$\overline{}$		
~	4	

		341
1	OUTO INITITEDITEDI	
2	OHIO UNIVERSITY	
3		
4		
5	RE: DR. YUSUF KALYANGO	
6		
7		
8	VOLUME II	
9	DECEMBER 11, 2020	
	8:30 a.m 6:06 p.m.	
10	REMOTE VIDEOCONFERENCE, RE:	
11	TENURE REVOCATION HEARING	
12	FACULTY SENATE PROCEEDINGS HEARING	
13	OF DR. YUSUF KALYANGO	
14		
15		
16	HELF BEFORE: Dr. Robin Muhammad, Hearing Committee Chair	
17		
18	COMMITTE MEMBERS: Lauren McMills	
19	Charles Lowery Mark Franz	
20	Vladimir Marchenkov Yehong Shao-Lucas	
21	Sheryl House	
22		
23	Higgins & Associates Court Reporting - Legal Video - Videoconferenc	e
24	4889 Sinclair Road, Suite 102 Columbus, Ohio 43229	
25	*614.985.DEPO (3376) *888.244.1211	
	1	

		342
1	APPEARANCES:	
2	ADAM WADE LOUKX, Associate General Counsel Ohio University	
3	1 Ohio University West Union Street Office Center 150	
4 5	Athens, OH, 45701-2942 Email: aloukx@ohio.edu (740) 593-2927,	
6	On behalf of Ohio University.	
7	MEL L. LUTE, JR., Esquire	
8	and GREGORY A. BECK, Esquire and ANDREA K. ZIARKO, Esquire Baker, Dublikar, Beck, Wiley & Mathews	
9	400 South Main Street North Canton, OH 44720	
10	(330) 470-7780,	
11	On behalf of Dr. Yusuf Kalyango.	
12	Also present:	
13	Elizabeth Sayrs	
14	Michael Courtney Duane Bruce	
15	Angela Brock Kevin Mattson	
16	Dr. Rossette Shelly Bean	
17	Stacey Bennett Dr. Lupo	
18	Barbara Nalazek	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

		344
1	INDEX (CONT'D)	
2		
3	WITNESSES ON BEHALF OF OHIO UNIVERSITY (CONT'D)	PAGE
4	ROBERT STEWART:	174
5	Statement by Stewart Direct examination, by Mr. Loukx Cross-examination, by Mr. Beck	176 185
6		
7	GEORGE ANTONIO ANAYA: Statement by Anaya Direct examination, by Mr. Loukx	195 207
8	Cross-examination, by Mr. Lute COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS:	213
9	Charles Lowery	230
10	MICHAEL SWEENEY:	
11	Statement by Sweeney Direct examination, by Mr. Loukx Cross-examination, by Mr. Lute	233 243 248
12	COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS: Vladimir Marchenkov	255
13	VIAGIMII MAICHEIROV	200
14	Direct examination, by Mr. Loukx	261 269
15	Cross-examination, by Ms. Ziarko COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS:	
16	Yehong Shao-Lucas	274
17		
18	WITNESSES ON BEHALF OF YUSUF KALYANGO	PAGE
	MARY ROGUS:	
19	Statement by Rogus	280 281
20	Cross-examination, by Mr. Loukx COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS:	297
21	Sheryl House	307 308
22	Vladimir Marchenkov	310
23	JUDITH MILLESEN: Direct examination, by Mr. Beck	315
24	Cross-examination, by Mr. Loukx	327

25

(CONT'D)

		345
1	INDEX (CONT'D)	
2		
3	VOLUME II	
4	WITNESSES ON BEHALF OF YUSUF KALYANGO (CONT'D)	PAGE
5	HANG YEE LEUNG: Statement by Leung	351
6	Direct examination, by Ms. Ziarko	361
7	JEANETTE MOUMAKWE: Statement by Moumakwe	366
8	Direct examination, by Mr. Beck	367 378
9	KENNY MAKUNGU:	
10	Statement by Makungu Direct examination, by Ms. Ziarko	386 393
11	Cross-examination, by Mr. Loukx COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS:	400
12	Vladimir Marchenkov	406
13	KENNETH MOENG: Statement by Moeng	410
14	Direct examination by Ms. Ziarko Statement by Moeng	416 421
15	ANGE IMANISHIMWE:	
16	Statement by Imanishimwe Direct examination, by Mr. Beck	425 426
17	Cross-examination, by Mr. Loukx COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS:	442
18	Sheryl HouseVladimir Marchenkov	446 447
19		45.4
20	Statement by Direct examination, by Mr. Beck	454 455
21	Cross-examination, by Mr. Loukx COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS:	462
22	Yehong Shao-Lucas	465
23		
24	(CONT'D)	
25		

		346
1	INDEX (CONT'D)	
2		
3	VOLUME II	
4	WITNESSES ON BEHALF OF YUSUF KALYANGO (CONT'D)	PAGE
5	NNAMDI EKEANYANWU:	
6	Statement by Ekeanyanwu Direct examination, by Ms. Ziarko	469 470
7	NANCY KATU-OGUNDIMU:	487
8	Statement by Katu-Ogundimu Direct examination, by Ms. Ziarko	470
9	JATIN SRIVASTAVA:	505
10	Statement by Srivastava Direct examination, by Mr. Lute	505 508
11	Cross-examination, by Mr. Loukx COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS:	518
12	Charles LoweryVladimir Marchenkov	525 527
13	Yehong Shoa-LucasSheryl House	529 532
14	CAROLYN WALCOTT:	
15	Statement by Walcott Direct examination, by Ms. Ziarko	
16	MICHELLE FERRIER:	F 4 F
17	Statement by Ferrier Direct examination, by Mr. Lute	549
18	Cross-examination, by Mr. Loukx COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS:	558
19	Vladimir Marchenkov	562 568
20	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON:	
21	Statement by Hendrickson Direct examination, by Mr. Lute	575 582
22	Cross-examination, by Mr. Loukx COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS:	589
23	Sheryl House	597
24		
25	(CONT'D)	

		347
1	INDEX (CONT'D)	
2		
3	VOLUME II	
4	WITNESSES ON BEHALF OF YUSUF KALYANGO (CONT'D)	PAGE
5	YUSUF KALYANGO: Statement by Kalyango	601
6	Direct examination, by Mr. Beck Cross-examination, by Mr. Loukx	603 634
7	COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS: Vladimir Marchenkov	630
8	Sheryl House	634 640
9	Charles Lowery	650 659
10	Lauren McMills	639
11	– –	
12	CLOSING ARGUMENT:	
13	BY MR. ADAM LOUKX	671 685
14	BY MR. GREGORY BECK	083
15	REBUTTAL:	700
16	BY MR. ADAM LOUKXBY MR. GREGORY BECK	708 711
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	P	R	0	C	E	E	D	I	N	G	S
	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_

- - -

3 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:

Seeing all -- both parties represented, we will begin the proceedings for day two of the tenure revocation hearing of Dr. Yusuf Kalyango.

Good morning. I'm Robin Muhammad, welcoming you again and thanking you for your participation in this process.

I just have a few words. They will be repetitive, in terms of some of our procedures; but also some particular notation around the nature of the international calls that we'll be receiving today.

Again, we're continuing with witnesses called by the faculty member, and we will do that throughout, followed by the summation.

After each witness has made their introductory remarks, the balance of the time left in the 30-minute period will be divided between the faculty member's rep- -- legal representative for questioning and then transitioning to university legal counsel.

At the end -- and this will be an item that I will repeat -- prior to the summation

at the end of all -- at the conclusion of all witness testimony, each party may expressly reserve a portion of the summation time for rebuttal. So again, I'll repeat that at the end, but I just wanted to make note of it now.

It's also worth noting that though the procedure for the testimony is the same as yesterday, we are doing this virtually. We've already experienced some connectivity issues, and we will work our way through them throughout the day, and hopefully there will be few.

Another aspect of it is that we're receiving several international calls. And not unlike some domestic calls, sometimes there is a lag time as the voice is coming over. So we need to be sensitive to that, patient with that. And again, we will work through that so that we can hear as best as the technology will allow us the testimony and to allow both parties to question during that 30-minute time for each.

And with that, I ask, Duane and Angie, I believe Dr. Leung is here; and if willing, we could get started right away. So bring her in and begin the process.

DUANE BRUCE: All right. She is in

1 the room. 2 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 3 Thank you. 4 Good morning, Dr. Leung. 5 Robin Muhammad. 6 HANG YEE LEUNG: Good morning. 7 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 8 I'm the hearing committee chair. Thank you for 9 being here today. 10 HANG YEE LEUNG: Thank you. Thank 11 you for inviting me. 12 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 13 Our procedure for each witness is the same. 14 We have a 30-minute block of time; and you are 15 welcome to make any introductory remarks that you 16 would like to make prior to, first, questioning 17 from the faculty member's counsel and then from the 18 university's legal counsel. 19 If you're reading from a particular 20 statement or a particular statement or a particular 21 document, we've been asking witnesses to just make 22 sure you're speaking slowly and clearly, because we 23 are -- in addition to recording the proceedings, 24 we're also having it transcribed by a court 25 reporter, and we want to make sure that we capture

every word.
HANG YEE LEUNG: Okay. No problem.
Thank you.
HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
Excellent. Thank you. Please proceed.
Oh, I'm sorry to interrupt.
When If you go beyond maybe ten
minutes or so of speaking, I'll I'll probably
give you a signal that you need to conclude; but I
will try very hard not to cut you off.
HANG YEE LEUNG: So I'll be given
ten minutes to speak. Right?
HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
Absolutely.
HANG YEE LEUNG: Okay. Okay. So
shall I start now?
HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
Yes, please.
And when you state your name, would
you please spell both the first and last name,
again, for the benefit of court reporter. Thank
you.
HANG YEE LEUNG: Okay. Thank you.
Good morning. Good evening here in
Hong Kong. My name is Hang Yee, H-a-n-g, Y-e-e;

1 and my family name is Leung, L-e-u-n-g. I'm 2 currently a lecturer at the Chinese University of 3 Hong Kong. 4 (Discussion held off the record.) 5 Good morning. Good evening here in 6 Hong Kong. My name is Hang Yee, H-a-n-g, Y-e-e; 7 and my family name is Leung, L-e-u-n-g. 8 currently a lecturer at the Chinese University of 9 Hong Kong. 10 I speak on behalf of my role as a 11 lecturer of the Hong Kong Baptist University, HKBU. Then I worked there from 2014 to 2019. 12 13 I taught journalism and social 14 communication for HKBU and was selected as an 15 International Journalism Educator in Residence 16 Scholar, IJERS, by O.U. E.W. Scripps School of 17 Journalism. 18 I joined the SUSI program in 2016. 19 English is not my first English. 20 I got to know Dr. Kalyango, 21 Professor Mary Rogus, Dr. Jatin Srivastava, 22 Professor Robert Stewart, and Dean Scott Titsworth 23 of the O.U. journalism faculty when I joined the 24 SUSI program. 25 I met a group of O.U. journalism

1 students in Hong Kong in 2015, and I also met 2 Dr. Aimee Edmondson in Hong Kong in 2017. 3 I am a friend and a follower of 4 Miss and Miss 5 on Facebook and Instagram. I know them virtually, 6 but I never met them in person. 7 HKBU invited Dr. Kalyango to spend 8 half a year in Hong Kong as a visiting professor of 9 the International Journalism department in spring 10 2015 and '16. That was time I first met 11 Dr. Kalyango in Hong Kong. He was invited by two 12 of my former co-workers, Miss Bonnie Chiu, C-h-i-u, 13 and Mr. Bruce Lui, L-u-i, who were the SUSI scholar 14 of 2014 and 2015; and we had been at a gathering 15 with Dr. Kalyango when he was in Hong Kong. 16 Dr. Kalyango taught a course of 17 undergraduate degree program and conducted seminars 18 with the Ph.D. students. When he was teaching in 19 Hong Kong --20 I know that I shouldn't show -- show 21 any slideshow here today, but I just want to show 22 you a picture that this is how Dr. Kalyango 23 conducted his lecture. 24 Every student liked him. All right. 25 He was so popular. And he was being interviewed by the newsletter of HKBU School of Communication
where he was become the cover story of that issue.

Dr. Kalyango has put much of his time and efforts in putting forward internationalization of O.U. journalism. He has founded a strategic alliance among three university of three countries, including O.U. from the U.S.A., HKBU from Hong Kong, China, and University of Leipzig in Germany where student of these three university would visit each other every year.

Because of this alliance, I got the chance to meet the group of O.U. students in Hong Kong during 2015. And at that time I just knew the students were from O.U. I didn't know Dr. Kalyango.

An O.U. student shared experience of producing a news documentary about Hong Kong property housing problems. I could feel how fascinated the O.U. students were when they met with the students in Hong Kong.

From my observation, the School of Communication of HKBU valued the relationship with Dr. Kalyango so much. I could even not be able to recall how many times I met teachers and students of O.U. in Hong Kong.

1 In 2017, Dr. Kalyango has brought 2 Professor Aimee Edmondson to Hong Kong, and 3 Professor Aimee Edmondson had delivered a public 4 lecture on data journalism. 5 Dr. Kalyango not only forced academic collaborations between Hong Kong and the 6 7 U.S., but also China. He was invited to deliver 8 seminars at the Shanghai International -- the 9 Shanghai International Studies University, a 10 university that rarely used English as their medium 11 of instruction. 12 He was also invited to speak and

organize an academic conference at the Fudan University, which is the top university in Shanghai, China, in November 2017 before he traveled to Hong Kong with Dr. Edmondson.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would say that there was no doubt Dr. Kalyango has really bring the name and the fame of O.U. and the Scripps College of Journalism to Asia; in particular, Hong Kong and China. really a great loss to the international journalism education due to the suspension of Dr. Kalyango.

Do you know what happened next? Because Dr. Kalyango was suspended by O.U., the triple alliance between HKBU, O.U.,

and University of Leipzig has collapsed because there was no one who could take up his work.

3 Despite Dr. Kalyango being suspended by O.U. for

4 over two years already, our former SUSI scholars

5 from Hong Kong and China, and even our students at

6 | HKBU continue to reach out to Dr. Kalyango. We

7 even sent him masks, face masks earlier this year,

because the U.S. is -- is having the COVID-19

9 pandemic.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So during my participation in the SUSI program, I was aware that Dr. Kalyango was friendly to everybody. He was very, very friendly. He invited me to dinner at his home and also at restaurants with other scholars, and he sometimes paid the check.

I have learned from some news report that one of the complainants, , described that Dr. Kalyango's friendly acts harassing.

But let me tell you something. When Dr. Kalyango stayed in Hong Kong, my former co-workers and I treat him dinner, brought him to watch movies and shows, and even invited him to our Chinese New Year celebrations. My co-workers even brought the O.U. Ph.D. students to Chau Peng (phonetic).

1 Does it mean that we harassed 2 Dr. Kalyango? I never heard about any rumors that 3 4 Dr. Kalyango has treated Chinese scholars better 5 than the other scholars or he has said anything or 6 done anything that make female scholars feel 7 uncomfortable. 8 So I don't deny that people might 9 feel strange that Dr. Kalyango make so many Chinese 10 friends, especially us who come from Hong Kong and 11 China, but he is a genuine fan of Chinese culture 12 and Chinese food. His favorite food is Chinese 13 fried rice. It is an open secret. All of my HKBU 14 colleagues in the Chinese SUSI scholar know about 15 that. 16 He taught Chinese students, make 17 friend with Chinese scholars and academics. No one has complained of him, and we all loved him. 18 19 Dear committee members, do you 20 know -- Yes, sorry. Oh, sorry. Okay. 21 So dear committee members, do you 22 was when she first -- she attended know where 23 the meeting yesterday? Hawaii. So why do I know? 24 Because I'm a Facebook and Instagram friend with 25 • , as well as But it's so sad that

has set her Instagram private immediately after 1 2 yesterday's testimony. Anyway, I got to be an observer 3 4 yesterday, when I have already expressed that --5 Yes. Sorry. 6 (Discussion held off the record.) 7 HANG YEE LEUNG: So yesterday, I was 8 an observer of the meeting; and I log in soon when 9 Mr. George Anaya repeatedly mentioned that 10 Dr. Kalyango has evidence discrepancy. 11 Did he ever fact-check what and 12 said in their complaints for looking over their 13 social media? 14 Did Mr. Anaya know how much has 15 been influenced by the Me Too movement on social 16 media when she filed her complaint against 17 Dr. Kalyango in 2018? 18 When Mr. Anaya put down the details 19 about how felt harassed when Dr. Kalyango 20 invited her to his hotel room and tried to kiss 21 her, did he know that, actually, for -- for 22 that she is a long-term drinker and she posts her 23 alcohol drink on social media almost every day. 24 So here's one. 25 So basically for -- for the

witnesses, especially for who have spoken yesterday, that I would say I never heard about anything that Dr. Kalyango drink, took SUSI scholars to drink, to dance, or try to -- to do anything.

