



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN  
**PLATTEVILLE**  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES

Jennifer Sloan Lattis  
Senior System Legal Counsel  
University of Wisconsin System Administration  
Office of General Counsel  
1808 Van Hise Hall  
1220 Linden Dr.  
Madison, WI 53706

June 24, 2013

Dear Ms. Lattis,

Enclosed are copies of Dr. Burton's complaint and Dr. Caywood's response. Thank you for your help with this case.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Shane Drefcinski'.

Shane Drefcinski  
Professor of Philosophy/Department of Humanities  
(608) 342-1828  
drefcins@uwplatt.edu

**Grievance: Dr. Caywood, chairman of the Department of Criminal Justice, practices retaliation, sexual discrimination and favoritism.**

The material in this packet is for settlement purposes only and should be used solely for that purpose. All statements are to the best of my recollection and knowledge.

1. Employers are required to post notices to all employees advising them of their rights under the laws EEOC enforces and their right to be free from retaliation. These notices are, as of 3/26/2013, nowhere posted in our department area.

2.  
3.  
4.  
5. Dr. Caywood's support for my efforts in bringing a cyber-security program to UW-Platteville was suddenly withdrawn without warning or explanation. He has not considered me for chair positions of search and screen committees for which I am qualified. He has treated me in a demeaning and unfair way. I have repeatedly asked Dr. Caywood why he has been treating me this way but I have received no answers, in fact, I have been told by our Affirmative Action Officer and HR Director Jeanne Durr that Dr. Caywood is not required to answer my questions. Dr. Caywood has also ignored Jeanne Durr's requests to meet with her about this matter. In the absence of any other viable excuse, explanation, or reason for his inappropriate behavior I have come to the logical conclusion that he is retaliating against me because he disapproved of the way I handled a student complaint. I handled the student complaint according to UWP guidelines and do not deserve the retaliation I am suffering.

6. Dr. Caywood has been the subject of previous sexual harassment/discrimination claims. I supported him when I was questioned about my experiences in that regard because at the time I had not personally witnessed harassment or discrimination. I would like to re-open those investigations and update my testimonies. He runs a sexist department and practices favoritism towards Mr. Dutelle.

support for  
2 His attitude toward me changed after the student complaint of Oct 10, 2012. I now find it very difficult to communicate with him and on numerous occasions he has ignored my email messages altogether. In the second half of December, after my husband had a discussion with Dr. Caywood the tension at work seemed to improve. Then on Jan 24, 2013 Dr. Caywood withdrew his support for my cyber-crime efforts in a harsh letter. The letter came only days before I was to accept a \$7,000 ceremonial grant check for a cyber-security program at UW-Platteville. As Dr. Caywood was aware, the actual monetary grant had already been deposited with the school weeks before. Dr. Caywood convinced the Dean of LAE that I had been misrepresenting facts when I had not. His lies to Dean Throop resulted in an embarrassing and defamatory email that was cc'd to an AT&T official and may have ruined my chance of getting additional funding from them. Also, probably as a result of his lies my name was not mentioned in the official press release celebrating the donation though I was solely responsible

UW-P 005466

for attaining the grant. My name on that press release would have given me valuable credibility in my future attempts at gaining grant money from other sources.

I don't see how I can justify spending the AT&T donation on a cyber-crime program development that no longer has the support of my department chair. I don't see any alternative to informing Wisconsin AT&T that the CJ Department no longer backs my cyber-security endeavor so I must return what is remaining of the donation.

*effects of 2*  
I am concerned for my other projects as well. I am unsure whether I can continue the efforts I have put into the restorative justice program that I brought on campus last year, which resulted in research opportunities for our students and in 15 students going through mediation training and ultimately being certified restorative justice mediators. I am unsure if I can further pursue the cold case project that I have been working on with 25 year FBI veteran Steve Moore, who asked me to be part of a team of retired FBI agents and assist in evaluating unsolved murder cases. Mr. Moore also invited me to be part of a new planned television series called "On Further Review." The TV producers and Steve Moore would like me to be one of their academic advisors and film me and my students working on cold case research. I fully expect that Dr. Caywood, if given the opportunity, would try to harm my other projects as he has harmed my cyber-crime project.

