

I feel I must be like Paul Harvey and tell you the rest of story in the context of the department's history. The criminal justice department has been a stand-alone department since 1971. The department in the 70s and 80s had as many as 500 majors. When President Reagan dismantled the LEEP program numbers started dropping to lows of 300+ in the mid-80s and early 90s. I was hired in 1991. The department included Robert Warfield, David Van Buren, Joe Lomax, Kathy Winz and Stephen Walters. Stephen helped me develop the research method course. The first new cj course in years. I learned quickly how to navigate the politics (turf protection) of curriculum committees. Cheryl Fuller replaced Stephen, who left because the DRB would not support his promotion to full professor. Cheryl and I worked to start a graduate program. Charlotte Stokes was the dean and Ralph Curtis was the provost. This was envisioned as a traditional on campus program. Chancellor Markee was interested in cost recover on line programs. He was supportive of the on line approach. We proposed the graduate program and it was approved by the Board of Regents. While Dr. Markee was supportive, we later learned his support did not include any additional positions or resources. So we developed a graduate program with the faculty we had. I developed 3 graduate courses for the program. Cheryl and I were the department's representatives to the graduate program. Project Management was created as a graduate on line program and engineering also created an on line graduate program. Both coordinators reported directly to their respective deans. Cheryl eventually becomes the director of the criminal justice graduate program.

In 2003 Provost Carol Sue Butts asked department chair, Joe Lomax, whether we as a department could develop a forensic related program. The department had the backing of the administration through the entire development process providing funding and more importantly positions to start the forensic investigation program. A nation-wide search was held late 2003 and early 2004. Aric Dutelle was hired, as academic staff, to start the FI program beginning Fall 2004. He has a Master's degree in forensic sciences. We had several FI classes approved through all related curriculum committees by the time Aric arrived on campus for the Fall semester. Not everyone in the department was supportive of the FI program or of Mr. Dutelle's qualifications (Cheryl Fuller and Susan Hilal). All of this while we were on the 4th floor of Warner. There were some contentious times in the hallways and at department meetings. At a department function at my home Cheryl and Susan standing in my kitchen encouraged me to run against Joe Lomax for chair. Which I did. Come time for faculty to vote on the chair only two votes were cast. One for me and one for Joe. Everyone else abstained. Silly me I voted for myself. Kathy Winz voted for Joe. Mittie Nimocks was the dean at the time. While trying to figure out what to do Cheryl and Susan went to Mittie to express their desire to see Joe removed. I became chair by default. I'd been played like a cheap guitar and Joe got shafted. I became chair in 2006. Between 2004 and 2006 4 faculty members had been hired by the department. Aric, Susa Hilal, Dale Kapla and Laura Khorhy. Susan and Cheryl's behavior toward Aric continued to escalate to the point where I had to sit Susan down to tell her to stop. Susan left the next year to accept a faculty position in Minneapolis (where she has family). Dale stayed one year as he accepted a position at a university in upper Michigan about 20 miles from his home town. We helped Laura with her moving expenses to get her here from back east. She stayed a year before accepting a position at UW Parkside, where her husband had been teaching for several years. So basically UW Platteville paid for her move to the mid-west so she could get a position at Parkside. To say I took over a harmonious department would be a mistake.

In January 2008 the criminal justice department moved from Warner Hall to the suites in Ullsvik. Office space was assigned by seniority. Cj chair and the director of the graduate program were assigned the two largest offices. Tenure track faculty and academic staff by seniority picked which office each wanted. Kathy Winz opted not to take a window office as she was retiring May 2008. So the senior staff picked windowed offices. Junior staff picked remaining offices. That was the way it was then that is the way it is now. Joe Lomax retired in December 2012. He was granted emeritus status and has not moved out of his windowed office. As soon as he does Sabina, who is next in seniority will be able to move if she wants.

Over the years we have had a number of failed searches. One year we had two new hires and both backed out during the summer. We have been continuously trying to get faculty hired to bring us up to full strength.

Amy Nemmetz and Joe LeFevre were hired in the fall of 2007 as academic staff. We were scrambling to fill positions (see above). Amy was Cheryl's pick from the start. Amy had a master's degree and work experience. Joe LeFevre had a master's degree and was a police officer in Platteville. Both met the minimum requirements and were hired. After being hired both Amy and Joe began working toward on-line doctorates. Both did eventually received Ph. Ds.