Dr. Kalyango himself is not a drinker, and he never gave SUSI scholar alcohol and tried to dance or kiss them. I can 200 percent confirm with all of you that Dr. Kalyango does not drink. I never seen him drink.

I know many SUSI scholars who completed the program in 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017; and I can 300 percent confirm to all of you that not a single SUSI scholar or program assistant has told me that they felt that Dr. Kalyango has any special romance intention on them.

HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:

Dr. Leung, sorry to interrupt, you have about two

more minutes. We added some time on because of the

interruptions, but you're about at time.

HANG YEE LEUNG: Okay. Thank you.

To be honest, I'm not an insider of O.U. Being a witness today does not give me any benefits. I don't have to spend so many time on preparing this testimony, because it is very hectic

exam period in Hong Kong, which I have an exam in (indiscernible) in less than 12 hours of time, and I got so many papers to mark. I believe you feel the same as teachers.

I'm here because I believe that truth is virtual, which is the model of the HKBU School of Journalism.

I let you all know the truth that I know.

I feel so disappointed that O.U. lost the SUSI program to the University of Arizona. Everyone at HKBU felt so frustrated, because it is like we never be able to see any O.U. faculty members and student visiting Hong Kong again. We all don't know what happened; and it's like, oop, we suddenly lost a contact with O.U., with Dr. Kalyango, with all the other faculty members of the O.U. Scripps School of Journalism.

I represent myself, my HKBU former colleagues and SUSI scholars that I know; and let me assure you that Dr. Kalyango is a professional, reliable, sincere, and well-respected international journalism scholar, who unreservedly contributed his knowledge and professionalism to O.U., to the journalism education globally. He put everyone

1	before himself.
2	Thank you.
3	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
4	Thank you, Dr. Leung.
5	We turn now to legal counsel for the
6	faculty member for a questioning period.
7	ANDREA ZIARKO: Thank you.
8	
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION
10	BY MS. ZIARKO:
11	Q. Dr. Leung, thank you for testifying
12	today. I will not take up very much time at all.
13	You had a very thorough statement. And your
14	testimony here or your statement here today was
15	very important to to Dr. Kalyango to explain the
16	SUSI program in Hong Kong and as well as the
17	alliance between the your school as well as O.U.
18	and the school in Germany. And I think that
19	that you've done that, and we appreciate it.
20	And in your experience, as you
21	stated, Dr. Kalyango's suspension has essentially
22	disseminated that alliance, and it has affected the
23	SUSI program in Hong Kong;
24	A. Yes.
25	Q correct?

1	A.	Yes. Correct.
2	Q.	Okay. Well, I appreciate your
3	testimony. And	with that, I will go ahead and turn
4	it over to Mr.	Loukx.
5	A.	Thank you.
6		HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
7	Thank you, Ms.	Ziarko.
8		Mr. Loukx?
9		Adam LOUKX: Oh, thank you.
10		And good morning to you from
11	Hong Kong. Tha	nk you for for sharing your
12	thoughts with u	s this morning. They're very much
13	appreciated.	
14		I really don't have any questions
15	for you. And -	- and again, I appreciate you
16	helping us out	here today. So you have a good day,
17	and thank you v	ery much.
18		HANG YEE LEUNG: Thank you.
19		HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
20	Thank you, Mr.	Loukx.
21		Thank you, Dr. Leung, very much.
22		HANG YEE LEUNG: Thank you very
23	much. So I can	leave now?
24		HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
25	Yes. Yes, you	may, with our with our thanks.

1	HANG YEE LEUNG: Thank you so much.
2	Thank you for inviting me. Good-bye.
3	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
4	And, Duane, do we have
5	We were ahead of schedule, I
6	believe. Our next witness was slotted for 9:15.
7	Is is that witness in the waiting room?
8	DUANE BRUCE: Not at this point.
9	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
LO	All right. Everyone, we're going to go ahead and
11	break for about, let's say, ten minutes. Please be
12	back at no later than 9:05. We have asked each
13	witness to be here at least ten minutes beforehand;
L 4	so if we're able to start a little bit early, we
15	can we will probably absorb some of that extra
16	time as we go along, given some of the technical
L 7	issues.
18	Thank you. Please mute your mics
19	and shut down video.
20	(Brief recess.)
21	DUANE BRUCE: With the exception of
22	the witness, who I think is getting confused by the
23	waiting room and keeps popping in and out, so.
24	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
25	Well, then, let's let's bring in the next

1	witness. We're we are ready.
2	DUANE BRUCE: No. I'm waiting for
3	her to log back in.
4	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
5	Oh, she's logged out at this point?
6	DUANE BRUCE: Yeah. This will be
7	the third time. I think the waiting room confused
8	her, because every time I pushed her there, she
9	logged off and has tried to log back in.
10	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
11	Okay. We have an email address for her. So,
12	Angie, would you please send her a quick email and
13	say, Please log back in.
14	MS. BROCK: Yes, I'll do that.
15	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
16	Thank you so much.
17	DUANE BRUCE: She just got back in,
18	and she is coming into the room right now.
19	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
20	Outstanding. Thank you. Thank you both.
21	DUANE BRUCE: She is in the room
22	now.
23	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
24	Good morning, Ms. Moumakwe.
25	You'll have to turn your mic on.

1	MS. MOUMAKWE: Oh, yeah, I did.
2	How are you?
3	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
4	I'm very well, thank you.
5	And how are you? Good afternoon.
6	JEANETTE MOUMAKWE: Good afternoon.
7	Good morning to you.
8	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
9	Good morning to us. Yes, indeed.
LO	Thank you for being here today.
11	We're setting aside for each witness about
12	30 minutes to give some testimony.
13	JEANETTE MOUMAKWE: Okay.
L 4	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
15	And the way that we have been doing it is each
L6	witness introduces themselves. Please state your
L7	name clearly and spell it for the benefit of the
18	court reporter, because we're taking a
L9	transcription of it.
20	And we're very sensitive to the fact
21	that we this is on Zoom, on a virtual platform,
22	and sometimes the audio can be have some lag
23	time, depending on the call. And that's okay.
24	We're going to to work through that.
25	And if you have a statement that

1	lasts, you know, more than ten minutes, I might
2	give a little indication that you need to wrap it
3	up; but there will be an opportunity both for the
4	faculty member's legal counsel first and then the
5	university's legal counsel to ask you some
6	questions after your testimony.
7	And, oh, by the way, I'm I'm
8	Robin Muhammad. I'm the hearing committee chair.
9	Sorry. I should have started with that.
10	Please proceed.
11	JEANETTE MOUMAKWE: Good even
12	Good day, everyone. My name is Jeanette Moumakwe.
13	I'm from I worked with Dr. K, who is
14	Dr. Kalyango, Yusuf Kalyango, and when
15	they came here for the I helped
16	them throughout the whole process.
17	Yeah, I think, uhm, that is my
18	introduction.
19	And I had a statement written about
20	which (indiscernible), and you can ask questions
21	from there, and they'll take you through the
22	statement that I shared with them if possible.
23	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
24	All right. So we can turn now to faculty, the
25	faculty member's legal counsel, if you have

1	questions.
2	GREGORY BECK: I do. Thank you,
3	Dr. Muhammad.
4	
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. BECK:
7	Q. Good afternoon, Jeanette. How are
8	you?
9	A. I'm doing fine. Thank you.
10	How are you?
11	Q. Fine. Thank you.
12	All right. Let me just take you
13	through your statement. I think it would be easier
14	for the committee and for you also if I just ask
15	you some questions that are reflected in your
16	statement.
17	First of all, you were the
18	administrative coordinator and program assistant
19	for the Is
20	that correct?
21	A. Right.
22	Q. And how did you How were you
23	selected for that position?
24	A. Well, the Embassy told me
25	about the job opening together in (indiscernible)

1 Dr. Kalyango (indiscernible), and that's how our 2 program from the other participants that we're 3 trying to get the role as well. All right. So just so the committee 4 Q. 5 understands, you then -- once you were selected, 6 did you have some preplanning calls, Skype calls 7 and other calls, with Dr. Kalyango and --8 I'm just going to refer to his 9 instead of her full name. assistant as Is that 10 okay with you? 11 Α. Okay. That's okay. 12 So did you have --Q. 13 (Indiscernible.) Sorry. Α. 14 Did you have some communication with Q. 15 Dr. Kalyango and before they arrived in 16 17 Yes, I did. Everything had to be Α. 18 authorized by them and the embassy as well, so I 19 had to do research to see which sites to visit, 20 which hotel for them to visit, and which type of 21 transportation for us to use. And I had to go 22 around to do quotation as well, like logistics 23 work, I meant to say. So, yes, I did have an 24 engagement, like we decide to do it there, and they

had the final say. And, like, I was like, Here,

25

1 this is what I found. Is this okay? And they 2 would decide. And they would tell me, okay, do 3 this and (indiscernible). Like, I was their go-to 4 I was the person that was responsible for 5 their stay here and making sure that everything run 6 smooth. 7 Q. All right. 8 (Indiscernible). Α. 9 Now, this -- this is really Q. 10 difficult, I know, because of this transmission; 11 but I -- if you can, I would like you to slow down 12 a little bit in your --13 Α. Oh, okay. 14 I -- In American language, I also Q. 15 speak very fast, so I have to always watch my pace. 16 But when you were having these 17 conversations with Dr. Kalyango and even , was 18 did you ever learn that Dr. Kalyango initially was 19 going to bring his son to 20 Dr. Kalyango did mention that he was 21 bringing his son with him, --22 Uh-huh. Q. 23 -- and he's going to be by his side, Α. 24 not -- not with, like, but he was 25 coming with his son because he wanted to show him

1 Africa, and because he didn't spend time together, 2 I would say. At some time, did you learn that his 3 0. 4 son was not going to accompany him? 5 He did say when he -- when Α. 6 (indiscernible) that, like, his son is not coming 7 no more. 8 All right. Now, when everyone Q. 9 arrived, okay, were you assigned to stay with -- I used to call 10 Okay. Me and Α. 11 her that, because that's how we would address each 12 other. 13 Uh-huh. Q. 14 So when they came -- so when they Α. 15 , I went to collect them by came here in 16 the airport, and (indiscernible) we used to share a 17 room together. Most of the time, we were together 18 doing the work and all the hours with her. I 19 shared a room with her. I slept with her, 20 everything. I was the person who saw her when she 21 woke up in the morning (indiscernible). 22 How many weeks was she in Q. 23 with you? 24 I will say three weeks. The first Α. 25 week it was us. I was taking them to the places

that I had organized for them for them to check out 1 2 (indiscernible) and all those things. And the 3 other two weeks --4 They came here on the 1st of -- of 5 and I took them around and all that. 6 And after that, we shared the room. 7 Now, did you enjoy spending that 8 time with -- with and -- and sharing the room 9 with her? 10 At first -- at first, all was well; Α. 11 but the (indiscernible) and the culture shock 12 (indiscernible). Before, like -- So we had our 13 challenges. Let me put it like that. We had our 14 challenges, but we overcame them. And then that's 15 (indiscernible) between us, and that's 16 (indiscernible). So with this whole thing going 17 on, we don't keep contact normal. 18 So, yes, we had a roller coaster. 19 Some days were good, some days were bad. 20 It even came to a point whereby Dr. 21 K asked me if I wanted another room for the next 22 (indiscernible). I was like, No, it's okay, I know 23 how to, like, you know, the (indiscernible) and all 24 So I was like, I will be there for her, and

I understand what's going on (indiscernible). And

25

1 Dr. Kalyango said that she -- she's sleeping. So I 2 never left her side. We stayed on. 3 And -- and was it just the work 4 volume that was causing the problem, the things 5 that you guys had to do? 6 I wouldn't say it was the work Α. 7 volume, because I didn't notice anything unusual. 8 And, uhm, she -- she had her moments. Like, she 9 would get pissed at everything. But I figured, 10 like, we're women. We've got moods, you know. 11 Q. Uh-huh. 12 We've got moods and all that. Α. 13 Now, were you interviewed by the Q. 14 investigator about this situation? 15 Yes, I was. Α. 16 And did he ask you questions about Ο. 17 whether you observed anything unusual between 18 and Dr. Kalyango? 19 Α. Yes, he did. 20 And what did you say to him? Q. 21 I told him, like, that I didn't -- I Α. 22 didn't see anything wrong with everything that they 23 had. I didn't see anything unusual except for 24 words. 25 And did ever complain to Q. Uh-huh.

you about Dr. Kalyango?

2 A. No.

Q. Now, in -- But -- And you've talked about your relationship with and so forth, but did you have --

In any of your communications with Dr. Kalyango, did you feel that there was anything inappropriate or wrong with his communications with you?

A. Well, Dr. K is very specific as to what he wants for work. So he wants to see results. And he would (indiscernible), Are you guys good? And he would ask also is the work too much and (indiscernible). I would say definitely Dr. Kalyango is a good boss and (indiscernible), and he knows what he wants (indiscernible). Judy, who was here also, knew what needed to be delivered. So did I.

So for some of us, we knew who we were working with and we knew what is it that he want -- he wanted and we had to deliver. And I remember that he was also very professional, I must say, when it comes to work.

Q. You also had a chance to work with Dr. Judy Millesen. Is that correct?

1 Yes, I did. Α. 2 And did you also find her very Q. 3 professional and good to work with? 4 She -- she is. They are a bunch of 5 good people. Like, we worked well together. I'm 6 not going to lie on that one. 7 Uh-huh. And, now, did you find 8 Dr. Kalyango to be kind and professional to 9 everyone when you observed him? 10 Yes, sir. Α. 11 Okay. Now, I want to ask you a Q. 12 little bit about some comments in your statement, 13 and that has to do with your observations of 14 temperament. 15 You -- you mentioned that there were 16 certain points in time when you saw her get very 17 upset. 18 Can you share with the committee what you were talking about? 19 20 Okay. When the embassy people --21 like, she would drive reporters back, and they had 22 to be authorized, like, the embassy to give a 23 go-ahead (indiscernible) and whatnot. And if there were a lot of (indiscernible) that a bunch of us

had to do, and they're like "F" this, "F" this and

24

25

1 on and whatnot. And had -- (indiscernible), she 2 had to do what she was asked to do. And that sort 3 of set up failure, because I think she had --4 because all of us, we had -- we were assigned to 5 certain tasks, if I may say. And when it came to 6 that, like, she would, like, Oh, this too much; and 7 all of that complaining, that and this. But who 8 doesn't complain anyways? 9 But I was supposed to be there when 10 she -- you know, when she was doing all those 11 things and whatnot. How was your day? My day was 12 the same. What did you get up to? Oh, I -- I had 13 to deal with this and da-da-da. What about you? 14 Oh, I'm good. Okay. Do you need help? 15 (Indiscernible) help; and, like, that was the 16 relationship. 17 So there was an incident with the 18 laundry at the hotel, and --19 Well, let me -- let stop you there. Q. 20 Let me just stop you there a second. 21 What I'm going to call your 22 attention to was something --23 Did -- did confide in you about a 24 situation where she got angry at Dr. Kalyango and 25 actually cursed at him? Do you recall that

1 conversation? 2 The one about the -- Dr. K giving Α. 3 the participants the American dollar, why not 4 (indiscernible)? 5 Yes. Q. 6 She -- she tell me about it in Α. 7 passing, and I just didn't take it into 8 consideration. 9 But what did she say to you? Q. 10 That he was -- she was mean to Α. 11 them. Like, they didn't have a good communication. 12 Their communication didn't end well. Like, at some 13 said she did cursed or whatever that point, 14 she did, (indiscernible) and she hd to, you know, 15 go back and rectify that. 16 And so she had told you that she had 17 actually cursed at him and then she was going to later try to apologize? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 All right. Now, what was the 0. 21 situation with the laundry? 22 And the only reason I'm bringing 23 this up is that we asked about this yesterday, 24 and she had certain testimony that I won't share

with you. But -- but what was your observation

25

about the situation with the laundry?