My health has suffered, my family has suffered. I have been bullied, humiliated, and discriminated against. I have spent much time explaining my position to Dr. Caywood, Dr. Throop, Jeanne Durr, Dr. Wilson and now the grievance committee instead of pursuing my publication offers, research and funding opportunities, and guiding undergraduate research.

*quested  
remedy*  
I hope I can finally get some answers to the questions I have been asking. I believe I am entitled to an official apology, a remedy, and an assurance that I will be treated fairly in the future. I want and deserve the opportunity to give my best efforts and undivided attention to UW-Platteville and our students.

I have met with foot dragging, indifference and even counter-accusations from others I have gone to for help in this matter. I asked the LAE Dean and the Affirmative Action Officer and HR Director Jeanne Durr multiple times to officially investigate Dr. Caywood's retaliation against me with no noticeable results.

Although I don't have tenure yet, and feel vulnerable in my employment, I am not willing to compromise my values and my dedication to justice so I am pushing this grievance forward knowing that it could affect my career.

I ask you to give serious consideration to my grievance and act swiftly to set this right.

UW-P 005467

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sabina Burton". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Sabina Burton, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor, Criminal Justice

March 25, 2013

**UW-P 005468**

# Index

1. Cover Letter: Grievance: Dr. Caywood, chairman of the Department of Criminal Justice, practices retaliation, sexual discrimination and favoritism
2. Index
3. Evidence that Dr. Caywood runs a sexist department and practices favoritism towards Mr. Dutelle and his FI program
4. Timelines:
  - a. Timeline of events surrounding the student complaint of Oct 10, 2012
  - b. Dr. Caywood's knowledge of my activities and support for my efforts to develop a cyber-security program until Jan 24, 2013 when he suddenly and without warning or explanation withdrew his support
  - c. Search and screen chair position issue
  - d. My attempts to regain fair treatment
5. Stumbling blocks that have been unfairly placed in front of my advancement
6. Damages and Demands
7. Appendix
  - a. NSF proposal of Apr 17, 2012 for Cyber-Security program; signed by Dr. Caywood
  - b. List of persons mentioned in my grievance package, their titles and a short explanation of their involvement where necessary
  - c. Salary comparison for 2011-2012
  - d. Laws against discrimination and retaliation in the workplace
  - e. Equal Employment Opportunity notice poster and supplement
  - f. Emails and other Documentation in chronological order

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. *support for 5*
  
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). *support for 6*
  - 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 *support for 6*

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 *see context* 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.

- support for 4*
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.

- support for 6*
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."

- support for 5*
9. Since the Oct. 10, 2012 student complaint Dr. Caywood (please see timeline for documentation):
- Has repeatedly refused to answer my questions
  - 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.
  - Has argued that he does not have to explain his negative actions or comments toward me
  - 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.)
  - Has been condescending and demeaning
  - Has thrown stumbling blocks in my path toward advancement

- support for 6*
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.

- support for 2*
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.

UW-P 005473

- 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 Nemmetz, 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.

Support for 2,  
6

- 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.

## Timeline of events surrounding the student complaint:

Oct. 10, 2012 (4:30 pm): A female student approached me with her friend and showed me a note that Dr. Lorne Gibson slipped to her during her Research Methods class in the morning. The note stated: "Call me tonight!! 642-0020." The phone number is Dr. Gibson's private cell phone number. The female student was very upset and felt violated. I told her I would inform our Chair Dr. Caywood about the incident to which the student replied "I don't want to talk to a man about it." I replied that our chair must be informed but would also check with our Dean to see to whom I could refer her.

Oct. 10, 2012 (5:01 pm) I informed Dean Throop by email that a student approached me with an inappropriate note and asked whether I should take it to Dr. Caywood or Student Affairs.

Oct. 10, 2012 (5:12 pm): Dean Throop suggested that I direct the student, who received the inappropriate note, to Artanya Wesley, the dean of students.

Oct. 11, 2012 (8:15 am): I Informed Dr. Caywood in person about the student complaint.

Oct. 10, 2012 (8:25 am): I checked with Student Affairs to see if Artanya Wesley was available. Since she was not available I was referred to Kate Demerse, her assistant, whom I briefed on the incident.

Oct. 11, 2012 (11:28 am): Dr. Caywood emailed me that "Lorne explained the note as part of a breach experiment to get peoples eractions [sic.]"