There became a time when the department was advertising for a tenure track position that academic staff began applying for those position even when they did not meet the qualifications. With Cheryl's backing Amy began applying for every tenure track position posted. One case in particular that Sabina makes reference to was when Amy applied for the research position posted. Amy had no research experience outside of research papers for classes or the secondary data source she used for her dissertation. She was not qualified for the position and as a member of the department I had a right to express my view as other members had expressed their views. Both the Provost (Mittie Nimocks) and the Director of HR (Jean Durr) questioned me about Amy's qualifications. The Provost accepted my explanation that Amy did not have the background for the position. The HR Director on the other hand even made the comment to me that "we sure would like to keep Pete (Amy's husband and physical plant employee) as he is such a good supervisor." Shortly after that and just before the Fall semester started Amy resigned from the CJ department to accept the position as director of first year experiences at a salary about double what she was making in an academic staff position. Leaving me scrambling to find someone to replace her. Joe LeFevre applied for and was hired as the new director of the forensic program at Fox Valley Technical College. His salary went from \$36,000 as an academic staff to nearly \$80,000 in the new position. Joe original came to Platteville from the Fox Valley area. So he got a better paying job closer to his family home.

When Amy resigned in late July 2011 we were short not only a lecturer but also the undergraduate on line coordinator. We did not have time to advertise or conduct a search for a replacement with such time constraints. Dana had a master's degree from UW-Platteville and had worked for Target in loss prevention. She had on line experience and work related experience. I approached Provost Nimocks and Ms. Durr, Director of HR, to see if it would be possible to issue a 2 year only contract. We could fill the position immediately and have time as a department to decide how to proceed in filling this tenure

track position. So did I hand pick Dana Cecil? Yes I did with the approval of the Provost and Director of HR. Dana knew from day 1 she had a two year contract with no promise of anything beyond that time frame.

Fall 2012. We started the semester with 2 new hires; Dr. Rex Reed with a corrections emphasis and Danelle Bemis in the FI program with a masters in forensic sciences. Due to her lack of teaching experience she was hired as teaching academic staff. We were still short of faculty. By the end of semester we had 5 different searches ongoing. Funding was available from Distance Learning to hire a full time on line faculty member who would be on campus in the cj department. Cheryl chairs this committee. Aric Dutelle volunteered to chair the search committee for Joe Lomax's replacement. With the new dean Elizabeth Throop we were able to split the tenure track/ undergraduate coordinator position (the Susan Hilal, Amy Nemmetz and Dan Cecil CJ 1 position) merge the .25 outreach coordinator (part of Joe Lomax's position) and create a new TSI position of .25 outreach coordinator, .5 undergraduate on line coordinator and .25 teaching academic staff. The CJ1 position converted back to a straight tenure track position. It was decided early on with the approval of the dean and director of HR to reduce the number of different search committees and allow each committee to search for multiple positions. That is how Lorne Gibson became chair of 2 searches and Aric Dutelle became head of 2 searches.

I would to speak briefly about my relationship to Cheryl Fuller. I will not go into great detail but an explanation is needed in context with this grievance. At the start there were three on line graduate programs; criminal justice, project management and engineering. Project management is a stand-alone graduate program with no undergraduate connection. Bill Haskins reports directly to dean of BILSA. Lisa Riedle was the coordinator of the engineering masters and reported to dean of EMS. Cheryl felt she should not have to report to a department chair when the other coordinators reported to a dean. The Board of Regents gave the criminal justice department permission to develop a graduate program. The master's program belongs to the criminal justice department. In the beginning Cheryl was on a 9 month contract just like the rest of the department. Cheryl convinced Carol Sue Butts to make this a 12 month contract and expanded Cheryl's duties without consulting the department. Cheryl had free reign to run the graduate program as she liked with little input from the department. This has been a major bone of contention with the faculty members. She eventually was able to report directly to the dean. She had total control of the graduate program she determined who was accepted into the program, who took which courses, when a student would graduate. She had total control over student. The department had no say over who she contracted to teach courses, to revise courses or to develop courses. The department had lost control of the graduate program. As department chair I had no say on any aspect of the program Cheryl even had her own separate budget which I was not privy to. She could spend money any way she wanted without any control. I had tried for years to gain control of the graduate program without receiving support from the previous dean. To make a long story short Dean Throop supported the department's desire to regain control of the graduate program. Cheryl could work with me and the department or she could step down. As a result Cheryl and I have had a good working relationship and she is trying to get on campus faculty involved in the graduate program. She is trying and so am I.