A. That she wanted the laundry to be done for her for free, and she didn't want to pay the hotel the money. So she gave the people at the hotel to do her laundry and came back and said the bill was high, she was not expecting that kind of a deal, and she started to be frustrated.

And upon when they were getting everything, the bill and whatnot, that pay -- had to pay -- paid only half of the amount (indiscernible).

So according to my observation, I think she wanted to just do the -- the bill like that. And, you know, that was just something else that went on also.

- Q. But were you actually standing at the counter when Dr. Kalyango paid the -- paid the bill?
- A. Yeah. When the -- when he was closing everything, the bill included. So I was there not with him, but I was around.
- Q. Uh-huh. And I'm looking at your statement, and -- and you say, Dr. K paid the balance that refused to pay. Then she got mad at him because she really wanted to leave without

1	paying, and she got furious with Doctor K.
2	Is that what you observed?
3	A. Yeah. She had a she had an
4	imbalance emotions. Like, she she had her
5	moments. Let me put it like that.
6	Q. Uh-huh. And did she ever say nice
7	things about Dr. K when she was there?
8	A. Yeah. We all heard, like, he knew
9	what he wanted, he knew how he wanted things,
10	because he was very professional. (Indiscernible)
11	she'd say he was a good boss.
12	Q. Uh-huh. Well, Jeanette, I really
13	appreciate your testimony for us today. And I
14	don't have any further questions.
15	And my colleague, Mr. Loukx, may
16	have a few questions for you.
17	A. Okay.
18	
19	CROSS-EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. LOUKX:
21	Q. Thank you. Good to meet you
22	remotely.
23	My name is Adam Loukx, and I do have
24	just a few questions for you. And and bear with
25	me. Thank you for your assistance today.

1	Prior to meeting in
2	you didn't know her. Is that correct?
3	A. What was the question, sir?
4	Q. You only know
5	You did not know before you met
6	her in Is that right?
7	A. I did not know both Dr. K and
8	when they came here in my in my country. So as
9	a human and I had to welcome them
10	and show them and the country, so I
11	had to (indiscernible) to watch them
12	(indiscernible).
13	Q. Oh, sure. Sure.
14	But you were not an intimate friend
15	of Is that right?
16	A. We we became so close, we even
17	call each other sister sisters.
18	Q. Uh-huh.
19	A. And she gave me a present when she
20	left. She gave me earrings with pineapple, like
21	pineapple earrings. And that was the point, like,
22	we started dancing as sisters. So we were close.
23	Hence, why I didn't change the room; hence, why I
24	took her, you know, (indiscernible) emotions and
25	all that.

1	Q. Okay. But it was not a long-term,
2	standing friendship. You met her in
3	worked with her in roomed with her in
4	but were not a long-term bestie, I
5	guess as they would say here, best friends?
6	A. It was supposed to have been like
7	that? I would say
8	Q. She wouldn't necessarily she
9	wouldn't necessarily confide with you on intimate
LO	secrets, would she?
11	A. She would. If she would dance to me
12	naked, then I I think she would have
13	(indiscernible).
L 4	Q. Okay.
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Okay. Now, you mentioned something
L7	about discussing with Dr. Kalyango his son may come
18	with him on the trip during the planning period.
L9	You had that discussion, if I understood you
20	correctly?
21	A. He did mention that in passing when
22	we were when he was interviewing me and when we
23	were (indiscernible) that he will he might bring
24	his son to
25	Q. When when approximately did this

1	interviewing occur in relation to the appearance of
2	Dr. Kalyango in In other words, was
3	it was the interview in the wintertime preceding
4	the trip? springtime?
5	A. My side or your side?
6	Everything started in March.
7	Q. Okay. Very good.
8	Were you aware that and Dr. K
9	took a trip
10	A. They mentioned that, that they were
11	going the next after the after the
12	program, they heading and they both
13	seemed excited about it.
14	Q. And you were not involved in the
15	planning of that trip, were you?
16	A. No, I was not. My portion was the
17	
18	Q. You talked a little bit about some
19	conversations over laundry issues.
20	A. Uh-huh.
21	Q. Were you present when you when
22	talked to hotel management?
23	A. I was doing the (indiscernible)
24	work, but she did mention that they spoke and they
25	agreed that she paid half. (Indiscernible.)

	i	
1	Q.	So you heard about the laundry
2	incident from	
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	Okay. Now, you
5	A.	And she was like, The money too
6	much, complain	ing that the money's too much or
7	(indiscernible	e) .
8	Q.	Now, the money issue that you
9	discussed invo	olved paying
10	participants i	n dollars rather than in local
11	currency. Is	that correct?
12	Α.	Say what?
13	Q.	Did the You mentioned something
14	about a disagr	reement between and Dr. K
15	overpayment of	, I think you said, American dollars?
16	Α.	She mentioned that. Yes, she did.
17	Q.	Okay.
18	Α.	But I had my own things to tab out
19	at that partic	ular moment, so I just didn't give it
20	much attention	ı .
21	Q.	Okay. Fair enough.
22		Now, when you indicated to Mr. Beck
23	that you were	interviewed by Tony Anaya, just
24	A.	Uh-huh.
25	Q.	I just want to make sure I

1 understand. Was that an email exchange or a 2 conversation? 3 We did a Skype interview. Like, Α. 4 initially we fail, because I had to go back to my 5 email. Then after that, he had questions, after 6 which I -- I was able to do Skype. He had 7 questions; and he was like, Answer this, and I did 8 send him that. 9 Okay. I hit the wrong button. 0. 10 Hopefully I didn't lose you. 11 I think I have no other questions. 12 Again, thank you so much for helping us out today. 13 And it's nice to meet you. 14 Nice to meet you, too. Α. 15 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 16 Thank you, Mr. Loukx. 17 Are there any questions from the hearing committee members for our witness? 18 19 Hearing none, thank you, 20 Miss Moumakwe, for being here today. And we wish 21 you well. 22 JEANETTE MOUMAKWE: Okay. Thank 23 you, also. 24 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 25 You're welcome.

1	JEANETTE MOUMAKWE: Are we done?
2	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: I
3	beg your pardon?
4	Yes, we are. I'm sorry. Thank you
5	so much. Have a good day.
6	JEANETTE MOUMAKWE: You also. Bye,
7	ma'am.
8	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
9	Bye-bye.
10	Looking to our next witness, is
11	Dr. Kenny Makungu in the waiting room?
12	DUANE BRUCE: Not yet.
13	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
14	Not at this time? Okay.
15	He's scheduled to appear at 9:45, so
16	we will just I'm just going to to stay on
17	camera and on video. If people want to stand up
18	and stretch stretch their legs or something like
19	that, I think that would be a good idea, but please
20	don't go very far. Again, we would like to move on
21	with the next witness as soon as he's here and
22	able.
23	(Brief pause.)
24	DUANE BRUCE: Our next witness has
25	arrived.

1	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
2	And I see that all the committee members are still
3	here and all counsel on both sides.
4	So please bring in Dr. Makungu.
5	DUANE BRUCE: He's here,
6	Dr. Muhammad.
7	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
8	Great.
9	Good morning, Dr. Makungu. I'm
10	Robin Muhammad. I am the hearing committee chair.
11	How are you?
12	You'll have to
13	Thank you for being here.
14	KENNY MAKUNGU: Thank you. I'm
15	fine. Thank you very much.
16	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
17	Excellent.
18	What we're doing with each witness
19	is setting aside about 30 minutes for each witness
20	to give a brief statement, introduce themselves to
21	the committee. And following that that
22	statement, we move to questioning first from our
23	faculty member's legal counsel and then to the
24	university's representative. Following that, there
25	might be one or two questions from members of the

1 hearing committee. 2 So we're asking if you have a --3 would like to introduce yourself and make a 4 statement. It can be very brief or it could go 5 perhaps for ten minutes. We're leaving that up --6 up to the witnesses themselves. 7 KENNY MAKUNGU: Okay. 8 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 9 So with that, Dr. Makungu, please proceed. 10 KENNY MAKUNGU: So I start? 11 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 12 Yes, please. 13 KENNY MAKUNGU: Okay. Good 14 afternoon. I had prepared a statement, so I'll 15 read my introductory and go from that. 16 Good afternoon, honorable members 17 of the university faculty senate. Ladies and 18 gentlemen. Let me first thank the president of the 19 faculty senate of Ohio University for inviting me 20 to deliver these thoughts as a witness and 21 Host-Country Director of Ohio University's study 22 abroad program to which was branded 23 Media, Society and Governance. 24 Before I delve into the weeds of my 25 testimony regarding the accusations against

1 Professor Yusuf Kalyango, please allow me to briefly summarize my credentials in just a minute 2 3 and also tell you how I am connected to the Ohio 4 University. 5 My name is Kenny Makungu. I am a 6 senior lecturer in the Department of Media 7 Communication Studies at the University of 8 I have taught at the University of 9 including holding academic administrative positions 10 for about 30 years now. I am a lifelong 11 academician in the area of journalism, media, and 12 mass communication. I have also hosted hundreds of 13 foreign students at the University of over 14 my three-decade academic career. 15 By the time Ohio University students 16 in the study abroad program led by came to 17 Professor Kalyango, I had accumulated substantial 18 international academic experience in administering 19 these types of academic exchanges. 20 Most importantly, I had also been to 21 Ohio University there in Athens, United States of

Most importantly, I had also been to Ohio University there in Athens, United States of America. I had spent six weeks in Athens, Ohio, as a fellow of the Study of the U.S. Institutes on Journalism and Media.

22

23

24

25

In fact, Professor Yusuf Kalyango

and Professor David Mould were my host in the summer of 2010.

I remember when I arrived in Ohio,
my leg got injured and I needed a wheelchair. I'm
so grateful that Professor Kalyango and his team
took great care of me. I had a wheelchair, and
they pushed me around for as long as I needed it.
I have great memories in Ohio and around the
United States because of Professor Kalyango and his
team.

So almost 18 months later when I hosted the students from Ohio University with Professor Kalyango, it was indeed my honor to return the favor to show our hospitality.

I am still very grateful to Ohio
University for the great education I received when
Professor Kalyango led that program in Athens. I
still follow American politics and current affairs
to this day, and I still believe in that goodness
of heart on the American spirit that welcomed me to
Ohio and the United States despite the ongoing
racial tensions and the struggle for equality in
the U.S.

Now, let me go to a bit of my testimony.

1 The study abroad program to 2 took place during the winter break, from late 3 Professor Kalyango 4 was the program director from Ohio University 5 leading 18 students all from Ohio University. 6 was one of two host country program directors from 7 the University of Another lecturer from 8 the University of was Mrs. Caroline. 9 Phiri-Chibbonta. She was the second female 10 host-coordinator in to deal in case there 11 were any problems with our female students on the 12 program. 13 During the four-week program, Ohio 14 University students experienced the inner workings 15 of different media outlets: newspapers, 16 magazines, radio, and television, both commercial 17 and government owned. We partnered students with 18 nonprofit organizations to do volunteer work, and 19 they also were immersed in African culture. 20 During that intensive and heavily 21 guarded program, Ohio University students took two 22 classes taught primarily by me and other senior 23 lecturers from the University of with 24 quidance from Professor Kalyango, but the students'

assignments and grading was all done by Professor

Kalyango.

The students got hands-on field experience in the media industry twice a week.

They volunteered in advocacy institutions within and in the countryside once a week, and they also worked alongside governmental service sectors in once a week.

The students also learned coalition-building efforts through African music, sports, and African dance, as well as cross-cultural communication and problem-solving skills.

They also did apprentice with local journalists, students, and interacted with the wide array of professionals and prominent newsmakers.

In order to save time, let me delve into the accusations.

I am aware that Professor Kalyango
was accused of sexual harassment, as well as
engaging in a hostile work environment on this
program in for this study abroad program,
which took place in beginning in

When he called me to inform me of these unfortunate accusations, I did not believe

him at first. I thought he was bluffing. He told me that given the current situation nationwide in light of the rampant assaults against women in Ohio and across the country, the university at Ohio took their positions against him very seriously, and it made his defense against these accusations very difficult. He said that it appeared the university was hell-bent on disclaiming him and he was not receiving a fair process.

I now believe him and the gravity of this situation.

accused Professor Kalyango of inviting her to a next-door pub called Chainama and had a drink with him at night after dinner. The accusations are that he engaged in inappropriate behavior, particularly sexual harassment. But I also understand that Dr. -- Professor Kalyango was never accused of asking to have sex, and he was never accused of engaging in any sexual acts.

with her, and I read the allegations and I read the investigator's summary report which he called the Memorandum of Findings.

I was interviewed by the Ohio

1	University investigator, Mr. George Anaya, about
2	these accusations back in Indeed, I
3	am a key witness in these accusations by
4	Miss
5	Maybe by way of introduction, I
6	should stop there and then I can answer questions.
7	Like I said, I did have a prepared statement, but I
8	will not read the whole thing.
9	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
10	Thank you, Dr. Makungu.
11	And just as a note
12	I apologize. I should have
13	mentioned this earlier.
14	when we are referring to
15	students, we're using their initials and not their
16	full names. So that my apology for not providing
17	that instruction.
18	KENNY MAKUNGU: Oh, sorry. I was
19	not aware.
20	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
21	Not not not a problem. My That was my
22	mistake.
23	So with that, I would like to turn
24	it over to questioning from Ms. Ziarko.
25	ANDREA ZIARKO: Thank you.

1 2 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. ZIARKO: 3 4 Thank you, Dr. Makungu. Q. 5 You -- you left off with the 6 starting to delve into the accusations from and 7 I wanted to ask you. 8 You stated you spoke with Mr. Anaya. 9 How -- how much time did you spend 10 speaking with Mr. Anaya about these accusations? 11 I'm sorry. You're breaking up. Α. 12 You're breaking up. I can't get you very clearly. 13 Okay. Can you hear me now? Q. 14 Yes. Α. 15 Okay. How much time --Q. 16 I can hear you now. Α. 17 Okay. Thank you. Q. 18 How much time did you spend speaking 's accusations? 19 with Mr. Anaya about 20 Yes, I did. 21 Do you -- do you know how much time 22 you spent talking with him? 23 It's been a while, but I know Oh. Α. 24 that we spent quite a bit of time. I think I spoke

with him for more than an hour --

1 Okay. Q. 2 -- and I think on more than one Α. 3 occasion. I can't be sure, because it's been -it's been a while back. But we did -- when we 4 5 talked, it was a while. It took quite some time. 6 Q. Okay. And did you actually read the 7 witness statements prepared by Mr. Anaya? 8 Α. I read the report that he wrote. 9 Okay. And --Q. 10 I (indiscernible) (did/didn't) look Α. 11 at all the statements of the witnesses that were 12 put forward. 13 Okay. And was what you told 0. 14 Mr. Anaya included in that report? 15 I'm sorry? Α. 16 Was what you told Mr. Anaya included 0. 17 in that report? 18 Α. Very little of it, I must say. Very little of it was included in the report. 19 20 Well, what did you tell Mr. Anaya? 0. 21 And I know you have a statement, and 22 you can refer to that, so. 23 Okay. Α. 24 Yes. Q.

Okay. I had explained to Mr. Anaya

25

Α.

1	that when that program took place here, I
2	spent every single day that the students and
3	Professor Kalyango here with them. And every night
4	after the day's activities, I would have dinner
5	with them, with Professor Kalyango and all the
6	students, whether we were eating from the hotel or
7	from another restaurant and so on. And after that,
8	we'd drive back to wherever the students were
9	staying. We would make sure that all the
10	students

And by the way, the students were sleeping in pairs.

