dr. Joe Lefevre was the only finalist for this position and he was rejected because there were “not enough candidates from which to choose.” Dr. Lefevre has since accepted a position at another school. He seems to feel as though he was treated unfairly.
 - b. The Forensic Investigation program now allows candidates with nothing more than a 1 year online Master degree to be full faculty members with the same or higher salary and benefits than Ph.D. faculty in Criminal Justice. Forensic Investigation programs at other higher education schools above community college level typically require a Ph.D. in CJ or in science for their faculty positions.
 - c. At the last 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.
5. 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. 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.
6. Dr. Caywood has made exceptions for Mr. Dutelle which allowed him to “double-dip,” getting paid by the university and also pursuing jobs for the Dept. of Defense which even took him overseas during regular semester (most recently during spring 2010 semester). His students had to make do with online assignments instead of classroom sessions during his paid absence. At DRB reviews Mr. Dutelle repeatedly received community service credit for his paid involvement

in summer high school Forensic Camp as well as his outreach to high schools for prospective students, for which he received paid release time from Dr. Caywood. In contrast I have volunteered numerous unpaid hours for various projects as community service. While Mr. Dutelle was ranked “outstanding” for community service in all his DRB evaluations I was repeatedly ranked lower than him.

7. Our new faculty member Dr. Lorne Gibson received an average ranking for community service on his first and second year DRB evaluations even though he had nothing listed in this category. I listed over three volunteer activities and was also given “average” in my first evaluation. Given that I have put in more time and done so as a volunteer rather than for pay, I can only assume a different standard is being applied to me than is being applied to Dr. Gibson and to Mr. Dutelle.
8. In a DRB review my student evaluations added up to over 4.2 (outstanding) but I was ranked “above average.” Both Mr. Dutelle and Dr. Gibson received “outstanding” with similar student evaluations. I brought up this double-standard in a letter to former DRB chair Joe Lomax on 1/21/2011 to which Lomax responded on 1/23/2011: “I received and read your concern and I lean in favor of your argument.”
9. Since the Oct. 10, 2012 student complaint Dr. Caywood (please see timeline for documentation):
 - a. Has repeatedly refused to answer my questions
 - b. Ignores my emails on a regular basis
Ex: Oct. 16, 2012 (10:58 am & 4:53 pm): In 2 emails I informed Dr. Caywood about and invited him to the filming and interviewing of myself and my class the next day by the Iowa television news station KCRG. I never received a response from Dr. Caywood.
 - c. Has argued that he does not have to explain his negative actions or comments toward me
 - d. Has not given me credit where credit is due (accomplishment in undergraduate research & presentations, bringing a restorative justice program on campus, being interviewed by KCRG News, bringing prospective students on campus, doing PACCE projects, gaining grants etc.)
 - e. Has been condescending and demeaning
 - f. Has thrown stumbling blocks in my path toward advancement
10. In photos of the homecoming banquet and other social function 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.
11. 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.

12. I have been assigned, in my opinion, the least desirable office in the CJ department. Out of 12 total offices in our department 6 have windows. Of the 6 offices with windows 5 are occupied by males, including Mr. Dutelle. My qualifications should rightfully elevate me in seniority above at least 3 of the males with window offices and 4 if you count Joe Lomax, who retired from the department in December 2012 and now teaches as an adjunct instructor and whom I consider a friend and mentor. The business department with which we share the suite in Ullsvik routinely reassigns the more prestigious offices to faculty with higher credentials and/or seniority; a common practice in most schools.
13. 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.
14. 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.
15. Dr. Caywood has given Mr. Dutelle advantage after advantage. Mr. Dutelle has received release time to attract prospective students for the FI program that allows him to teach fewer courses and devote university paid time to writing and advertising his books. Mr. Dutelle assigned the former LTE for the FI program, Kim Sargent, to type part of his book. Using university personnel for personal gain seems a misuse of funds. I would appreciate some release time as well so I can apply the donation of AT&T for a cyber-crime curriculum as well as pursuing my offers to publish. I would also appreciate an LTE to type portions of my books.

- a. I have been teaching 5 courses and supervise multiple unpaid directed studies and still make much less money than Mr. Dutelle, who makes more than all of the PhD's in our department with the exception of the chair and Dr. Fuller. (see attached pay comparison for 2011-2012)
 - b. 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 and Dr. Anderson wrote letters for the FDRA grant proposal in early 2011 in which they guaranteed that I would be relieved of duties if I were to receive the sabbatical grant. While I was on sabbatical, however, Dr. Caywood, on Feb. 24, 2012 (9-10 am), assigned me to develop a short study abroad program to Germany so CJ students could explore the German CJ system. 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 have 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.
16. 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." In recent years our department lost qualified Ph.D.s like Dr. Susan Hilal, Dr. Amy Nemmitz, Dr. Joe Lefevre and others. Dr. Fuller also explored outside employment and I feel pushed to do the same.
17. In spring 2010 LAE did an investigation on sexual harassment charges brought forward by Dr. Fuller against Dr. Caywood. As a result the Dean 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.
18. 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.
19. Another investigation was done by former Associate Dean Dr. Bunte who 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 dean's office, shows that he is not interested in improving communications within the department and supports my claim of gender discrimination.

20. 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 reject Dr. Caywood's affirmation that Mr. Dutelle is the "logical choice" for prestigious assignments. 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.

- a. 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 contains wording and thoughts that seem eerily similar to Mr. Dutelle's wording and thoughts which he expressed at a private meeting I had with him in his office on Nov. 19, 12-12:30 pm at which 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 or helped write Dr. Caywood's letter of Jan 24, 2013. It seems that Dr. Caywood and Mr. Dutelle are conspiring against me.
- b. Mr. Dutelle was a police officer at a department outside of Denver, CO, for 5 years. He then got a 1 year online master degree in a Forensic Investigation program from a school in Southern California. Clearly his qualifications in academia are quantifiably inferior to mine. I was the first women 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 for several years now 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.

21. After the student complaint Dr. Caywood began assigning me only lower level classes to teach while instructors with lower qualifications than myself were assigned higher level courses.
22. 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 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.
23. During the entire fall semester, 2012, Dr. Caywood showed little interest in supporting or advertising my Short Study Abroad Trip to Germany, scheduled for June 2013, for students to explore the German criminal justice system, a program he assigned me to develop in March 2012. I have worked several months on putting the program together, securing German state subsidized food & lodging for our students at a German Police Command College/Academy.