I would like to make a few general statements and then I will get to the specific charges. This is my sixth year as department chair I've been in the cj department 22 years. There are over a thousand students in the criminal justice program whether on campus or on line. Students may receive a bachelor's degree in criminal justice on campus or on-line; they may pursue a forensic investigation degree on campus or obtain a master's degree in criminal justice on line. We have 11 full time faculty on campus including Dr. Fuller who is full time director of the graduate program. There are also a number of adjunct lecturers on campus and on line. I am ultimately responsible for all.

The criminal justice department is a hierarchical organization where faculty report to the chair, the chair reports to the dean, who reports to the provost, who reports to the chancellor. We are just like any other academic department on campus. Faculty governance is the force behind academics on this campus. The faculty hand book is very specific in handling complaints and grievances. If a faculty member has a complaint or grievance against another faculty member faculty guidelines describe the process. This committee is the appropriate governing body not the director of HR. Nowhere in our hand book does it say the HR gets involved in faculty governance issues.

I can empathize with Sabina in regard to work, health, and family. The numerous email complaints sent by Sabina have taken a toll on my work environment as I am often caught between her, other faculty in C.J. , Dean Throop, HR and the Provost. Much of my time this school year has been dealing with her actions, reactions, and disgruntled behavior. In September I was transported by ambulance to Madison due to a pulmonary embolism (blood clots in the lungs). I've had stress test due to reoccurring chest pains. I've had a CAT scan due to the development of cluster head-aches. Even though this condition is not directly related to the work related stress the medication requires constant monitoring via blood tests. When dealing with health issues is never good to have work related stress added to the problem. My mother in law passed away on March 3 of this year. Three days later my brothers and I put our mother in hospice. Her days with us are limited. We all have family issues to deal with. It is part of life.

There are 2 points that I believe explain much of what has happened with Dr. Burton. The first is an exchange of emails between her and I that happened between May 31st and June 1st 2012. The second point is a conversation Sabina had with my wife last summer.

Email A is a series of emails between Sabina occurring on May 31st and June 1st. Part 1 is Sabina inquiring about her summer intern load. She lets me know she had received an unsolicited job offer and she may have to entertain future offers if her income diminished. My reply in part 2 explains how interns are divided up. I also replied if opportunities were available elsewhere I wished her the best. I took this as a veil threat. Part 3 is her reply about her concerns for salary issues. (at the end of this report is an appendix listing of all the on campus overloads or additional courses she has taught). It seem like economic issues was becoming a major concern. The second point is a conversation she had

with my wife last summer (July) while attending a social function at the invitation of a mutual friend, Dr. Burton made numerous complaints to my wife about the University. She complained about Dr. Fuller and her management of the C.J. graduate program. She also complained about the students and the quality of the Master's program. She calmed down a bit after her husband gave her a nudge with his elbow. Dr. Burton did make it clear to my wife that she was going to follow Dr. Fuller's method to get what she wanted. This method includes emails to upper administration and human resources without communication with the department chair. At the time my wife thought it strange that Dr. Burton would share this strategy with her.

In the fall my wife happened to stop by the C.J. Department. As she passed Dr. Burton's office she stopped to say, "Hello". My wife asked about Dr. Burton's parents and asked if they would be visiting from Germany this fall. Dr. Burton informed by wife her parents would not be making the trip due to health concerns and then proceeded to complain about the UW-Platteville administration. Apparently, Dean Throop had some questions about a grant proposal Dr. Burton was writing. My wife told me she was unable to have a pleasant conversation with Dr. Burton about her family since she only wanted to list her complaints with UW-Platteville.

Listed below are specific issues I would like to address.

1. I will start with the most recent incident. Development of a graduate CJ course. October 4, 2012 an email from Dr. Fuller, director of cj graduate program, to Sabina RE: new course development – first time offering Spring 2014 see email #1. October 22, 2012 an email from Cheryl to Sabina stating Cheryl had until late January to submit approved development contract to DLC email #2. Email # 3 is a series of emails on November 14th about course development in an effort to get everything to the Grad Council for the December Meeting. It did not happen.

Email # 4 from Cheryl to Sabina about the course development. This email is dated February 12th 2013.

On March 18th Sabina's proposal was placed in my mailbox. The Graduate Council was scheduled to meet on Thursday March 21st. I reviewed the proposal and had several concerns. I met with Dr. David Van Buren, dean of the graduate school late in the day on March 19th. Before his current position in the University Administration, Dave was a long time member of the criminal justice department. He is a leading expert in faculty governance and well versed in how the graduate council operates. I wanted to get Dave's advice on Sabina's proposal. He had objections to some of the wording and the focus of the course. Exhibit A is my hand written note to Cheryl on Sabina's proposal making suggestions. The intent was to ensure passage at the Graduate Council without objections from other members of the Council. Email #5 is my email to Sabina indicating I spoke with Dave and as is, he didn't think it would pass. Included is her response to me. Email #6 is a series of emails between Dave Van Buren, Sabina and I.