-- all the students retired to their rooms, and Professor Kalyango, and I remained to prepare for the next day. And I would be with Professor Kalyango sometimes close to midnight and sometimes likely after that every single day of that program.

- Q. Okay. Okay. And did you ever see

 Dr. Kalyango acting inappropriately while you spent
 time with him?
 - A. I never did, not even once.
 - Q. Okay.

A. And to be honest, it's quite a surprise that these accusations have come up so

1 late after the fact, because one would have thought 2 that those are the kinds of things that students 3 would have brought out during the evaluations after 4 they were brought back to Ohio, and even before 5 they left, because we had talked to them. And, for 6 example, the lady that I talked to about 7 Miss Tuwanta Perry (phonetic), her task was to 8 ensure that the ladies especially, if they felt 9 inhibited to speak to either Professor Kalyango or 10 to myself, there was a female in the group that they could confide in and talk, and none of them 11 12 ever did anything like that.

Q. Okay. Did you ever observe Dr. Kalyango purchasing food or drinks for the students studying abroad?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Dancing with students?
- Q. Purchasing, buying food and drinks.
- A. All the food that we consumed during the program, as far as I remember, was paid for by Professor Kalyango, but there was no alcohol.
- Q. Okay. All right. That was my next question.
- A. There was no alcohol. He paid for the drinks and he paid for the sodas, but there was no alcohol bought for any student. He never even

1 bought a drink for me, and I drink.

- Q. Well, now, that you say that, I do want to mention there was some testimony yesterday regarding an investigation by Ohio University regarding some accusations made against you back in 2011. Is that correct?
 - A. I heard -- I heard about those accusations yesterday.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. That's when I learned about them.

 When they happened, if they did happen in 2011,
 that is news to me. Nobody ever got in touch with
 me. Nobody questioned me about them. And I'm
 very, very, very surprised. I was shocked that
 there were allegations like that and people just
 kept quiet. Nobody ever got in touch with me.
 - Q. But those accusations did not involve Dr. Kalyango. Correct?
 - A. Sorry?
 - Q. Those accusations with regard to either drinking and maybe driving some students or the other accusations did not involve Dr. Kalyango. Correct?
 - A. From what I know, no, they don't.
- 25 Q. Right. Okay.

_

What has been the impact of this investigation of Dr. Kalyango and his suspension with regard to the University of

disappointing, because we thought we were starting a meaningful relationship. And after the first intake of students, we had actually even started planning, seeing if we could have another group of students come over in a similar manner. And unfortunately, those plans were derailed, because I think Professor Kalyango lost one of the parents or the other. He had some kind of bereavement in the family, and the whole program just fell through after that.

- Q. Do you have anything else to -- to add, anything in conclusion that maybe I didn't pull up from your -- your statement at all?
- A. Well, uhm, one of the things that surprises me about the accusations, like I said earlier, the students were sleeping in pairs; so if Dr. Kalyango did invite any of the students to go out at night after they had already gone to bed, that would have been -- had to have been after midnight. And I don't think that was possible.

 Because what was the other -- what was the other

roommate going to be told where was the -- the roommate going to be going. I don't think it was possible.

Every night I left after the students had been sent to their rooms, every single night. It is not possible thereafter that a student could leave the room without their roommate knowing. And I -- I would have believed that since the accusation is that it was in the night, then the roommate for the accuser should have been one of the witnesses to confirm that, Yes, after we got to the room, then I -- she left because she said she had an appointment with Professor Kalyango. It never happened. I don't believe it ever happened.

Q. Thank you.

And I just want to check.

Was the schedule pretty busy during the day for the students?

- A. Sorry?
- Q. Was the schedule busy during the day for the students? Did they have any of downtime?
- A. No, they didn't. And, in fact, that was one of the complaints that they had; because the program was so tight, they never had any free time to do -- I'm sure they would have loved to go

1	out on their own and do certain things, see certain
2	things, and so on; but we were worried about
3	letting them loose and going in their own
4	directions, because there was no way that you could
5	keep an eye on 18 students when there were only
6	essentially three of us looking after them. So we
7	didn't give them that free time.
8	Q. Okay. All right. Thank you very
9	much.
LO	I'm going to turn it over to
L1	Mr. Loukx here. Thank you.
12	A. Thank you very much.
13	
L 4	CROSS-EXAMINATION
15	BY MR. LOUKX:
16	Q. Good morning, Professor. And thank
L 7	you for helping us out here today.
18	My name is Adam Loukx, and I am with
19	Ohio University Legal Affairs.
20	How long was this program in
21	How long did it last?
22	A. It was four weeks.
23	Q. Four weeks.
24	And as I understand your testimony,
25	in that four weeks, after the program ended, you

1 were beside Dr. Kalyango's -- you were at 2 Dr. Kalyango's si- -- side every night. Is that 3 right? 4 I sure was, from the date they 5 arrived. 6 From the date they arrived until the Q. 7 date they left? 8 Α. Yes. 9 You indicated that you talked to Q. 10 Tony Anaya maybe on more than one occasion. 11 I said I definitely talked to him, Α. 12 and I'm not sure whether it was once or twice. 13 That's what I said. 14 When did that occur? Q. 15 Sorry? Α. 16 When did you talk to Tony Anaya? 0. 17 Just, not the date, but what year? 18 Α. Last year, 2019. 19 Q. Last year. 20 And I heard you say you can't be 21 It's been a while back, last year. 22 This is December. Α. 23 Okay. But you have a very clear Q. 24 memory of but you don't

have a clear memory of talking to Tony Anaya a year

1 ago? 2 I remember talking to him. What I Α. 3 said was I can't remember how long I talked with 4 him. 5 Okay. Very good. But that was a Q. 6 year ago. Now, you indicate that the first you 7 8 heard of a complaint made against you was recently? 9 Α. Yes. 10 And are you -- Did you see the MOF Q. 11 in that case? 12 No. Α. 13 Were you -- Well, let me put it a Q. 14 different way. 15 Well, were you aware a student in 16 that case indicated that you invited her back to 17 your room when you were in the 18 Α. I learned about it yesterday. 19 Q. And I suppose you deny that 20 happened. Correct? 21 Like I said, how could it happen 22 when students were dismissed as a group? 23 As it was related, this happened Q. 24 when you were driving a group of students, and

Dr. Kalyango was in another van.

1	A. I was So I invited her to my room
2	in the presence of other students?
3	Q. That's what was related.
4	But you deny that. You deny that.
5	Is that fair to say? We can move on.
6	A. Absolutely. It never happened.
7	Q. It's also been alleged that you were
8	driving students after consuming alcohol.
9	A. Again, I never heard that till
10	yesterday. I remember
11	Q. Did you
12	A. No, no. Let me let me finish.
13	Q. Okay.
14	A. I remember one evening on the
15	I bought a bottle of whiskey to take to
16	my room. I never drank it in the presence of the
17	students. I bought it, and they saw it, because
18	they knew that I did consume alcohol. They had
19	been invited to my house. And at my house, we
20	invited them to take sodas from my fridge at my
21	home. And in that fridge, there was alcohol. They
22	were invited to take sodas, which they did. And in
23	my living room, I have a bar. So they knew I
24	drank, but I never drank in front in the

presence of students. And I never drove.

1	That's one of the things that would
2	(indiscernible) warned against. If my employers
3	even heard that I was driving under foreign
4	students after consuming alcohol, I would have been
5	fired a long time ago.
6	Q. Thank you. So you
7	A. A long time ago.
8	Q. So in a word, you deny it? You
9	deny
10	A. Why do I deny it?
11	Q. You deny that you drank and drove
12	students. Right?
13	A. I did not drink and drive students.
14	Q. And so when a student testified
15	before this committee that it was bad enough where
16	a student actually jumped out of the vehicle you
17	were driving, that wouldn't have been true, either?
18	A. A student didn't jump out of my
19	vehicle.
20	Q. Okay. Fair enough. You
21	A. No, that's something that I never
22	even heard yesterday.
23	Q. Thank you.
24	A. How could that happen and goes so
25	quiet until until yesterday?

1	Q.	So let's talk let's switch a
2	little bit on	the questioning.
3		You talked to Dr. Kalyango about
4	this matter, -	_
5	A.	Yes, I did.
6	Q.	the matter we're here for?
7		How often did you talk to him?
8	A.	You're breaking up again. Sorry?
9	Q.	Did you talk to Dr. Kalyango more
LO	than once abou	t this matter?
L1	A.	He briefed me more than once, yes,
12	about what was	going on.
13	Q.	Okay. He briefed you?
L 4		And did you get the MOF from
15	Dr. Kalyango?	
16	A.	The what?
L 7	Q.	Did you get the Memorandum of
18	Finding from D	r. Kalyango?
19	A.	From Anaya.
20	Q.	Okay. And when you were briefed by
21	Dr. Kalyango, d	did you discuss what you were going
22	to say here to	day?
23	Α.	Absolutely not.
24	Q.	You did not mention what you were
25	you would tell	the committee?

1	A. (Witness shook head negatively.)
2	Why would I do that? I've got nothing to hide.
3	Q. And Dr. Kalyango did not ask you to
4	tell them what you were going to tell the
5	committee?
6	A. I think if he did that, that would
7	be an insult to me,
8	Q. That's all the questions I have.
9	A and I would be very offended.
10	Q. All right. Thank you for your
11	patience with me. And that's all the questions I
12	have. Again, thank you for coming in and helping
13	us out today.
14	A. Thank you very much.
15	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
16	Thank you, Mr. Loukx.
17	Do we have any questions for our
18	witness from the hearing committee members?
19	All right. We have no
20	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Robin, sorry.
21	I have a question, just a clarification, a
22	clarification if I may.
23	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
24	Please.
25	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Dr. Makungu,

1	my name is Vladimir Marchenkov. I am a member of
2	the hearing committee, and I wanted to clarify one
3	point in your testimony.
4	You said that after the trip,
5	the O.U. study abroad trips to ended.
6	Right? That that was the end of that program.
7	KENNY MAKUNGU: Well, we only had
8	one visit, yes. That was the first and the last.
9	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Okay. And
10	then you you mentioned
11	What was the reason for this? Was
12	it was it because O.U. did not send any students
13	your way or something happened on your side?
14	KENNY MAKUNGU: No. My And in
15	fact, like I said, we had started planning on a
16	second trip; and then I think somewhere along the
17	way, Professor Kalyango had a bereavement or two in
18	the family, and the whole program just broke down.
19	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Thank you very
20	much for clarifying that.
21	KENNY MAKUNGU: Thank you.
22	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Thank you.
23	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
24	Well, thank you very much, Mr. Makungu
25	Dr. Makungu, excuse me, for being here today and

1	providing your testimony. It's very much
2	appreciated. And we thank you and wish you a good
3	rest of the day.
4	KENNY MAKUNGU: Thank you very much
5	for having me.
6	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
7	Absolutely. Take care.
8	KENNY MAKUNGU: Thank you. Thank
9	you.
LO	I can leave the meeting?
L1	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
12	Yes, you may. Thank you again.
13	KENNY MAKUNGU: Thank you. Thank
L 4	you.
15	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
16	All right. Thank you, everyone. We'll again sort
L7	of hold. I don't think our next witness is yet in
18	the the waiting room, but I would expect them
19	within about four minutes. So again, I'm going to
20	stay on camera with my mic off. It's an okay time
21	to get up and stretch, but please don't go very
22	far.
23	(Brief recess.)
24	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
25	Good afternoon Dr Moeng I'm Robin Muhammad

1	I'm the hearing committee chair.
2	KENNETH MOENG: Good afternoon. I
3	hope you can hear me loud and clear, if that's okay
4	with you. Thank you.
5	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
6	Yes. Do you have video capability or is it easier
7	for you to have the video off?
8	KENNETH MOENG: Let me enable it.
9	That should be fine.
LO	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
L1	Thank you very much.
12	KENNETH MOENG: Thank you.
L3	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
L 4	Well, again, thank you for being here. With each
L5	of the witnesses, we're allocating about 30 minutes
16	for to include, excuse me, your testimony, brief
L7	introductory remarks, and then the balance of time
L8	for questioning from each side; that is, from the
19	faculty member's legal counsel, as well as the
20	university's representative.
21	KENNETH MOENG: Okay.
22	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
23	Following that, we have an opportunity, if any of
24	the hearing committee has a have questions, then
25	we could entertain those questions at that time.

1	So we very much appreciate you being
2	here.
3	And for the benefit of court
4	reporter, please just state your name. And if
5	you're going to be reading from any statement,
6	definitely speak slowly.
7	Do you think that you'll be giving a
8	testimony of more than a few minutes?
9	KENNETH MOENG: Uhm, my name is
10	Kenneth Moeng, for the court.
11	In terms of reading a statement, I
12	would not necessarily be reading, but I will be
13	presenting a summary of my conclusions that I had
14	previously prepared.
15	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
16	Thank you. That will be that will be excellent.
17	If it goes past ten minutes, I might
18	raise my hand and and indicate that we need to
19	move into questioning.
20	KENNETH MOENG: Okay.
21	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
22	But with that, please please proceed.
23	KENNETH MOENG: Okay. Let me say
24	good morning to you and good afternoon for me.
25	It's almost sunset here in Gaborne, Botswana, which

1 | is where I am.

2 As I said, my name is

Kenneth Moeng. I'm an author and all-around mediaprofessional. I started my profession in 1997.

I'm currently working for the Botswana government, which is the State Department. I'm at the office of the president doing media relations. And my -- my profession spans about 23 years.

So firstly, let me talk about how I met Professor Kalyango. I have known him after I was contacted first by the State Department through the embassy in Botswana, and this is where I was invited to attend the SUSI program. This was in 2015. And that's when I first met and worked with Dr. Kalyango.

The second time that we did meet professionally was when I was the host country director for Botswana, and this is when the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the United States through Professor Kalyango had asked me to be the director on the YALI Connect Camps.

The YALI Connect Camps are the camps that nurture young mentors and mentees across Africa. And this was now in

And let me say that's my brief

1 introduction, and to say that I'm really honored to 2 be here to state a case of really what I know and 3 what I have observed and I experienced with 4 Professor Yusuf Kalyango on these two distinguished 5 programs. And, in fact, I was quite inspired, 6 because I ultimately then published my fifth book 7 in 2017 after going through these programs. 8 In -- in summary, I would say this, 9 these things accusations about harassment, sexual 10 harassment, all revolve around work abroad by 11 Professor Kalyango. And those accusations involve 12 work implemented in Africa, you know, for -- for 13 international scholars. And I had the opportunity 14 to experience working with Kalyango then. And to 15 just say that under the SUSI program in 2015, we 16 were about 18; and in doing the 17 we were managing about 52 mentees and 18 mentors, inclusive. And this is the same time 19 that Professor Kalyango had, I believe, hired 20 to work as an assistant on these 21 I believe, if I'm not mistaken, 22 that's 23 And for the under credit 24 (indiscernible) was already really 25 working with Professor Kalyango in I believe

that now for, in the case of we actually did not have met It was Miss who came with Professor Kalyango to instead of

And -- and for this, I believe that
my engagement with the professor, especially how I
have seen him engaging with his team, his staff,
especially the student female employees, females
participants, you know, was quite profound.

In fact, because it was the first time for me in
America in 2015, I was like, Wow, is this what they
say the American dream? I was quite delighted of
how he was quite good at working with us, all of us
in 2015, each one of us.

And then in the program, to -the -- all of the graduate students who were
working with us were quite confident. And we had
program assistants who were also men and some were
women. We had about four female assistants, and
Kalyango was the administrator taking care of us.
And each one of us, the scholars had our egos. You
know, we are from different countries: Kazakhstan,
I -- I remember Pakistan,
Africa; we had
some from Greece, different cultures, denominations
of -- you know, because we even had some who -- who

were asking where they could go to a Mosque and pray. And all of these, I believe, during my encounter with professor was very good here. And at no particular time have I seen anything that was outward or wayward. He was always respectful. And we respected him with all of our unique cultures. And I could say that most of us were very, very, very, very, very comfortable.