Oct. 11, 2012 (1:50 pm): I emailed Dr. Caywood "May I request that we are informed of such experiments in the future. It certainly interrupted my schedule having to attend to a student who was visibly upset. I wish I knew about it before and could have put her mind at ease right away."

Oct. 11, 2012 (2:32 pm): Dr. Caywood's response: "I don't think we need to do that. That in and of itself could bias the results of the experiment. If a student is having a problem with a faculty member he or she needs to come see me and let me sort it out." This shows that Dr. Caywood believed the note to be part of an actual experiment and that the results extended outside the classroom. If he believed the event to be merely a lecture about how to conduct an experiment he would not have been concerned about biasing the results.

Oct. 11, 2012 (4:27 pm): I informed Dean Throop that Dr. Caywood told me that the incident was just an "experiment."

Oct. 11, 2012 (6:30 pm): The female student who brought forward the complaint mentioned in an email to me that Dr. Gibson had previously made her uncomfortable with statements in

class. She wrote that once he gave an example of a breach experiment as "... him walking into the class naked and what some of our reactions would be," and that it made her feel "uncomfortable hearing a male teacher say that."

Oct. 11, 2012 (8:19 pm): email to me from Dr. Caywood: He asks for the name of the student "so I can interview her." He also offers a brief definition of a breach experiment as: "In the field of social psychology, a breaching experiment is an experiment that seeks to examine people's reactions to violations of commonly accepted social rules or norms." He further explains that: "This sounds exactly what he (Dr. Gibson) 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."

Oct. 11, 2012 (9:31 pm): I asked Dr. Caywood if I was part of the experiment. This question has never been answered.

Oct. 16, 2012 (10:20 am): Dr. Caywood sent out a department email with attachment on "how we should deal with student complaints." His procedure is contrary to UW-Platteville guidelines and is against the law. He generated this procedure as a direct result of the student complaint of Oct. 11 and shows that he disapproved of the way I handled the event.

Oct. 16, 2012 (4:07 pm): I informed Dean Throop that I was uncomfortable and felt stressed by the way Dr. Caywood implied that I had mishandled the student complaint incident and his insistence that it should have been handled within the department.

Oct. 17, 2012 (8:42 am): Dr. Caywood asks for a time line, wants to know who, and when, I informed about the student complaint and whether I contacted or attempted to contact Dr. Lorne Gibson about the note.

Oct. 17, 2012 (12:09 pm): I responded to Dr. Caywood's inquiry in detail.

Oct. 17, 2012 (5:59 pm): HR Director Jeanne Durr emails Dr. Caywood directing him to "cease further communication" regarding the student complaint. "Under the circumstances Sabina acted quite appropriately." [...] "I do not want there to be any perception that we are retaliating against one of our employees ..."

Nov. 15, 2012 (8:00 am): Department meeting. Tom brought up how student complaints are supposed to be handled. They are to be brought to his attention immediately. He scoffed that "somebody overreacted and brought a student complaint all the way to the provost and everything got out of hand." (Paraphrased by S. Burton)

Nov. 17, 2012 (1:32 pm): Because Dr. Caywood had become cold to me, short with me and his actions made me feel intimidated and detracted from my ability to do my job I asked HR

UW-P 005478

Director Jeanne Durr to begin a full investigation into circumstances surrounding my reporting of the student complaint.

The following is a timeline showing that Dr. Caywood had knowledge of my activities and that I had his support for my efforts to develop a cyber-security program until Jan 24, 2013 when he suddenly and without warning or explanation withdrew his support:

February 24, 2012 (9-10 am) FI/CJ planning meeting with Dr. Caywood, Dutelle, Burton, Roberts, Michael Gay and others about cyber-program idea and forensic expansion plans.

March 27, 2012 (1-4:30 pm): Meeting with DOJ (Jack Heinemann and Ed Wall), Caywood, Dutelle, Burton, Roberts, Michael Gay to get DOJ support for forensic program and cyber-crime program proposals.