I believe this is Sabina's first course submitted to the Grad Council. I don't believe she has every submitted a course to the undergraduate Curriculum Committee. I have done both. I have served on the grad council and the college curriculum committee. I know the politics of getting a course approved. Dave's and my intent were to make sure it would be approved without any trouble. Why not take the advice of the Dean of the Graduate School. Email #7 is a series of emails. Part 2 is from Dave where he

thought the topic looked fine but expressed concerns about references to “training” and the areas of the document that seemed to allude to the technical side of computer security issues.

Email #8 dated Thursday at 10:15 AM March 21st when Sabina sent an updated proposal for him to review. Dave was going to include this on the agenda. Once Sabina made the changes I signed off on the form and took it to the Dean’s office for her signature. I approved Sabina’s proposal when she made minor modifications.

2. AAFS (American Academy of Forensic Science) Conference. Email # 9 Sabina informs me she is submitting abstracts of 3 students for the February meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences. My response was “sounds good.”

Email # 10 Part 1 Sabina is asking for funding from the department for her and her students. Part 2 is me asking her if the department had not provided funding for a conference she and students went to in the Fall semester. Part 3 she confirms I had. But she wanted more funding. Not in the 21 years I’ve been here has the CJ department provided funding to a faculty member for 2 different conferences. Diana Johnson asked for funding for her and several students to attend the national conference in February 2013, as this is the preeminent organization for forensic sciences. Exhibit B is a University press release about Dr. Burton and her students who attended the conference. Reading this release you would not know that Professor Johnson and several of her students (1 did an oral panel presentation) were also at that conference nor would you learn that Diana Johnson is the president elect of this national organization.

The issue becomes how to fund faculty and student going to their first conference and then deny a faculty member and students from going to their second conference. There were sufficient amounts in the CJ Foundation account to fund both groups so I decided it would be easier to fund both groups. Email # 11 is an email to both faculty members indicating \$250 for each student and \$200 for each faculty member. Faculty members could also apply for funding from the Dean’s office for conferences.

Issue 3 Submission of 3 separate PACCE Projects. Sabina puts these PACCE projects in my mailbox on February 12, 2013 for my approval. I reviewed her projects which seemed to me to be very labor intensive (Exhibit C). I was aware of her addition overloads and was concerned she was doing too much. Part 1 of Email #12 I raise my concern that she was doing too much. In fact for the Spring 13 semester she was teaching a current topics course as an overload, she had 1 intern she was supervising, and one graduate seminar paper (all of which she was receiving additional funds) she was also developing a short study abroad trip to Germany. I did not force her to develop this study abroad course. Part 2 is her reply. Part 3 informs her I signed the paperwork and put in her mailbox.

Issue 4 DRB files: I’ve been the chairman of the CRSTC in the past and seen first-hand some of the problems faculty have had with DRB files. URSTPC guidelines are very specific about DRB files that include what goes in each section and the size of the folder of 1 inch. As a courtesy for all non-tenured faculty I review their DRB files to ensure files are in compliance with current URSTPC guideline. It was not until I looked at her file did I realize she is going up for tenure. She had not mentioned it

beforehand. I was trying to get her to get her file to meet the requirements. Email 13 is a series of emails between Sabina, the DRB chair Elizabeth Gates and Cory Wein chair of the CRST.

With only 2 tenured faculty members in CJ (Cheryl & I) we had to go outside the department and find tenured faculty in the college to serve as tenured faculty for the purpose of deciding the tenure issue for two cj faculty members (Sabin Burton & Aric Dutelle). John Rink, Political Science and Elizabeth Gates, Psychology were approved by the dean to serve on the CJ DRB. Lizzy agreed to be the chair.

Sabina was going up for tenure a year early. I don't recall anyone going up early and getting it. Aric Dutelle was hired in the Fall of 2004 to start the Forensic Investigation Program. His was the first TSI position in the Department. He was brought in as teaching academic staff. It took 5 years to get this position as a tenure track position. A national search was conducted and he was hired in 2009. He was given 2 years toward tenure by the dean and provost. For him this was his up or out year. It is true I was hesitant about Sabina's early tenure request. I did have a conversation with Cheryl Fuller, the only other tenured faculty member in the department. We did discuss the early tenure request. Cheryl did make the argument for early tenure. Her reasoning was we should to avoid any repercussion. It wasn't worth the fight. And I agreed with her on that. It wasn't worth a fight.