Even on arrival, I remember that, you know, they would give us, you know, a room to rest, because when -- I believe it's Hilton Gardens in Columbus, very hospitable. And this is first time when we -- we all just met. And his student employees were also there, most of them which were women. And they took time to make us comfortable the first time arriving in -- in America. It was at the time. And as scholars, we met several times just us scholars, and we would talk about how the program is going and what we think of the professor and how we think of Dr. Mary Roberts, who was also working with professor, and how the students are helping us to cope with the assignments that we were also given during the course of

And our schedules were -- were very demanding. So we would meet in the evenings, cook,

1 come with different dishes, and meet. And in all 2 of those times, there was no -- no one who ever 3 shared a moment that was quite discomforting about 4 how Professor Kalyango acted or how he took himself 5 or suggested or implied or inferred anything that 6 was either sexual or that would be considered some 7 form of harassment. And -- and I say that, because 8 quite -- maybe one or two of us, we had -- we had 9 medical issues. We had to visit the hospitals. 10 I -- I was one of them. And one of the females was 11 from Ghana, Uganda, also had, and I believe that 12 she -- I remember her telling me that, Kenneth, you 13 know, I've been helped very well. I have not been 14 underprivileged or taken any other way for not 15 being well. It was an appropriate behavior, 16 welcoming encounter with the professor and staff, 17 and the -- the students or the -- whether those be 18 master's or doctorate that were working with the 19 professor. 20 I think for now, to allow for your 21 questions, I would say I would hold here, and then 22 I will keep taking my (indiscernible) I -- I had 23 also written before.

HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: Thank you, Dr. Moeng.

24

416 1 Miss Ziarko, please proceed. 2 ANDREA ZIARKO: Thank you. 3 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MS. ZIARKO: 6 Dr. Moeng, thank you for your Q. 7 testimony so far. 8 Could you describe for the committee 9 a little bit about the SUSI program in general and 10 your -- and your experience with that in -- at Ohio 11 University? 12 The -- the SUSI program, we were 18 Α. 13 from different countries, and it was highly 14 involving. It was six weeks in Ohio. And these --15 when we arrived, I believed, somewhere around 16 4th of July and we -- we were taken to a different 17 places; and in terms of the -- the curriculum and 18 the content, it was quite excellent. It dealt with 19 educational matters, the scholars learning the 20 issues about how America reports and talks about 21 itself. We would have different professors who 22 come and do presentations in -- in those six weeks,

and we would visit different cities and towns and

go to some of the media institutions, including the

likes of CNN, uhm, Washington Post, and the likes.

23

24

So in general, I would say that the
SUSI program, as it were, was an eye opener, and
especially how America is able to bring from
outside people to learn and understand how America
is in terms of media institutions.

- Q. And would you say within those short weeks, really, that you were there, that there was quite a bit of travel and logistics with regard to transportation?
 - A. Yes. What was your question?
- Q. Would you say that --

So there was quite a bit of transportation and traveling during the SUSI program. Right?

- A. Yeah, correct. Yes.
- Q. Okay.

- A. We -- we did travel a lot. I remember we went as far as Columbus. We did Atlanta, Georgia, Cleveland, Amish country, northern Ohio. Uhm, I forgot the name. We visited the -- the coal area where there used to be mines of coal. Yes, there was a lot of travel; and in those times, we were treated very well in the program.
 - Q. Okay. And can you -- How did the

YALI program in compare to the SUSI program? Can you explain to the committee a little about the -- the difference?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think the -- the difference with SUSI and YALI was some -- hum, different in the sense that, uhm, it -- it will be the same as if you had gone to a camp, you would have had to have gone through something that is, YALI that is administrative to teach you how the development of -- of your profession and how you do it. was -- it was almost the actualization of someone who actually went to SUSI and now is out mentoring people, teaching them; and making sure that when they go back to their country, they can be able to deliver quite well. So I would say in terms of curriculum, it was almost at par; and in delivery, quite good, because we had different and other professors who were also hired in to come in to mentor the scholars from the 32 countries.

So, yes, the content was high; and it was involved, because you -- you would actually now experience the connection between the young professionals and the mentees and how the professor and his colleagues who were coming are able to -- to nurture these young YALI professionals.

1	Q. Okay. And did you have anything
2	else you wanted to state about your interactions
3	with Dr. Kalyango?
4	A. Yes. Uhm, I would say that, uhm,
5	I've been I will forever, for me, particularly,
6	I will forever be grateful for all the resources
7	that we got from the program; in fact, you know,
8	from my academic peers we met in the United States
9	For example, we attended an Association for
10	Educators in Journalism and Mass Media
11	Communication Convention. And I believe that was
12	in San Francisco. It was very good. And this is
13	one of the biggest academic conventions, and we
14	were very grateful to to have attended it. And
15	even then, all of us, female scholars who were
16	working with the professor, we were all booked in
17	one hotel. And I'm pleased to say that at all of
18	those times, Professor Kalyango was quite
19	enthusiastic, making sure that we we were
20	working together and we understand how the SUSI
21	program works.
22	Q. Okay. Thank you.
23	At this point I'll turn it over to

25 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:

counsel for the university.

1	Thank you, Ms. Ziarko.
2	Mr. Loukx?
3	ADAM LOUKX: Oh, thank you.
4	And good morning, Dr. Moeng. I have
5	no questions for you, but do like to thank you
6	for for helping us out today.
7	KENNETH MOENG: Oh, thank you very
8	much.
9	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
10	And with that, do we have any questions from the
11	hearing committee members?
12	Hearing none, I want to thank you
13	again, Dr. Moeng, for being here. And that
14	concludes your testimony time.
15	Again, thank you very much and have
16	a good rest of the evening
17	KENNETH MOENG: Yeah.
18	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
19	in Botswana.
20	KENNETH MOENG: Yes. If you don't
21	mind, it's just one minute just to add to
22	(indiscernible), if that's okay.
23	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
24	Absolutely. Please do. Go ahead.
25	KENNETH MOENG: Yes.

Let me just say that, uhm, it's -I'm very happy that to -- for you, the special
committee of Ohio University faculty that I hereby
reassert my knowledge of Professor Kalyango's
character; that it is sound; he is a man of God;
he's fearing. And what I know and what I did
actually really observe and experiences is that
Kalyango's interaction with us male, female
scholars was quite commendable. And I applaud his
maturity and the way he related with all of us,
some of who were quite confused with environmental,
either being in America or being a different
teaching opportunity, as it were.

And in my opinion, as you might imagine, that the sexual harassment charges are quite scary, sometimes very important and detrimental and even combative if not handled properly.

And I -- I would like to say thanks for you having invited me. And I pray that the facts and the evidence and my testimony like this one that I'm giving it to you would work and help you come up with your decision that you believe will be sound and that will stay quite good for the University of Ohio, currently, presently, and for

1	the future.
2	Nevertheless, I'm very, very happy
3	to say that I've been here. So thank you very
4	much.
5	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
6	Thank you very much, Dr. Moeng.
7	KENNETH MOENG: Thank you.
8	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
9	Wish you a very good rest of the evening.
LO	KENNETH MOENG: You too.
11	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
12	Thank you so much.
13	KENNETH MOENG: Bye-bye.
L 4	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
15	Bye-bye.
16	KENNETH MOENG: Bye.
L7	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
18	All right. Everyone, well, based on the schedule,
19	we have a a morning break that will be a little
20	bit expanded since we're running ahead a little bit
21	of schedule.
22	Our next witness will be here a
23	little bit before 11, scheduled to be here from 11
24	to 11:30. So take the morning break until just a
25	few minutes before 11; and please be back, you

1	know, no later than 10:55 so that we can begin on
2	time.
3	Thank you. I will be off camera but
4	nearby. See you around 11.
5	(Brief recess.)
6	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
7	Hello all. We're going to get started momentarily
8	with the next couple of witnesses.
9	Also for the benefit of the hearing
10	committee and counsel on both sides, I've just
11	received a document provided by university
12	representatives. I've shared that with the
13	committee members, and I've also forwarded a copy
14	to the faculty member and his legal counsel as well
15	just so you're aware of it, because I just just
16	sent it.
17	Duane, and with that, would you
18	please bring in our next witness.
19	DUANE BRUCE: He is entering the
20	room now. It says joining.
21	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
22	Good afternoon. I'm Robin Muhammad. I'm chair of
23	the hearing committee. Thank you for being here.
24	Mr. Imanishimwe, are you there?
25	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Hello.

1	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
2	Hello. Good afternoon. Thank you for being here.
3	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Good afternoon.
4	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: I
5	hope you can hear me okay. I'm Robin Muhammad, and
6	I'm chair of the hearing committee.
7	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Yes.
8	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
9	Excellent. Well, thank you. We're giving about
10	30 minutes for
11	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Yeah. I can hear
12	you.
13	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
14	That's fine. I can We can tell that there's a
15	little bit of a delay, and that's no problem; so I
16	apologize for speaking over you.
17	I'd like to begin by allowing you to
18	introduce yourself and to make any introductory
19	remarks that you would like to make. And then
20	we'll turn some questioning over to, first, the
21	faculty member's legal counsel and then to the
22	university's legal counsel. That should take in
23	total about 30 minutes. And after that, if there
24	are any questions from the hearing committee, we'll
25	entertain them at that time.

1	How does that sound?
2	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Okay. Thank you
3	very much.
4	My name is Ange Imanishimwe. I'm
5	from
6	And then I thank you, Dr. Muhammad,
7	for this opportunity in this hearing.
8	And I would like tell you that I was
9	the director of the program when Professor Kalyango
10	was in as
11	well.
12	So I'm very happy that I can
13	provide, you know, all the details that you needed
14	from our side. And then any questions is very
15	welcomed to tell you how the itinerary was. I just
16	want to tell you everything that was happening
17	during that stay of 60 days in
18	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
19	That will be excellent.
20	I would also like to add that when
21	we are referring to students, we use only their
22	initials and and not their full names. I
23	apologize. I should have said that earlier on if
24	you weren't aware.
25	But please proceed.

1	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Yes. I just want
2	to say that my full name is Ange Imanishimwe. I
3	don't know if I can spell it; but, you know, my
4	name is I-m-a-n-i-s-h-i-m-w-e. That is how I can
5	spell my name.
6	
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. BECK:
9	Q. Ange, this is Greg Beck. Why don't
LO	I pose questions to you, and then we can get down
L1	your statement that way.
12	A. I can hear you.
13	Q. Can you? Okay.
L 4	First, would you tell the committee
15	what your NGO is, BIOCOOP, and what you do in
16	with that?
L7	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Okay. Thank you
L8	very much for that question.
L9	My local organization is called
20	BIOCOOP, and that is a large biodiversity
21	conservation organization, and is an organization
22	that I founded in 2012 (indiscernible) we can take
23	young people, put their studies (indiscernible) and
24	to put them together to give back to their
25	community.

1 So from a very young age, I made the 2 commitment to see how I can give back to my 3 community, and that is why I put in place the 4 BIOCOOP which is a biodiversity conservation and 5 (indiscernible), because I was born in , and I was born in 6 which is, you know, one of the poorest districts in 7 8 this country of And it is in the 9 (indiscernible) province of the country. And then 10 that is why I made that commitment. 11 And then from there, I was the top 12 leader of the country here in in 2012; 13 and I was awarded, you know, by our president to be 14 the best young innovator of the country. And, of 15 course, that is when I started to, uhm, you know, 16 to be exposed at the national and international 17 levels. 18 Q. And was it in that capacity that you 19 met Dr. Kalyango? 20 Uhm, thank you for that question. Α. 21 Because of that initiative that I 22 had at the grass-root level in I wanted to 23 raise some funding, you know, from different 24 organizations at the international level, including 25 the United States (indiscernible) for the program

here in (indiscernible) where I got 50 thousand 1 2 U.S. dollars for the (indiscernible) of the Nyungwe 3 National Park. And because of that performance, I 4 was recommended by President Obama in 2015 in the 5 program called The Mandela Washington Fellowship 6 for Young African Leaders. 7 And because I was there in the U.S., 8 I do -- I was doing a program at the University of 9 California in Berkeley, and I was doing public 10 policy and civic leadership, you know, in 11 California. And because of the problems that I --12 I had -- and in that time, I was also among 100 13 Young African Leaders to stay in the United States, 14 and I was doing my program at the. 15 Nature Conservancy in Boston, Massachusetts. And then I -- I went back to 16 17 And when I went back to that was a program and that is where 18 Professor Kalyango was involved. And he came in 19 20 , and then we met with Professor Kalyango. 21 And he was with his son, and there were other 22 professors from Ohio University. I can remember 23 that there was a professor called Dr. Judy and 24 Dr. Rogus. They were there in that program. And 25 that is where I met Professor Kalyango. And, of

1 course, I started discussion with him the 2 possibility to connect to BIOCOOP, because in my 3 (indiscernible) of (indiscernible) BIOCOOP, I was 4 insisted that can put BIOCOOP at international 5 level. And now I'm happy that BIOCOOP now is in 6 Ethiopia and now is in Kenya. 7 So I was discussing with 8 Professor Kalyango (indiscernible) of creating some 9 partnerships with international professors and 10 international professionals so that I could put my 11 organization to an international level. 12 Okay. Thank you. Thank you so much Q. 13 for that explanation. 14 And I'm going to ask you to do 15 something that I have to remind myself all the 16 time, and that is to slow down how I'm -- the pace 17 of my speech. Because of this Zoom call, it's --18 sometimes it's hard to hear exactly what you're 19 saying, and I want to make sure we get everything 20 that you say. 21 What I want to --22 And thank you for that connection. 23 But I want to move now to what 24 happened in and your involvement 25 in this trip.

1 It's my understanding that you 2 reached out to Dr. Kalyango in to for something 3 see if he could come to 4 related to environmental journalism. Is that 5 correct? 6 Yes, it is correct. Α. 7 But from that, I would love to tell 8 you that my connection with Professor Kalyango 9 started in 2015 when we met in 10 And later on, in 2016, I was 11 (indiscernible) with Dr. Kalyango, because, you 12 know, he was doing so many programs at the 13 international level. So I got to know that 14 Professor Kalyango would have a in (indiscernible) 15 In that time, I was 16 proposing to him, Can you please come to as 17 well so that you can work with some alumni of the 18 program, the Young African Leadership Program. 19 Q. All right. 20 (Indiscernible). Α. 21 Yes. Yes. 22 Let -- let me stop you. Q. 23 (Indiscernible.) Yeah. Α. 24 Let me just stop you there just so Q. 25 we understand.

1 You reached out to him in 2 because you -- you had heard he was coming to 3 Camp. in Is that 4 correct? 5 I knew that he will come to Yes. Α. 6 and did come. 7 Then I told him, Is there any 8 possibility that you can come to as well 9 so that you can meet some Young African Leaders 10 in some other areas, because I knew that 11 Professor Kalyango is an expert in the journalism 12 and the communication. And my ambition was now to 13 connect in environmental conservation and 14 journalism, because I know that people needed to 15 understand, you know, the connection between the 16 (indiscernible). And that is when I told him. 17 And then he told to me that to my 18 pledge, the program of the U.S. of Department of 19 State is not something you can do automatic. 20 told me that maybe he would have the program in 21 in the --And 22 that is when he told me with that it was possible 23 that maybe he can arrange if we can work with some 24 of the leaders, especially in the program of 25 international journalism.