March 28, 2012 (1:13 am): Michael Gay sent email to Ed Wall, David Matthews (DOJ), cc'd to Caywood, Dutelle, Burton, Roberts, Heinemann. Refers to "expanding CJ program under Department Chair Caywood's direction." Attached DOJ 2012 Grant Outline that states: "Cyber Scholar Project: This is a competitive National Science Foundation (NSF) project to develop curriculum for undergraduate and criminal justice system continuing adult education focused on issues relating to technology and cyber-crime. The University is conducting a feasibility study of emerging trends and other program models prior to submitting the application. This is a three-year project which, if awarded, will fund at approximately \$350,000.00."

March 29, 2012 (12-1:15 pm): Cyber-scholar grant initiative meeting. Attending: Roberts, Burton, Hasker (CS), Carothers (Bus), Nelson (PS).

April 5, 2012 (1-2 pm): Mark Seitz & Liz Stower meeting arranged by Rose Smyrski. Attending: Caywood, Dutelle, Burton, Roberts, Michael Gay (discussed among others: cyber-program initiative)

April 10, 2012: Dr. Caywood informed me that a workgroup folder WG-CriminalJustice-CyberScholar.Campus.UWPlatt was created on the S drive with Caywood as owner. Access given to: Bob Roberts, Sabina Burton, Robert Hasker, Todd Carothers, Travis Nelson, Tom Caywood.

April 13, 2012: Dr. Caywood asked department members if we had any good computer forensics graduates for DNR

April 17, 2012: NSF proposal "Institutionalization of Cyber-security" at UW-Platteville submitted: Proposed was a program that would offer a BS degree in cyber-security. Dr. Caywood signed this statement on the proposal: "I certify that I have reviewed the proposal and found it to be complete, including required clearances, budget, and commitments involving space, faculty/staff time, and matching funds. In addition, I certify that all resources and other

UW-P 005480

provisions of any award will be fulfilled. Proposal was also signed by Dr. Wein for LAE, and Dr. Nimocks and supported by EMS Dean Hudson, Rob Hasker (Computer Science), Todd Carothers (Business/Accounting), and Travis Nelson (Political Science). This proposal achieved peer-review and received overall favorable consideration. However, NSF does not fund curriculum development so the grant was not awarded.

Aug. 11, 2012: Rose Smyrski, Assistant to the Chancellor, sent NSF update on Secure and Trustworthy Cyberspace (SaTC) to Hudson, Wiegman, Sherer, Burton

Aug. 12, 2012: EMS Dean Hudson sent email asking "I have to wonder if we could find opportunities for the investigation of cyber crimes??"

Aug. 21, 2012: Rose Smyrski, Assistant to the Chancellor, encouraged me to prepare another cyber-security grant application to NSF.

Aug. 30, 2012 (10:33 pm): I asked Representative Travis Tranel for assistance in finding potential donors to develop a cyber-security program at UWP.

Sept. 6, 2012 (2:30 pm): Tom Still, Wisconsin Technology Council, emails me in response to Travis Tranel's inquiry in support for my cyber-security work and plans at UWP. "We have a strong interest in the cybersecurity sector and will soon embark on constructing the Wisconsin Information Security Center as a classified place to conduct certain types of work."

Sept. 12, 2012 (2:05 pm): email from me to Dr. Caywood. "I just secured between \$5000 - \$7000 in donations/funding from AT&T for getting a cybercrime program started in our CJ department. Have been working on getting some outside funding for the past weeks. Have other ideas on how to get more funding. Jim Jermaine, the regional vice president of the company, and his associate Tricia Conway will work out donation details with Stacia Nemitz next. I have to do some write ups for AT&T as well." This email proves that Dr. Caywood knew that the donation was for the purpose of getting a cybercrime program started in our CJ department contrary to his claim of Jan 24, 2013.

Sept. 23, 2012 (10:30-11:00 am): NSF Cyber-Corps Program meeting. Roberts & Burton. Dr. Caywood was informed.

Oct. 3, 2012 (1-1:30 pm): NSF Cyber-Corps proposal meeting

Oct. 6, 2012 (10:14 pm): My Email to Dr. Caywood with a Proposal for a Cyber Security Program attached. Proposal includes announcement that I now own the following sites: Journal of Criminal Justice at [journalofcriminaljustice.org](http://journalofcriminaljustice.org) and [journalofcriminaljustice.com](http://journalofcriminaljustice.com) Journal of Cyber Security at [journalofcybersecurity.org](http://journalofcybersecurity.org) and [journalofcybersecurity.com](http://journalofcybersecurity.com). Dr. Caywood

cautioned me against the wording in these web pages on Jan 24, 2013, well over 3 months later.