Email #14 notates that the tenured faculty of the department voted unanimously to support her request for tenure. The CRST took no action on tenure as it is a matter between the tenured faculty and the chancellor.

Issue 5 student note issue: Criminal justice research methods in a class designed to educate students in part on various methods of collection data or how different types of experiments are conducted. As part of class discussion on breach experiments the faculty member (Lorne Gibson) passed a note to a female student during class. The note said "call me tonight 642-4160" this was to demonstrate one aspect of breach experiment- an effort to get a reaction. In one section when Dr. Gibson handed the note to a female student she read the note laughed out loud passed the note to other students who also laughed and the lectured continued. Nothing else was said. In the other section he did the same thing handing a note to a female student. This student looked at the note and said or did nothing. Dr. Gibson continued on with his lecture. This occurred on Wednesday October 10, 2012.

As I later learned (in an email from Dr. Burton on 10/17/12; email #15) this student contacted Dr. Burton around 4:30PM on the 10th. Dr. Burton checked my office. I was not there. I have class on Wednesdays from 3-6PM and I was in class. Sabina emailed the dean (Liz Throop) at 5:01PM as part of a longer email. Sabina spoke to another cj faculty member shortly after her email to the dean. Sabina did not notify me of the incident until about 8:30 AM the following morning (Thursday October 11th.) She showed me a note as described above, see email #16 and 16A. I was able to talk to Dr. Gibson shortly after noon on the 11th. This was the first time we were both were available to meet. In the meantime Sabina had emailed me a copy of the note. I showed and asked Dr. Gibson about the note. He explained it was part of a lecture on breach experiments and the note was an example of how to elicit a response. We talked about how the student may have misunderstood the purpose of the note. I instructed him to email both sections of research methods to explain what happened. This he did at 12:17PM (see email #17). In the

mean time I emailed Sabina with the explanation of why the note was passed. From Thursday afternoon onward I had a number of emails from the dean & Sabina email #18, & 19. By this time the Provost and Director of HR were involved in a number of emails about the incident.

The Dean directed me late Thursday evening October 11th to set up a meeting with The Director of HR, the Dean, Lorne and myself for Tuesday October 16th at 8:30 AM which I did. I am a trained investigator and I began to investigate this incident. Trying to ascertain who the student was so I could speak to her to find out what happened. I was instructed at the October 16th meeting to stop trying to speak to the student I was instructed by the HR on October the 17th to quit asking Sabina for information (email # 20). So I stopped. I was assured at the October 16th meeting that the dean or the Director of HR would contact the student. I had no further involvement in the incident. Several weeks later I had an advisee meeting with the student in question. I asked her if she had been contacted by either the Dean or Director of HR. She said she had not.

I believe the issue with the student was mishandled from the start. I was prevented from speaking to the student. Lorne and I were summons to the officer of the Director of HR and grilled by her and the dean. I was not informed of the incident until 8:30 am the next day while the dean was notified almost immediately. Sabina made no effort to contact me that evening, no email, no text message, no phone call even though she had time to contact another faculty member and email the dean. As soon as possible I spoke to Lorne Gibson to find out what happened. I had him send an email to all research methods students to explain what happened. I was not made aware of the student's name until later. Sabina's actions harken back to what she told my wife last summer.

Issue 6 ATT grant. See exhibit D my letter to Sabina concerning upcoming ATT News Release (exhibit E) to be January 28, 2013 stating the development of a new cyber security program in the criminal justice department. In this letter I laid out a series of concerns for statements made on websites owned by Dr. Burton as well as misrepresentations about a cyber-crime program. Emails #21 and #22 focus on this issue. Exhibits F & G are copies of the websites.

I had no problem with Sabina getting a grant from ATT. I was concerned about statements being made about something that did not and does not exist in the criminal justice department.