1 All right. So then you and Q. 2 Dr. Kalyango agreed that after the in right after 3 June of , he would come 4 that to work on this -- on the environmental 5 journalism issues with you. Is that correct? 6 It -- it was a kind of agreement, Α. 7 but he -- he was not yet sure about that. But, of 8 course, he said he promise that it is possible. 9 the confirmation started to come in -- in March. 10 That is when he said maybe it would be possible. 11 But in January, he was not sure yet. 12 Okay. So once it was confirmed in Q. 13 March, can you just tell the panel what -- what 14 part you did in part of the planning as far as 15 scheduling and -- and -- and so forth? 16 Actually, in March, I reached out to 17 talk to Professor Kalyango only one time, only one 18 time before. (Indiscernible) called me, you know, 19 What's up; you know, telling me what his plan is. 20 And then told me that in the summer, now it is 21 confirmed that after he will come 22 with is son. And that is when we decided to 23 work. You know, the room was with him, because he 24 was telling me, I will come now and I 25 will be coming with my son. And because even when

Τ.	1 1 was with Dr. Kalyango back in 2013 in
2	Kigali, also he was with his son. And then I was
3	telling him, Ah, that is great. So will you come
4	again with your son? Then he's saying yes. Then
5	I started now to work on the itinerary with
6	Professor Kalyango in March.
7	Q. And in part of that itinerary, did
8	it include this with his son?
9	A. Yes, he (indiscernible) that,
10	because when the (indiscernible) in
11	Professor Kalyango was with Dr. Judy, as I said,
12	and Dr. Rogus. And at that time, I can remember
13	that Dr. Judy made a commitment to go to the
14	(indiscernible) National Park.
15	And actually that is when I also
16	told Professor Kalyango, This is a fantastic thing
17	This is something which is fabulous.
18	This is a one-time experience. Please, can you
19	plan to come back and do such kind of
20	activity, because it was very amazing.
21	And then he said, you know, I'm
22	tempted to come again, even though I
23	don't know when yet; but when I will come, I will
24	visit for sure.
25	So during those discussions, of

1	course, (indiscernible), he said, I (indiscernible)
2	that I can see, I would like to come with my son, I
3	want to come with my family (indiscernible)
4	lifetime experience.
5	Q. So did you make those arrangements
6	for the for he and for he and his
7	son?
8	A. Yeah, yeah. I made the reservations
9	for Professor Kalyango and his son to go to the
10	mountain,
11	And I think in the end of April,
12	that is when Professor Kalyango was asking me, you
13	know, if I have, you know, already made a
14	reservation. And I said yes.
15	And then he said that there is a
16	a change in the plan. That is where I was a little
17	worried, because the the government here was
18	very strict when you were booking the
19	and the mission (indiscernible), they were
20	not (indiscernible) about changing.
21	But during that time, I went back to
22	(indiscernible) in , because (indiscernible)
23	. And there So I told them, now is
24	there's a change which is happening. And then they
25	say, It's fine, it's fine. (Indiscernible.)

1	Q. All right. So you changed the name
2	from his son
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Now, did you also book and make
5	arrangements for the the rooms for he and his
6	son in
7	A. Of course. When I was because
8	that was in March, uhm, he sent an email. And
9	then, of course, I was in touch with the people
10	because I know the guys there at the
11	Actually we call it Resort, you
12	know?
13	Q. Uh-huh.
14	A. And I was actually the one to
15	recommend that hotel as well.
16	Then he made reservation for a
17	double room. But, of course, because everything
18	that was going on, I was (indiscernible), that is
19	when also he said that he will come, of course,
20	with his son. So that's double room that he was
21	reserving at that time, of course, it was for him
22	and his son. And last thing is that also me and
23	the driver for the (indiscernible) also we
24	stayed we were supposed to stay at
25	But because there was some condition there in

1 and then somehow the expenses, we were 2 supposed to stay there as well. But for us, we 3 didn't want to stay there, but at some cheap hotel. 4 And then we negotiated with the people at the hotel 5 to cancel our reservation, me and the driver. 6 then, of course, we stayed somewhere around. 7 Now, in May, did you start having 8 conversations with and Dr. Kalyango about 9 trip? 10 Actually, we may -- we Uhm, yes. Α. 11 kept to discussing, because it wasn't my first time 12 to go with some international students, because in 13 2015 I hosted a student from Ohio University. 14 That's (indiscernible). It was here at BIOCOOP. 15 And in 2016, I hosted also an Ohio University 16 student (indiscernible). You know, they was 17 planning it in two days, you know, here at my organization. And they really enjoyed, you know, 18 19 our -- where we put them, especially in 20 environmental conservation and the (indiscernible) 21 activities. 22 But, of course, in 20 --23 As you were asking -- as you were 24 asking, in we discussed the route, you 25 about the itinerary. And I know, with

1	connected to a professor called
2	Professor Beth Kaplan. She's actually an American,
3	but she's working for the University
4	And when I am hosting those international students,
5	I'm instructed that I connected them with two other
6	academicians, other professors, other, you know,
7	(indiscernible). So we discussed. And I, like I
8	said, connected to Professor Beth Kaplan. And
9	they talked. You know, they were talking. You
10	know, she was asking Professor Beth how is
11	you know, how do do we work. And they confirm
12	that the organization, of course, is working very
13	well.
14	And that is when you know, was
15	calling to me, you know, on the phone, telling me
16	that, you know, she's happy to come .
L 7	And I can remember that the I was
18	there having to address the itinerary; and, of
L 9	course, got to know what would be the work
20	plan when she they reached
21	Q. All right. So from your
22	conversations with , including her conversations
23	with Dr. Kaplan, is it your belief that when she
24	arrived, or even before she arrived in , she
25	knew what the itinerary was?

1 To me, she knew that, because A. Yeah. 2 on the I personally discussed it with 3 and about what she will be telephone about 4 doing And, you know, maybe she --5 (indiscernible) there would be a probing question; 6 but when she would arrived, you know, everything 7 that was in the plan was done in the itinerary. 8 And then I can --9 Q. Now, let me ask you. Can you 10 knew before confirm that both you and Ms. 11 they came that Dr. Kalyango would not be 12 in the area; he would be staying 13 somewhere else? 14 That is a very good A. Ah, ah. 15 question. 16 What I can say there is that in 17 April, Dr. Kalyango told me that there was a change 18 in the plan, that his son -- his son will not come. And then he informed me that instead of his son 19 20 coming to , he will come with someone working 21 in the program of called 22 And that is when I -- I first heard, 23 you know, 24 And then Dr. K told me that, you 25 will be the one to stay, you know, at know,

1	Hotel and I and the driver.
2	Q. And he was Where was Dr. Kalyango
3	going to stay during that same period of time?
4	A. Uhm, during that time, he told me
5	that he will be in is a university,
6	a private university here in . They have a
7	program of journalism. And that that that
8	university has been working with Ohio in some years
9	ago, as I was informed by Professor Kalyango. But
LO	also he had some work in Because even when
L1	they reached (indiscernible) Dr. Kalyango
12	has never been, you know, to the western province,
13	because is in the Western Province in the
L 4	border of in (indiscernible) and is, you
15	know, far from The only day we were
L6	together with Professor Kalyango was when we were
L7	at the mountain and
18	Q. Okay. But is it your testimony or
19	is it your statement
20	And then this is sort of my last
21	question.
22	Is it your statement that both you
23	and knew even before you came to that
24	Dr. Kalyango was not going to be staying at
25	he was going to be in and those

1 areas?

A. Yes, for me, I -- I knew that, because he has (indiscernible). I knew that, that he would be in and (indiscernible) and other stuff. And that is why he told me, Make sure that you, and the driver will tour the whole country.

But one of the things that he permitted, and that is, he didn't manage to do maybe because (indiscernible) work, is that he will be involved on -- it was the -- you know, on the -- I think it was on the June 21st, he had promised that he will be with me generally. But also because he had -- he had a very tight schedule, he didn't come to -- to the event over (indiscernible) as well because of driving from to the Southern Province where it was a hilly road, (indiscernible) road, it was not easy. So which means that only one day with Dr. K. The remaining days, I was with

- Q. All right. And that was pursuant -- that was in the whole itinerary. Is that right?
- A. Yes. Yeah, as I was informed, it was in the itinerary.
 - Q. All right. And my final question to

you, sir, and then I'll turn it over to my colleague, is, did you explain all of this to the investigator?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ah, yes, I managed to tell the investigator. But the thing is that, you know, I told him all of those things. But when I was reading the report, I didn't see where the investigator was showing in my statement. Because I was someone on a (indiscernible) of calls, knowing everything which had went on, I was with from the first day to the last day, and I was explaining everything to the investigator. But even when I was reading the report, I was punished, because I didn't say anything regarding (indiscernible), you know? And I could see that sometimes he was describing as a country. (indiscernible), maybe, which is not accurate. But, you know, I would love to tell you that it is a country. Even though you can check all the professional report, it's a country which manage to do a lot for the people; and it is a country, which is really very safe. Everyone in is very calm. And we wanted to have really the culture (indiscernible) so that the people that coming to our country (indiscernible).

1	Q.	Thank you so much. I appreciate
2	your time.	
3		Mr. Loukx may have some questions
4	for you.	
5		
6		CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. LOUKX:	
8	Q.	Thank you. Do you mind if I call
9	you, is it Ang	re?
10	A.	Ange.
11	Q.	Ange.
12		Ange, thank you for helping us out
13	today.	
14		You indicate that you made the
15	reservation fo	r the Hotel?
16	A.	Yes.
17	Q.	And I'm a little confused, and maybe
18	you can help m	e out.
19		Is your email angeisho7@gmail.com?
20	A.	Yes.
21	Q.	I'm looking at an email that's at
22	168 in the evi	dence pack. And I recognize you
23	probably don't	have that, so I'll I will
24	describe it he	re. It's from Dr. Yusuf Kalyango.
25	It's dated Mon	day, Reservation

1 Executive room, and it's addressed to Request: 2 com, ah, and three other email 3 addresses also that appear to be the 4 Resort, with a copy to you at that email I just 5 spoke of. 6 Do you recall receiving a copy of 7 that email? 8 Yes. I -- Yeah, I -- I remember I Α. 9 got the copy of that email, because I was even the 10 one to provide the email over the -- over the 11 hotel. 12 Okay. Well, the email says, Dear Q. 13 Reservation Manager, and this is from Dr. Kalyango, 14 I am writing to request you reserve one executive 15 room; and then in quotes -- or in parentheses, 16 double bed and breakfast. It doesn't talk about 17 two beds, but a double bed and breakfast for two 18 people at Resort and (indiscernible), 19 The booking is the following is it 20 dates, and then it goes on to say to 21 I hope you can confirm this 22 reservation. I look forward to hearing from you. 23 And it's got the signature line for Dr. Yusuf 24 Kalyango, Professor and Director, Institute of 25 International Journalism at Ohio University.

And I guess the confusion I'm having is that this appears that Dr. Kalyango made the reservation, and he made a reservation for a room with a double bed, not two beds, and breakfast at the Emeraude Hotel.

Can you explain?

A. Yes. Thank you for that question.

Normally I (indiscernible) that area, saying that when he was making that reservation, he was telling me that he was coming with his son as usual. Because it was not the first time for Dr. K to come with his son, because as I state in the previous year, he was also here in with his son. And at that time, there was another professor from Ohio University, including Dr. Rogus and Dr. Judy. So that is when he made the reservation.

And, also, to me also, I made the reservation, because Professor Kalyango said to me to make my own reservation over there, the driver. But for that one that he sent, I knew that, and I was aware that he will be coming with his son and they will stay at, you know,

Q. Now, do you know if this is the room that stayed in, the one referenced in this

1	email?	
2	A.	Uhm, I can tell you
3	Q.	If you don't know, that's fine.
4	A.	Yeah, I don't know that. I don't
5	know that.	
6	Q.	Have you talked to Dr. Kalyango
7	about this cas	e?
8	A.	Which case?
9	Q.	The case that we're here discussing
10	today, the mat	ter that we're here discussing today.
11	Have you had a	n occasion to talk to Dr. Kalyango
12	about this mat	ter?
13	A.	No, I did not He didn't talk to
14	me. Ah, for m	e, I considered the email letter I
15	received from,	you know, Dr. Robin. Ah, yeah.
16	Q.	So you talked to Tony Anaya and you
17	gave a stateme	nt
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	in but you've
20	not talked to	Dr. Kalyango about this case?
21	A.	No, I didn't talk to him, but I
22	talked to his	attorney.
23	Q.	Okay.
24	A.	Yeah.
25		MR. LOUKX: I I sure appreciate

1	you attending long distance. And thank you for all
2	your help.
3	I have no further questions. And,
4	hey, have a great day.
5	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Thank you very
6	much.
7	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
8	Thank you, Mr. Loukx.
9	At this time are there any questions
10	from the hearing committee members?
11	SHERYL HOUSE: Robin, this is
12	Sheryl House. I have a question.
13	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
14	Yes. Dr. House, please.
15	SHERYL HOUSE: Ange, you had
16	mentioned that you had made the
17	I'm kind of confused still, because
18	I hear you say
19	Did you make reservations for
20	Dr. Kalyango in ? Did you have anything to
21	do with his reservations in the city where he
22	stayed, ended up staying?
23	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Well, actually,
24	for the reservation, he was the one to make the
25	reservations, but he was informing me on all the

1	reservations.	
2	SHERYL HOUSE: So he made his own	
3	reservations where he was giving his presentations?	
4	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Yes. He made the	
5	reservation in different hotel in , and he	
6	was informing me about where he would be staying.	
7	SHERYL HOUSE: Thank you.	
8	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Yeah.	
9	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:	
10	Thank you, Dr. House.	
11	And thank you, Dr. Imanishimwe.	
12	Thank you so much for your testi	
13	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: May I ask a	
14	quick questions?	
15	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:	
16	Of course.	
17	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Hello,	
18	Mr. Imanishimwe. My name is Vladimir Marchenkov.	
19	I am a member of the of the hearing committee.	
20	And I was wondering if you could	
21	clarify what exactly did when she was in	
22	with you on that trip.	
23	ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Okay. That is a	
24	very fantastic question.	
25	Actually, the (indiscernible)	

, it was only June 19th, And on the, 1 2 you know, other time, you know, stayed in ; but the second day we drove to the 3 national -- National Park where (indiscernible) 4 5 mountain in (indiscernible). And at that time, 6 we -- we finished the day -- the 7 at around 1 p.m., 1 in time. That time we had 8 one car hired by, you know, Professor Kalyango. 9 And he said that he has a little work in 10 For him he took a taxi, a cab to go back to 11 and the driver, So I and Frances. We -- we drove directly to the Western 12 13 Province where we call (indiscernible), and then 14 that is when we reached even the 15 Hotel. 16 So we were there. And, of course, 17 as I told you, I had also contacted other people 18 that I would be staying there. But after learning 19 that the hotel, is expensive, (indiscernible), but 20 to stay in that room. we accompanied 21 But during the trip, what we were 22 doing, I was just explaining to what we have in 23 , the environment that we have, because 24 (indiscernible) I was telling her about 25 the electrical service, because I'm a professional

1 quide. And I was used to work in the international 2 parks in 3 So the other day now, that is when 4 now, of course, It is a 5 national park, which is rich in biodiversity. You 6 know, we were visiting also different areas in 7 , and we were taking a lot of pictures. 8 And I can remember that when we were 9 , in the middle of the forest, that is in 10 was telling me that Dr. K is texting her when 11 that he is in and that he will not manage to 12 come to the event to meet the journalists. 13 So I -- I knew that information just

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

told from not really from Dr. K, because me, you know, I can get now diversity from Dr. K, that now he's still busy in and that he won't attend the event. And Dr. K asked now to speak on behalf of Ohio University. Then when it come to driving, I have (indiscernible) passerby as well. And we were taking pictures. And I can remember the words that would used She was used to say, This is quite super sav. duper mega cool, you know? Super duper mega cool. So she said to me, Ange, you know, This is super duper mega cool.

1 And, you know, to be honest with 2 you, I have never seen a very happy woman like 3 , because (indiscernible) she was very happy. 4 She was laughing, you know. She was saying, Ange, 5 This is fantastic. 6 And I know that before departure, 7 commit to me that she will come to for 8 other projects. 9 So, you know, to complete the -- you 10 know, the answer that I was saying, now 11 (indiscernible) this is the second town in 12 where now we met the local journalists. You know, 13 I had invited the local journalists. I had invited 14 the academician. And then I was with now, who 15 was representing Ohio University. 16 So in that event, now with attending 17 the journalists (indiscernible) in how to 18 connect their skills with environmental management, 19 because in we don't have any program of 20 environmental journalism. There is no program of 21 environmental communication. We only have the 22 program of journalism and communication. 23 And now the plan was now to see how 24 we can connect the dot, saying how can we connect

environmental management and the journalism.