Oct. 8, 2012: Dr. Caywood receives link to my planned journal for our CJ program: <http://www.journalofcriminaljustice.com>. He did not indicate any concern about the wording of the web pages until Jan 24, 2013, well over three months later. This shows that he had no objection to the wording on the web pages on Oct 6, or 8, 2012 but did object on Jan 24, 2013. The wording never changed during that time. I believe he retaliated against me because of the student complaint incident of Oct 10, 2012.

Oct. 10, 2012 (9:44 am): Dr. Caywood encourages Bob Roberts, Sponsored Programs, and I to try for another NSF funding cycle in December. After this date Dr. Caywood began his retaliation against me for the Oct 11, 2012 student complaint incident.

Oct. (date unsure) Jim Jermain, regional vice president of AT&T, stopped by my office and offered the potential for more funding for the cyber-security efforts. (Jim Jermain checked in with CJ Secretary Sheri Kratcha)

Nov, 2012: AT&T Regional Vice President James Jermain expressed to me in a visit last November that AT&T was so impressed with my efforts that they planned to donate more money in the near future.

Nov. 9, 2012: I submitted cyber-security pre-proposal to WiSys Grant opportunity.

Nov. 28, 2012 (12-1 pm): Meeting called by Dr. Hasker, Computer Science, on options for cyber-security program. Attendees: Hasker, Burton, Carothers

Nov. 29, 2012 (2-2:30 pm): Meeting on cyber-programming. Attendees: Burton, Roberts

Dec. 12, 2012 (8:56 am): Re: Applied Research-WiSys Technology Advancement Grant Pre-proposal feedback. Dr. Caywood's response: "Looks like you are one step closer to getting a system grant. Congrats. Tom" After my husband's meeting with Dr. Caywood on Dec 11, 2012 Dr. Caywood seemed to make an effort to show his support again. He greeted me pleasantly and seemed to be more open to professional communication with me. I was hopeful at this time that things would work out but his positive change in behavior was short lived.

Jan 11, 2013: AT&T grant money is deposited into UW-Platteville account. I told Dr. Caywood of this and it is noted in my DRB folder.

Jan. 23, 2013: Jessica Erickson, Director of Public Affairs, AT&T Wisconsin, sent drafts for press release for the official \$ 7000.- check presentation by AT&T on Monday, Jan. 28, 2012 (forwarded draft to Dean Throop, Dr. Wein, Dr. Caywood).

UW-P 005482

Jan. 24, 2012 (8:10 am): I invited Dr. Caywood in person to the AT&T donation ceremonial check presentation in my current topics cyber-crime class. (The donation itself had already been deposited with the school.) Dr. Caywood told me he had been conversing with Dean Throop about the check presentation but gave no indication that there was any problem.

Jan. 24, 2013 (10:27 am): Email from Dean Throop to Jessica Erickson (AT&T), Rose Smyrski, Assistant to the Chancellor, cc'd to Caywood, Burton: "This press release concerns me deeply. There are a number of highly inaccurate – indeed, misleading – statements regarding the status of cyber-security curricula at the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. I am not confident that the ceremony being planned is wise given this." Dean Throop made this statement based on lies that Dr. Caywood told her.

Jan. 24, 2013 (10:38 am): Email from Dean Throop to Jessica Erickson (AT&T), Rose Smyrski, cc'd to Caywood, Burton: "Jessica and I just spoke and the long form release will be edited again to reflect my concerns." My name was not mentioned in the press release even though I was instrumental in getting the donation.

Jan. 24, 2013 (1:27 pm): Email from Dr. Caywood to me with "letter to Sabina" attached (cc'd to Dean Throop). This was the first time Dr. Caywood told me that I did not have his support for my cyber-security program efforts. He wrote: " I'm not aware that the CJ Department approved a cyber security program or the development of one. [...]You are advertising in press releases and websites that the department and university are supportive of what you are doing. That is in error. First, you need to garner support of the cj faculty. [...]I would caution you on how you are presenting your ideas and visions in the media or on the world wide web as that of the Criminal Justice department or the University of Wisconsin- Platteville."