Finally I would like to address the issue of double dipping. Aric Dutelle has been involved in a number of activities out-side the classroom since he has been at UW-Platteville. He has worked with agencies of the Federal Government in recovery attempts of human remains of US citizens killed in Africa. He has been involved in forensic training for government agencies in Central and South America. We made a proposal to an agency in the federal Government of bringing criminalist from Mexico for training here on campus involving chemistry, biology and forensic investigation faculty. It was not approved. Aric and I have worked jointly on a number of federal Department of Justice grants. To date we have not been successful in obtaining federal grants. Aric has been successful in obtaining a Wisconsin Department of Justice grant to purchase photographic equipment. He has authored several books. He, along with John Rink (political science & mock trial supervisor) and Chuck Cornett (chemistry) have provided forensic camps for local high school students during the summer. Camp participants learn about evident

collection, crime lab techniques and conduct a mock trial. One semester he did teach a class aboard an aircraft carrier. He was not on campus for several weeks at the start of the semester. We had talked about class coverage. This is a classic example of a hybrid type of course (at the time no university policy governed this) He utilized D2L extensively for this class until he returned to campus. Most cj faculty members utilize D2L to some extent in their on campus classes. Aric has also lead short term study abroad classes (in Honduras) for our students just like Sabina will do this summer with her study abroad trip to Germany. Aric's underwater crime scene course focused on scuba diving, photographing and collecting physical evidence underwater. I believe for the last time students made 18 dives. Students also conducted training session on evidence collection to local and national Honduras police. An example of students conducting training and utilizing their foreign language skills. Does he double dip? Yes. I have one faculty member who teaches on line course for University out of state. I have another faculty member who is a practicing attorney with a private practice. Aric Lorene and I received a 2 year UW system grant for prior learning assessments. I believe Sabina double dips as she has taught courses for the University of Phoenix and does outside consulting.

When you look through all of the complaints leveled by Dr. Burton not once have I ever refused any of her requests? Whether it was an overload, or applying for grant or whatever. Not once. I always supported her.

An excellent example of my support of Sabina was her decision to give a graduate student a D on his seminar paper even though Dr. Fuller was pressuring her to change it to a passing grade. This started March 27, 2012, when I received a copy of the student's paper. I believe issuing of grades is a faculty issue. I did not even look at the paper. Sabina even sent a copy of the paper to the dean who also supported Sabina's decision. This went through the appeals process with a final decision issued by the Appeals Committee on September 25, 2012. I supported her 100% on this issue.

The problems arise when I question what she is doing or try to suggest changes or try to correct her when she has made false claims. So as long as she gets what she wants there are no problems. Raise an issue or concern and the emails start flying all over campus. As an example Exhibit H is an email sent to the dean and I with just a website listed. Part 2 is the dean's reply "Tom, don't respond." I don't respond to all her emails. Particularly when I am instructed not to.

Sabina's husband made an appoint to come in to talk to me. I tried to answers his questions as best I could. I then informed the dean. Her reply is Exhibit I

The only time I refused her request for an overload was for the Fall 2014 semester. I told all faculty members there would be no overloads no current topic courses because I still have 12 cj courses to staff. See email # 23 an original email sent out to all faculty members on January 8, 2013 stating there would be no overloads or current topic courses until we can get courses covered. As mentioned before we've had 5 searches on going. Email #24 is a series of emails when she asked to do an overload, my reply in part 2, her reply in part 3 and my response in part 4.

In a recent email dated April 8, I emailed faculty to see who would be interested in supervising interns this summer. Email 25 is Sabina's reply. She will be included with all other faculty members when it comes time to assign interns.

A review of emails shows that I have been supportive of Sabina as I try to be with all faculty in the criminal justice department. The record is clear I have never refused her request for anything.

Appendix: listing the history of overloads, winterum, or pre-session classes

Sabina Burton's additional teaching beyond 12 credits per semester.

Overloads or teaching during winterum or pre-session/ does not include internships during summer.

Spring 2010	CJ 4630 terrorism
Fall 2010	CJ 1130 Introduction to Criminal Justice
Winterum 2011	CJ 4630 Behavioral Profiling
Spring 2011	CJ 4630 Terrorism
Summer 2011	CJ 4630 Behavioral Profiling

Requested summer appointment in excess of 2/9

Fall 2011	CJ 1130 Intro
Winterum 2012	Psy 4830 Psychology and the law
Spring 12	CJ 4630 Domestic terrorism* 100% release for UW system grant
Summer 2012	CJ 4630 women who kill (co taught with Diana Johnson)
	CJ 3900 Research methods
Fall 2012	CJ 4630 Behavioral Profiling
Winterum 13	Psy 4830 Psychology and the law
Spring 2013	CJ 4630 cyber crime

- Cj 4630 is the current topic course number and a 3 credit course

CJ 4880 intern (1) this is an 8 credit course

List does not include any contracts she received from the graduate program.