25

1 was now explaining to them, and was now 2 talking on behalf of Ohio University. 3 And that is when now I was even 4 trying to market Ohio University, because even 5 though you can send someone to come here in 6 the local journalists, especially in the 7 Province, they know about the program is between 8 and Ohio University. And they know that, 9 you know, Ohio did a lot to (indiscernible), 10 because I was the first one in to connect 11 (indiscernible) with environment. And now, even though you can tell me 12 13 right now, I can sell you more than 20 --14 (indiscernible) that the journalists have 15 (indiscernible) after meeting, you know, from 16 Ohio University, and that was mostly because of the 17 connection that Dr. Kalyango did. Because although 18 the connection is between 19 and Ohio University, where because Dr. Kalyango was 20 putting a lot of people, you know, to connect dots. 21 And as I told you earlier, 22 (indiscernible) his students, you know, to come 23 here to this country who were doing their 24 (indiscernible) in

So in a few words, that is what we

25

did with
And then told me that she will
come back to and she told me that she
really enjoyed the environment of the country.
And, you know, even the driver that we were
together in generally, they know, because she
was really very, very happy and she was a best
friend here.
VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Thank you very
much, indeed. Thank you.
ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Thank you.
HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
Thank you very much Mr. Imanishimwe. I want to
thank you for your time today and on behalf of
the hearing committee.
And this will conclude your
testimony. We wish you all the best.
ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Thank you very
much.
HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
You're welcome. Take care. Bye-bye.
ANGE IMANISHIMWE: Okay.
HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
And with that, Duane, would you please move in our
next witness.

1	DUANE BRUCE: He is joining the
2	meeting now.
3	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
4	Thank you.
5	Good afternoon, I'm
6	Robin Muhammad. I'm the hearing committee chair.
7	Thank you for joining us today to provide
8	testimony.
9	(Inaudible.)
LO	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
11	Good afternoon, I'm Robin Muhammad.
12	I'm the hearing committee chair.
13	Thank you for being with us today.
L 4	We're going to use the next 30 minutes.
15	Yeah. Good afternoon.
16	Good to see you.
17	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
18	Good to see you as well. Thank you.
L9	So for the next 30 minutes, we'll
20	start first by any introductory remark that you
21	would like to make, and then the balance of time
22	will be between divided between the faculty
23	member's legal representative for questioning, and
24	then we'll switch to the university's legal counsel
25	for additional questioning.

1 At the end of that 30 minutes, we'll 2 entertain any questions that the hearing committee 3 might have as well. And we're asking everyone --4 Yeah. 5 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 6 Please -- please proceed. 7 Yeah. Thank you so 8 much for (indiscernible) of this senate hearing, as 9 well as everyone present. Good afternoon also to 10 Professor Kalyango. 11 My name is 12 I am now an 13 alumni. I graduated from Ohio University in 14 15 and then a 16 17 I got to know Professor Kalyango 18 when he visited He was at my former 19 university, my alma mater. The 20 where he was going around, 21 talking about Ohio University and telling people 22 how, when they get to Ohio University, they will 23 have a better opportunity to school themself. 24 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 25 Thank you for that. We're hearing you just fine.

1	I thank you for speaking so clearly and slowly,
2	because we're managing this Zoom meeting and a lot
3	of audio audio issues.
4	If it would be all right, now we're
5	going to ask Mr. Beck to come in and offer up some
6	questions.
7	Mr. Beck.
8	GREGORY BECK: Thank you,
9	Dr. Muhammad.
10	
11	DIRECT EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. BECK:
13	Q. my name is Greg Beck, and
14	I represent, along with some others, Dr. Kalyango,
15	and I just have a few questions. I I do have a
16	copy of the statement that you had prepared, and I
17	want to ask you some just some general
18	questions.
19	While you were at O.U.
20	, did did you know
21	Dr. Kalyango at that time?
22	A. Yes, I did. I Like I mentioned
23	earlier, I first met him in when he came
24	visiting, talking about Ohio University. And so
25	when I was Then when I came to Ohio University,

	456
1	
2	·
3	And so to (indiscernible)
4	Dr. Kalyango, I was also attracted
5	
6	So
7	(inaudible) I knew Dr. Kalyango.
8	Q. And during your course of study,
9	,
10	was he helpful to you?
11	A. Yeah, he was very, very, very
12	helpful.
13	Let me just make a quick correction.
14	
15	
16	
17	·
18	And so during my projects, every
19	step, every chapter (indiscernible) making is
20	making academic (indiscernible).
21	Q. I want to talk I want to draw
22	your attention, to the late part of
23	
24	Did Dr. Kalyango ask you to do some
25	work for him on some evaluations from the trip

2 A. Yes, that is accurately correct.

3 Yes. So I was invited by Dr. Kalyango to work on

4 some evaluation which he brought from

5 And so it was a pile of documents, which is a hard

6 copy; and then the soft copy was, indeed, on his

7 Mac computer in his office.

And so he left the office for me so that I can check the paper-based documentation. I changed the one which I entered on the computer to check whether they are the same or whether there was some variation and also to check the (indiscernible), whether they are grammatically correct. So, yes, yes, I was asked to do some work by Dr. Kalyango.

- Q. So just so that I understand, he asked you to match the hard copies of the evaluations that were filled out by the participants up against what was actually in the computer. Is that right?
 - A. Yeah, that is correct.
- Q. Now, had you ever done that type of job before?
- 24 A. Yes. I did one of those, ah, for 25 another project from, I think, yes,

1 which, again, was a paper-based document which I 2 need to look at it and then double-check to the 3 ones that were entered in (indiscernible). 4 So you froze up on me a little bit Q. 5 there, 6 Yes, I'm here. Α. 7 Q. So the job that you did in at 8 looking at the hard evaluations was 9 the same job that you did for him in -- in 10 from the Is that correct? trip. 11 Yeah, that is correct. The -- the Α. 12 difference within the two job is different 13 participants and then different location in terms 14 of being So, yes, 15 But in terms of what goes in, that is correct. 16 (inaudible) was they are all (inaudible) based. 17 Q. Now, how much time did you have to 18 spend to do this match-up between the hard copies 19 and the computer copies -- and the computer 20 information? I'm sorry. 21 Uhm, if I could -- I could recall, I Α. 22 think that I use over six hours to do that. 23 And in that process, did you see any Q. 24 errors? 25 Α. Yes, I -- I did; I mean,

typo-related errors, and then errors regarding the 1 2 evaluation itself were what I identified. 3 Q. And when you identified an error, 4 did you just simply correct it? 5 Yes. I was able to correct it, A. 6 because it was in the -- the soft copy. But then 7 the hard copy is original copy, which I didn't -- I 8 didn't know to touch. And so I was just matching 9 the hard copy, I did on the soft copy. So that the 10 hard copy will reflect exactly what it is -- is 11 captured on the hard copy. 12 And then once you completed that Q. 13 task, did you just advise Dr. Kalyango about that? 14 Α. Yes. Once that task was completed, 15 I -- I mentioned to him that it's done. And so I 16 placed the hard copies in brown envelopes and 17 dropped that in his office in (indiscernible). And 18 then I think (indiscernible) the one 19 (indiscernible), I quess, yeah. 20 And did he ask you to do anything 0. 21 else after that with respect to the 22 23 Α. No. That was -- No. My job was done after matching the hard copy to the soft copy 24 25 to ensure that they reflect -- the hard copy

1 reflect exactly what had been captured in the soft 2 And my work was done, and that was it. copy. 3 You know, that's really ο. 4 the last question I have except for this one. 5 Yes. Α. 6 And that is, in your statement, Q. 7 you -- I think you -- I -- you were asked to sort 8 of reflect on your thoughts on Dr. Kalyango. And I 9 think I'm referring to your last paragraph in your 10 written statement. Would you just share that with 11 the panel? 12 Can you say that question? You were 13 breaking. Your last question was breaking. 14 I'm sorry. My last question for you Q. 15 was, would you just share with the panel the last 16 paragraph that you wrote in your statement about 17 Dr. Kalyango? 18 Α. Yeah. So let me quickly jump to 19 that. 20 I think that Professor Kalyango for 21 me and students will say that he's a 22 lifesaver, because he actually understand our 23 challenges given that he's an African-born 24 professor, which happens to be the only African 25 born professor in the Scripps College. He's very

1 approachable. Anytime you approach Dr. Kalyango with any issue, you knew not to explain yourself 2 3 more, and that he would be in the position to -- to 4 really -- to really assist. 5 I mean, I think that I can't just 6 imagine Scripps College without him. I mean, 7 talking for myself, I do not know what I would have 8 done to succeed academically without the assistance 9 of Professor Kalyango; not just academically, but 10 financially in the sense that giving us some 11 (indiscernible) jobs, which indeed also sustained 12 us during our stay on Ohio University campus. 13 And so it will be very difficult to 14 get a replacement of such professor or, indeed, a 15 lot of respect. Not just in America, but across 16 Africa given his experience as a journalist and as 17 somebody who knows the African politics in and out 18 and somebody who knows how the African economy 19 works. 20 Thank you, 0. I have no 21 further questions. 22 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 23 Thank you, Mr. Beck. 24 We'll turn now to university's

25

counsel.

1 ADAM LOUKX: Thank you. 2 3 CROSS-EXAMINATION 4 BY MR. LOUKX: 5 good afternoon. Or maybe Q. 6 I guess it's still morning, here anyway. Thank you 7 for joining us and thank you for your help. 8 I only have a very few questions, 9 and it's partly just to aid my confusion. Perhaps 10 I'm the only one that's confused, so indulge me 11 just a second. 12 As I understand it, you were given 13 some evaluations, and your task was to take the 14 hard copy of the evaluation and check it against 15 something that had been downloaded on a computer. 16 Is that right? 17 Α. Yeah, that is correct. 18 Q. And you did that task? 19 Α. Yes, I did that task. 20 I think, like I mentioned earlier 21 when I was responding -- I responded to the other 22 attorney, my task then was to focus when there were errors, which -- which I did, and also correct few 23 24 numbers which were not entered correctly. And so 25 once that was done, my -- my work ended.

_	Q. And the endpoint of this task was to
2	make sure that the hard copies matched what was on
3	the computer. Correct?
4	A. Yes. The task was to match the hard
5	copy to exactly what was captured in the computer.
6	Q. So the best document to tell what
7	the evaluation said is the hard copy. Right?
8	A. Absolutely. Absolutely. It's just
9	like you coming from Ohio University and presenting
10	your transcript to, let's say, an (indiscernible)
11	university. So (indiscernible) with a transcript
12	you submit it, (indiscernible) and reflects the
13	original. You may be asked to send an original.
14	(Indiscernible) you send to that university by the
15	Ohio University.
16	And, so, yes, my task was to match
17	the hard copy. I gave the soft copy to
18	(indiscernible) in the soft copy reflect exactly
19	what is on the hard copy.
20	Q. And what was the purpose of the soft
21	copy? Where did that go?
22	A. That, I am not actually sure,
23	because I just write on it and then send it.
24	Q. I see. But again, if I compare the
25	soft copy to the hard copy

1	A. I did it on the Mac computer as
2	a way to (indiscernible). Yeah,
3	that's it. That was my task. So where it was sent
4	to wasn't my task, so that I cannot say.
5	Q. Okay. Do you know if you were the
6	last person to do this task with those evaluations?
7	A. So far as my memory, ah, can
8	remem I So far as I can remember, I did not
9	ask for (indiscernible). I knew that one student
10	work on it first, and that is now I'm I'm
11	just getting to know it now. Before that, I didn't
12	know somebody work on it before I was asked to work
13	on it.
14	And so my task then was just to
15	compare the hard copy to the soft copy, and then
16	that was it.
17	So subsequently, I didn't know
18	whether after me someone else work on it or that
19	was it.
20	Q. Okay. But in the end of the day, if
21	there is a discrepancy between the soft copy and
22	the hard copy, that discrepancy would be the fault,
23	for a lack of a better word, the person that
24	entered the information into the soft copy. Right?

A. Can you repeat that again? You were

1	breaking at that point.
2	Q. Okay. Fair enough.
3	The If there is a discrepancy
4	between the hard copy and the soft copy, that would
5	be error by the person that entered the information
6	into the soft copy. Right?
7	A. Yes, that is correct.
8	Q. Okay. That helps me out a bit. And
9	thank you for bearing with me.
10	I have no other questions. And
11	thank you again for your participation in this
12	matter.
13	A. And thanks so much for also having
14	me.
15	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
16	Thank you, Mr. Loukx.
17	one moment. I wanted to
18	ask the hearing committee members if anyone has a
19	question for at this time.
20	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: I have a quick
21	question.
22	Okay.
23	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Hi,
24	So after
25	I just want you to clarify this.

1 So after you finished a comparison, 2 did you -- what did you do? You sent it to 3 Professor K, or did you --4 Can you clarify that? 5 Did you -- So you corrected it and 6 then give the soft copy to Professor K. Is that 7 right? Am I -- Is that correct? 8 Yeah. I think that 9 let me better explain this particular aspect of the 10 question. 11 Like I mentioned in my previous 12 response to the previous attorney, I told him that 13 my task basically was to compare and then correct 14 if, indeed, there was some error on the soft copy, 15 which indeed was on the Mac computer in 16 Dr. Kalyango's office in Schoonover. And so after 17 that was done, after that correction was done, the 18 next thing I did was to put the hard copy in a 19 brown envelope, and then that was dropped in the 20 Sing Tao office, which, indeed, is Dr. Kalyango's 21 office as well, which is near to Baker, if I -- I 22 quite remember. And that meant my task was done. 23 YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Okay. All 24 right. Thank you. 25 You're welcome.

1	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
2	Thank you, Dr. Shao.
3	Thank you so much, . That
4	concludes your testimony. We greatly appreciate
5	your time today in providing the testimony. Have a
6	good rest of the today.
7	All right. Thank you,
8	Dr. Robin. It's been fantastic having me. And
9	have a good one, too.
10	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
11	Take care. Bye-bye now.
12	All right. Yeah.
13	Bye.
14	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
15	Our next witness is in the waiting room, as I
16	understand it, so I'd like to move on with them;
17	and then we will break at approximately 12:30 for a
18	lunch break for just 30 minutes.
19	Duane, would you please bring in
20	Dr. Ekeanyanwu.
21	DUANE BRUCE: I believe he is in the
22	joining phase at this time.
23	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
24	Thank you.
25	Good afternoon, Dr. Ekeanyanwu. I

1 am Robin Muhammad. I am the hearing committee 2 chair. Thank you so much for being with us today 3 to provide testimony. 4 We have about 30 minutes. 5 welcome to start with some introductory remarks, 6 and then we'll shift to the faculty member's legal 7 counsel to pose some questions to you, followed by 8 the university's legal counsel to do the same. 9 the end of that 30 minutes, if there are questions 10 from the hearing committee itself from various 11 members, we'll entertain them at that time. 12 I hope you can hear me all right. 13 You might want to take your -- Your microphone is 14 muted; so if you'd click on that, then we can hear. 15 NNAMDI EKEANYANWU: Can you hear me 16 now? 17 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: Ι 18 can hear you very well. Thank you. 19 NNAMDI EKEANYANWU: Okay. Thank 20 you, ma'am. 21 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 22 So -- so please make your introductory marks 23 remarks; and then if you heard me, I hope, we'll 24 shift to the questioning portion of the next 25 30 minutes.

1	NNAMDI EKEANYANWU: Okay, ma'am.
2	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
3	Very good.
4	NNAMDI EKEANYANWU: Thank you,
5	ma'am.
6	So my name is Nnamdi Ekeanyanwu.
7	I'm a professor of international communication at
8	the University of and strategic communication at
9	the University of Uyo in South-South part of
10	Nigeria.
11	I'm sure I was invited for this
12	testimony because of my relationship with Ohio
13	University. I'm a SUSI scholar. I was part of the
14	cohorts that attended the
15	I'm also the national president of
16	the African Council for Communication Education,
17	ACC for short. ACC is the one of the largest
18	communication association for Africans in Africa in
19	that, you know you know, in Diaspora. I'm the
20	current national president. My tenure started in
21	2017. And so and then a SUSI scholar. That's
22	my brief introduction.
23	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
24	Thank you for that. We'll turn now to questioning.
25	NNAMDI EKEANYANWU: Okav. ma'am.