Jan. 24, 2013 (3:45 pm): I emailed my response to Dr. Caywood's letter.

The following is a timeline showing events after Jan 24<sup>th</sup> related to my cyber-crime efforts and Dr. Caywood's withdrawal of support:

Jan. 25, 2013: I had to call in sick. I had strong tension headaches and felt very stressed. My doctor prescribed me pain and anxiety medication.

Jan. 28, 2013 (2 pm): Jim Jermain presents ceremonial check during my cyber-crime class.

UW-P 005483

March 14, 2013 (12:37 pm): I submitted a request to Dr. Caywood to either teach cyber-crime or domestic terrorism. Students have repeatedly requested the courses. I received an FDRA grant from the UW-System for homegrown terrorism research in spring 2012 and an AT&T donation of \$ 7000 for cyber-crime/cyber-security course development in January 2013. Dr. Caywood denied this request at 1:30 pm. He informed me that I will be teaching 2000 and 3000 level courses.

March 18, 2013: I put a completed form requesting permission to develop the graduate course "cyber-crime" in Dr. Caywood's mailbox for his signature. Syllabus draft was approved by CJ Graduate Studies Director Dr. Fuller.

March 20, 2013: I found my permission request my mailbox with Dr. Caywood's comments and red marks correcting my punctuation. Dr. Caywood wrote "If she (Dr. Burton) chooses not make changes I will not sign off on this. This looks like a bare bones proposal." His comment "If she chooses not to make changes..." indicates that he expected me to resist making changes. I have always given Dr. Caywood my best efforts and do not resist his direction. He is implying that I resist making appropriate changes to documents such as this, which is not the case. My proposal was of average length and content when compared to other course development permission requests. This demonstrates Dr. Caywoods propensity to throw hurdles in my path as retaliation against me. This form should have easily passed his desk and all the issues he pointed out could have been discussed and finalized by the grad council. Dr. Caywood also questioned my ability to teach about encryption asking "Are you bringing in experts to discuss encryption?"

March 20, 2013 (12:18 pm): Email from me to Dr. Caywood reminding him that cyber-security is part of my professional expertise. I asked him "why do you question my expertise?" He never answered this question.

March 20, 2013 (2:49 pm): Dr. Caywood's email response to me: "I spoke to David van Buren about your proposal. As it is, he didn't think it would be approved. That's why I sent it back to you."

March 20, 2013 (3:54 pm): email from David Van Buren, Dean of Graduate Studies to me: "I'm sorry if there has been any miscommunication regarding my discussion with Tom (Dr. Caywood). I didn't tell him that I thought the course wouldn't be approved. In fact, I said that I thought the topics in the course description looked fine."

March 21, 2013: I resubmitted my request to develop the course with minor changes and it was approved by Dr. Caywood. The facts that I must defend simple requests like this in order to get required approvals and that Dr. Caywood misrepresents facts shows that he is looking for opportunities to undermine and hinder my efforts.

Timeline Showing Search and Screen chair position issue: 3 & 6

Sept. 10, 2012 (9:35 am approx): Dr. Caywood asked me to surrender my Search & Screen Chair position to CJ colleague Dr. Gibson so he could build his DRB file. Dr. Caywood told me that I would still be, in his words, the "token woman" on the search committee. Dr. Caywood also told me that I would get the next chair position. In good faith and in the name of fairness I agreed to offer my chair position to Dr. Gibson. I have been refused my subsequent requests to chair search and screen committees.

Dec. 8, 2012 (8:40 am): Email from me to Dr. Caywood: I requested to chair the search & screen committee for Joe Lomax's vacated position.

Dec. 10, 2012 (8:35 am): Dr. Caywood's response to my request: "Aric Dutelle volunteered."

Dec. 10, 2012 (10:43 am): My response to Dr. Caywood: "I wasn't asked. Dutelle has now chaired his 5<sup>th</sup> search & screen, I have chaired only one. Lomax's vacancy is a Ph.D. position in Criminal Justice. Dutelle has a MS degree in FI."

Dec. 10, 2012 (1:25 pm): Dr. Caywood's response: "He (Dutelle) has law enforcement as investigative experiences. Seemed the logical choice to me."

Dr. Caywood has favored Mr. Dutelle on search and screen assignments and appears to be grooming him to be the next chair. Mr. Dutelle has been assigned the chair position for 5 search & screen committees (2 in FI and 3 in CJ). 2 of those positions are for Ph.D. candidates in CJ. Mr. Dutelle has been given unfair opportunity to build his influence and support with new hires in the Criminal Justice Dept. I have been given only one chair position.

## Timeline showing my efforts to regain fair treatment:

Dec. 3, 2012 (10-10:30 am): Meeting with HR Director Jeanne Durr to address hostile work environment by Dr. Caywood for having reported student complaint. 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.

Dec. 10, 2012 (7:57 pm): I shared my concern of discrimination with Dean Throop by email.

Dec. 11, 2012 (7:29 am): Dean Throop's response to Search & Screen issue. "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."

Dec. 11, 2012 (10:30 am): Since I was denied support from the dean my husband, Roger Burton, offered to sit down with Dr. Caywood in an attempt to re-open communication between Dr. Caywood and myself by explaining to him my views on some issues. Roger and Dr. Caywood have met at numerous occasions. Both have a military background and Dr. Caywood always seemed very comfortable talking to my husband. At the Dec. 11 meetings 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 was beginning to 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 the discussion with my husband Dr. Caywood seemed friendlier to me and I was hopeful that things were returning to normal. I am still waiting for an apology from Dr. Gibson.

Jan. 29, 2013 (8:15-9:15 am) I met with Jeanne Durr and Dean Throop in HR in response to Dr. Caywood's letter and harsh treatment. I asked about grievance process but didn't get a clear answer on how to proceed.

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 "Tom does not have to respond to your questions." She said she would address my concerns with Dr. Caywood. I again asked how to go about filing

a grievance. Jeanne Durr recommended mediation between Dr. Caywood and I and wanted me to talk to an "Ombudsman" person on campus.

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 I, with Dean Throop after March 13.

March 8, 2013 (9 am-10 am): I asked to talk to the Assistant Chancellor Joanne Wilson. She provided me with information on members of grievance committee. Joanne Wilson offered to look over my grievance report.

March 13, 2013 (10:30 am): I turned in draft grievance report package to secretary of Assistant Chancellor Joanne Wilson. The material in that draft grievance report is incomplete and is not to be used for this settlement or for any other purpose.

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 (12:39 pm): I received an email from Jeanne Durr informing me that Dr. Caywood has not responded to her requests to schedule a time to meet with her.

The following shows stumbling blocks that have been unfairly placed in front of my advancement:

4,6

1. When Mr. Dutelle put in for promotion to associate professor, in his 2nd year of faculty employment, he was approved by the DRB on first review. When I put in for promotion, with a 16 year teaching record and in my 3rd year of UWP faculty employment, the DRB rejected my request giving as a reason that there was not enough evidence of teaching history. My DRB file contained teaching evaluations dating back to 1996 and 3 letters of support naming me as one of the most efficient and flexible instructors in UC Irvine's CJ department. After I pointed out the oversight my promotion was approved.
2. Again this January when I put in for tenure at the same time as Mr. Dutelle, Dr. Caywood favored Dutelle's request and argued that I should wait another year. Dr. Fuller told me that she advocated for me and said she would support both, Mr. Dutelle & Dr. Burton's request for tenure. This and my impeccable performance record may have swayed Dr. Caywood to give in and endorse both of us.
3. January 21, 2011 8:38:12 PM: email from me to Joe Lomax, former CJ department chair. "I would like to share with you a concern I have about the DRB outcome. I'm afraid that my evaluation score with "room to improve" will reduce my chance of gaining tenure and may even cause other problems for me in the future." "I do not think it is fair that I am artificially underscored so I have "room to grow."
4. January 23, 2011 1:18:46 PM: email from Joe Lomax to me. "I received and read your concern and I lean in favor of your argument. With your permission, I will forward this information to the other two members of the DRB and request that we meet and upgrade the evaluations to reflect your outstanding work as opposed to trying to calculate a future impression. Thank you for expressing how you are feeling. You already have one of the three DRB members in favor of the change." My score was never changed.

UW-P 005488

## Damages:

- My health has suffered significantly since Dr. Caywood has begun retaliating against me. I have seen a doctor on several occasions and have been treated for sleep problems, headaches and anxiety. This has also affected my family negatively.
- After AT&T was cc'd on the embarrassing communication on Jan. 24, 2013 I am concerned that AT&T may balk at any further financial support wiping out all the effort I expended to get them on board. My reputation with AT&T has suffered as it was suggested that I misled them.
- A Cyber-Security program at UW-Platteville would be a fantastic opportunity. We could have had one of the early cyber-security programs for public and private security. With a grant I would have been able to pursue this field with release time. My opportunity for professional advancement has been damaged.
- Dr. Caywood has ignored many of my communication attempts, will not answer my questions and has been rude to me. My dignity is damaged.
- Dr. Caywood has minimized my accomplishments, embarrassed me in front of my peers and attempting to ruin my success thus damaging my reputation. I expect he will continue to hold a grudge against me so my work environment is damaged if he continues as my chair.
- Dr. Caywood assigned the chair position for several search and screen committees to Aric Dutelle while I was asked to give one of my two chair position to a colleague. Mr. Dutelle has only a one year online Master's degree and I have a full Ph.D. from the University of California, Irvine studying under some of the best names in Criminal Justice. Dr. Caywood called Mr. Dutelle the "logical choice" to chair search and screens and allows Mr. Dutelle to make far more pay than I receive.
- I have had to make do with an office space that does not reflect my rightful place in the department.
- I took my NSF proposal to the AT&T Regional Vice President who offered to help us get the program started. The AT&T donation to the UWP Foundation for the cyber-crime project was a result of my work but I was not mentioned in the press-release. I deserve recognition for my work.

The following is a list of the persons mentioned in my grievance package, their titles and a short explanation of their involvement where necessary:

Banachowski-Fuller, Cheryl: Professor in Criminal Justice, Director of Graduate Online Program in CJ (UWP)

Bunte, Alison: Former Associate Dean, LAE

Burton, Sabina : Associate Professor, Criminal Justice; complainant

Carothers, Todd: Assistant Professor in Business/Accounting (UWP)

Caywood, Tom: Chair of CJ Department and the subject of my complaint.

Demerse, Kate: Assistant to the dean of students

Durr, Jeanne: HR Director, Affirmative Action Officer (UWP)

Dutelle, Aric: Associate Professor, Forensic Investigation Program Coordinator

Erickson, Jessica: Director of Public Affairs, AT&T Wisconsin

Fuller, Cheryl: see Banachowski-Fuller

Gay, Michael: Director of Center for New Ventures of UW-Platteville

Gibson, Lorne: Assistant Professor in Criminal Justice (UWP)

Hasker, Rob: Professor of Computer Science (UWP)

Heinemann, Jack: Director of the Wisconsin Security Research Consortium

Hudson, William: Dean of EMS (UWP)

Jermain, Jim: AT&T Regional Vice President, Wisconsin

Johnson, Diana: Assistant Professor in Forensic Investigation (UWP)

Kratcha, Sheri: CJ Secretary (UWP)

Lomax, Joe: Professor (emeritus) in CJ (UWP)

Matthews, David: Wisconsin DOJ

Nelson, Travis: Assistant Professor in Political Science (UWP)

Nimocks-Den Herder, Mittie: Provost of UWP (former Dean of LAE)

**UW-P 005490**

Reed, Rex: Assistant Professor in Criminal Justice (UWP)

Riedle, Lisa: Professor in EMS (UWP)

Roberts, Bob: Interim Director of Sponsored Programs, grant writer

Seitz, Mark: Assistant to Liz Stower, Legislative Assistant at U.S. House of Representatives

Smyrski, Rose: Personal Assistant to Chancellor Dennis Shields (UWP)

Still, Tom: Wisconsin Technology Council

Stower, Liz: Legislative Assistant at U.S. House of Representatives

Throop, Elizabeth: Dean of LAE (UWP)

Tranel, Travis: Legislative Representative of Grant County

Van Buren, Dave: Dean of Graduate Studies (UWP)

Wall, Ed: Wisconsin DOJ

Wein, Kory: Associate Dean of LAE

Wesley, Artanya: Dean of Students (UWP)

Williams, Mary Rose: Professor in Media Studies; Member of grievance committee (UWP)

Wilson, Joanne: Interim Assistant Chancellor , Student Affairs (UWP)