1	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
2	Ms. Ziarko.
3	
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MS. ZIARKO:
6	Q. Thank you, Professor, for that.
7	You mentioned that you're here and
8	you wanted to talk about your relationship with
9	Ohio University and the SUSI program.
LO	Can you go ahead and do that and
L1	explain your role in that and the importance of the
12	SUSI program?
13	A. Thank you, ma'am.
L 4	In 2011, one of the best things that
15	happened to my career was the announcement that I
16	won the scholarship to represent West Africa,
۱7	Nigeria, in the SUSI program at the Ohio
18	University. Immediately the U.S. ambassador
19	informed me. A week later Professor Yusuf Kalyango
20	sent an email also congratulating me for that. And
21	in July we came for the program.
22	The SUSI program is a program that
23	American government set up to help African scholars
24	like me and permit scholars to, you know, come to
25	America, understand the American system, and view

the cultural divides.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That program changed my life and career, because it -- for somebody who meddled in international, you know, communication, it helped me to understand, you know, the American system that supposedly I was teaching a class; and it also helped me in my career in terms of my students that it is crucial and the contacts that came from that. And the continuous collaboration that continued from that scholarship I attended Ohio is something I cannot describe in words (indiscernible). had been a very -- it was an enriching program. It was a program that exposed me to the program that, you know, gave me a connection to Ohio University, as well as other, you know, scholars that participated in that program.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

And can you describe your interactions with Dr. Kalyango and your experiences with him during the SUSI program?

A. Thank you, ma'am.

From the very first email he sent, you know, you could see the kind of man that he was. He was a gentleman. The -- the man was very respectful; was very, very, very respectful, I

would say in my time with him and for -- Because I checked him out online, and he was a big professor as far as I was concerned. I was young (indiscernible) career. And at the airport, he was physically present at the airport to welcome me and other persons that arrived. And that was the first shock I had of a -- of somebody with such a CV representing American government and the university waiting for me at the airports and not (indiscernible) student a person to do that. And so the relationship started.

And all through my stay at Ohio
University and subsequently, because we -- it
didn't end at Ohio University after we left the
program. When I became the president -- secretary
of the ACC that I mentioned, we also made an
attempt to invite him, you know, because he was
a -- he remained a gentleman; he remained very,
very respectful as a person. And most importantly,
we all saw him, as a scholar, very attentive. You
know, related well with everyone, you know, during
my time there. And that's why I say, my being
here, I'm not just here as SUSI scholar. I'm also
here representing some of my colleagues. You know,
I was second person from Nigeria that attended that

program. I am a representative of my colleagues who have I have interacted with since this issue started. And I was asked to speak on their behalf. I'm also representative of ACC. They also ask me, because they know him, so to speak on his behalf.

University was a very, very respectful scholar, very detailed, very attentive, and very strict, because he handled us well in terms of some of us, we were in America for the first time and making sure that we were within the bounds of the program and we didn't go outside our expectations. That's the man I knew, and that's why I have agreed to speak here today as a witness.

Q. Thank you.

In your statement that you provided to me, you listed several reasons why the -- the SUSI program, which is administered at O.U., how it benefitted you and -- and all the other scholars that are a part of it.

- A. Yes.
- Q. Can you -- can you highlight those for the committee, please?
- A. Yes. The SUSI program, as I said earlier, was very, very changing in terms of career

turnaround for me. And number one, it increased my, you know, professional knowledge about the American media system. And so for the first time -- We were reading books -- for the first time, I had a full-time contacts with American media, because we were taken to, you know, different media places and systems. We had practical lectures, interactions.

You know, my visit to C- -- to CNN in Atlanta was a high point of that.

Today I am being consulted as an (indiscernible) in that area where I had just done my visit. And that SUSI program provided that opportunity.

Secondly, you know, the -- it helped me in my collaborative research. I am happy to report that I have published some works with Professor Kalyango and other colleagues arising from the SUSI program. Without the SUSI program, I wouldn't have met them; that collaboration wouldn't have happened. And so I can boast of a, you know, international publications, you know, in my CV from that SUSI program. Number 3, we also participated in, you know, extensive exchanges.

In Dr. Kalyango led a team

to -- to _____, you know, to, you know, lead a conference, help organize the conference and lead, you know, the conference in _____. That's one of the benefit of that.

So we had, you know, international representation, because Kalyango is completely an international scholar, well known. We had some funding because of his presence because he agreed to participate at that conference.

And so this we are talking about number 4. I don't know. Also with my participation in SUSI with Professor Kalyango (indiscernible) Mary Rogus, you know, we also have a -- we -- we -- our -- Our profile, the journal we publish from that (indiscernible), the profile, you know, you know, went on, because Dr. Kalyango agreed to be a part of the international team for that conference.

So these are some of the, you know, benefits of my participation at SUSI.

- Q. Okay. And you said you are here on behalf of several people and organizations to speak on --
- A. Yes, ma'am.

25 Q. -- to speak for Dr. Kalyango.

But, in fact, you're not -- you didn't just come here today for this.

me.

You actually wrote the president of the university, didn't you, on Dr. Kalyango's behalf?

when we invited Dr. Kalyango and the international journal, (indiscernible) where he was the director. So we reach an agreement for him to co-host the conference as part of a -- the -- the collaborations we would be having with the university. And he agreed. And we started the process. And all of a sudden, he wrote me to say that he will not be able to represent Ohio University again because he has a pending case.

And I said, What pending case?

And he described the situation to

And I felt obligated to write
the university president as the president of
ACC that we had a standing arrangement with
Professor Kalyango, and this is who represented the
university. And (indiscernible) promise was funded
if he -- the university and the -- the unit he was
directing agreed to participate, and that they were

not going to continue if he did not.

So I wrote a personal letter to the president finding out what is the situation, and this is our situation. And after several, you know, weeks, there was no response. I sent a reminder, reminding the president I wasn't writing as an individual. I am representing an organization in Africa, Africans in communication education, and we had a contractual agreement with the universities, and I needed to understand what was going on and why Kalyango cannot be part of it anymore.

And then after that, she respond -the president, you know, responded and was
dismissive because I (indiscernible) that
Dr. Kalyango had shared the details of the issue
with me. And then I (indiscernible) the matter was
still -- the issue was still ongoing. It was not
stopping him from participating.

And so the president was dismissive of my abuse; and then eventually, you know, sent me a memo to interact with the dean. And the current dean was also not a -- was not supportive.

(Indiscernible) He didn't want to get involved with whatever project that -- that he knew Professor K,

we used to call him, was livid at that point in time.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So they all did not -- They were not helpful.

If not for my relationship with Ohio University as an alumnus of the SUSI program, I'm almost tempted to, you know, take the case further in terms of Kalyango representing the university and having an agreement with us, and that human being thrown out of the way without any consideration of the implication for us. And so it was a big deal. It was a big deal for us on a negative side trying to get that conference organized and have that conference in 2019 without Ohio University, without Ohio -- without Dr. Kalyango be part of it, because it was advertised the (indiscernible.) We couldn't get it funded again. (Indiscernible) they were deceptive. We provided Ohio University (indiscernible) international scholar in the name of Kalyango to secure funding. All of a sudden Ohio University was not participating; Kalyango was not coming.

And I couldn't share the details of this situation together, because it was a private matter, which I -- it wasn't my place to do. But

it was negative on the part of ACC, and we're not happy.

And I expressed that to the president, that ACC was not happy how the matter was treated and how Kalyango was not allowed to represent the university even when the case was an ongoing case, there was no, you know, condition, and a lot of that.

Q. All right. Thank you.

And based on your knowledge and observations of Dr. Kalyango, were you surprised about these allegations?

A. I was completely -- I was completely surprised.

Ma'am, I have to be very honest with you. I would apologize for being in Africa, but I have to be very honest with you. Every other person, because when the conference did not go as planned with Kalyango, the secretary called me at ACC and some members. Don't forget everybody goes online. Kalyango was in _______as he lead from Ohio for that conference.

And so when he spoke, if I'm

permitted to show some videos here, Kalyango was

a -- was like a -- a super star right from U.S. for

that conference. He was the most photographed person at that conference. I was -- I was the secretary of the (indiscernible) there. Because I brought Kalyango and Ohio, I was contesting the election for the presidency, that election, I won that election clearly because everybody felt bringing the person of Kalyango, that that's the kind of thing that is spread at an international conference, the kind of (indiscernible). So I won that election because I brought him there. So everybody, we are aware.

And then he announce the arrangement that we had in 2019, Ohio will partner with ACC in a graduate conference. So when the conference (indiscernible), I had to share some of the reasons, because I didn't want to sound like a politician who was like -- I had to share some of the details. Some of them also found online and called my attention. (Indiscernible) seen online about Professor Kalyango. And everybody, everybody, they were surprised. And I was particularly -- particularly (indiscernible), because it doesn't represent the man that we know.

My colleagues who were a part of the SUSI program, the SUSI program had, you know, an

almost equal female and male. We're all free in this process. We -- More than four or five hotels, we spent together.

The -- Most of the students helps
that we had. You know, all of them, we have -most of them -- they have -- The graduate students,
they were all females. None of them have -- have
written to find out what is going on. None of them
had anything negative to say to date
(indiscernible). No one has reported any negative.

Kalyango came to When he came to

I said he was like a super star coming from U.S.,

you know, in a city (indiscernible) And

so everyone, everyone, people wanted all these

details.

I have to be very frank with you.

of hundred female in that conference, they would sign up with me. So how about that show? But that never happened. All throughout our stay and we left, there was no indication of the quality of man, the kind of person that had been (indiscernible) in the last two years been described. In my place, we say that a leopard cannot change his spots. If a man is so described,

but it cannot be in one instance. It's a character that people cannot hide for a long time. It will show. So we were all surprised, and that's why I'm -- I'm speaking here today. We were all surprised that such allegations here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I am happy. My happiness is that I have asked every other SUSI scholar, ACC members. Nobody seems to say anything negative. And I'm happy to hear that there are no corroborations of rudenesses. The older graduate students to line up to say that this is the man, we have had this experience with him or not, the other colleagues here, I'm happy -- I don't know exactly if Mary Rogus is part of the team speaking or the -- Anne Cooper (indiscernible). These are people we met. They were people that are working, comfortable working with him. I don't know whether they are speaking for him at this hearing. But I have tried to talk to them, and I'm happy to hear that every one of them says that is not Professor K that we know.

And so it's -- I am shocked, and I can't describe it in words.

And let me say this before you ask your next question.

1	I I don't want to You know, we
2	can't stop saying this. But I'm very particular.
3	I am very convinced. You know, I'm happy that this
4	senate committee is being heard by professors who
5	know what it takes to be a professor and who know
6	what amount of effort that Professor K put into
7	life to become a professor; and, you know, didn't
8	want to be rubbish over an isolated is you
9	know, incident.
10	I I I reach that conclusion,
11	that if he was not black and African and
12	successful, we wouldn't be having this
13	conversation. And I'm sorry to say that. We
14	wouldn't be having this conversation.
15	Q. Thank you for your testimony.
16	I am going to turn it over now to
17	Ohio University's counsel, and he may have some
18	questions for you, okay? Thank you.
19	NNAMDI EKEANYANWU: Thank you,
20	ma'am.
21	MR. LOUKX: Good afternoon. And
22	thank you for your appearance here today.
23	I have no questions for you. So I
24	do appreciate your your testimony and the help
25	you've given the committee, but no questions from

1	me. Thank you.
2	NNAMDI EKEANYANWU: Thank you, sir.
3	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
4	Thank you, Mr. Loukx.
5	Do we have any questions for
6	Professor Ekeanyanwu from the hearing committee
7	members?
8	Hearing hearing none, I want to
9	thank you again, Professor Ekeanyanwu, for your
LO	time here today to provide testimony and to answer
L1	questions. It's very much appreciated. And on
12	behalf of the hearing committee, we wish you all
13	the best.
L4	NNAMDI EKEANYANWU: Thank you so
15	much, ma'am, for the opportunity. And I pray that
16	you people have the guidance to do the right thing
17	God help all of you. Thank you so much, ma'am.
18	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
19	Thank you. Have a good day.
20	NNAMDI EKEANYANWU: Thank you,
21	ma'am.
22	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
23	All right. Thank you, everyone. It's about 12:16
24	by my clock.
25	We can break now for the lunch. I

1	won't call it the lunch hour. It will be the lunch
2	44 minutes.
3	Please be back around 12:25 at the
4	latest, so Excuse me. Excuse me. Please be
5	back at five minutes before 1 so that we can bring
6	in our next guess in a timely fashion.
7	Thank you so much. Enjoy the break.
8	I will be off camera and muted, but not far away.
9	CHARLES LOWERY: Thank you, Robin.
10	
11	Thereupon, a luncheon recess was
12	taken at 12:16 p.m. until 12:57 p.m.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	Friday Afternoon Session December 11, 2020
2	12:57 p.m.
3	
4	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
5	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
6	All right. Thank you, everyone. We're back for
7	another slate of testimony between now and 3:30.
8	Duane, please usher in our next
9	witness.
10	DUANE BRUCE: The next witness is
11	joining now.
12	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
13	Good afternoon, Dr. Katu-Ogundimu. I'm
14	Robin Muhammad, the hearing committee chair. I
15	hope you're doing well.
16	Good afternoon, Dr. Katu-Ogundimu.
17	NANCY KATU-OGUNDIMU: Hi. Good
18	af good evening from Nigeria.
19	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
20	Better. Good evening, then.
21	NANCY KATU-OGUNDIMU: Yeah.
22	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
23	Thank you very much for being here.
24	Are you able to key in with video?
25	NANCY KATU-OGUNDIMU: Yes, I can.

1	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
2	Excellent. Thank you so much.
3	NANCY KATU-OGUNDIMU: All right.
4	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
5	I'm Robin Muhammad. I'm the chair of the hearing
6	committee. On behalf of the hearing committee, I
7	want to thank you for being here today to provide
8	testimony for these proceedings.
9	NANCY KATU-OGUNDIMU: Thank you.
LO	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
11	We have about 30 minutes for your testimony. That
12	will include any introductory remarks that you
13	would like to make at the beginning, and then we'll
L 4	pivot to questions from the faculty member's legal
15	counsel and then to questions from the university
16	legal counsel. And at the end of that 30 minutes,
L7	we'll entertain any questions that there might be
18	coming from the hearing committee itself.
19	So with that, simply begin your
20	testimony when you're ready.
21	NANCY KATU-OGUNDIMU: My name is
22	Dr. Nancy Katu-Ogundimu, and I am a faculty member
23	in the Department of Mass Communication, University
24	of Jos, Nigeria. I earned by master's and my Ph.D.
25	at Ohio University, my master's in communication

1	and development, and my Ph.D. in mass communication
2	in the School of Media Arts and Studies, Scripps
3	College of Communication.
4	And my husband, my daughter, and I
5	actually all earned a master's and our Ph.D.s in
6	O.U., so basically we are Bobcat family members.
7	And I'm a proud member of the Bobcat family in
8	Nigeria.
9	So basically that's just a general
10	introduction about me. And I'll just be waiting
11	for Andrea to to speak with me.
12	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
13	Excellent. Thank you.
14	Ms. Ziarko, if you would like to
15	proceed with questions.
16	ANDREA ZIARKO: All right. Thank
17	you.
18	
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MS. ZIARKO:
21	Q. Doctor, can you give a little bit of
22	background. You say you and your family are all
23	graduates of O.U. And can you give some background
24	as to the relationship between O.U. and the
25	Nigerian community?
	•

1	A. Uhm, like I said, my husband, my
2	daughter, and I all came to O.U., and we all earned
3	a master's and Ph.D. And one thing that fascinated
4	me about O.U. from the beginning was the fact that
5	O.U. had a relationship with the Nigerian
6	government between the 1980s to the nine the
7	1980s and the '90s. There was a relationship with
8	Northern Nigeria, a contract signed to train
9	students of Nigeria at O.U.; so I was very
10	fascinated to find, you know, a lot of governors
11	here, senators, members of the House of
12	Representatives, a number of people I know who are
13	all alumni of O.U.
14	And when I got onto the campus, I
15	also found, for example, that in the seventies,
16	there were a large Nigerian community. So that's
17	kind of one of the reasons that drew me to O.U.,
18	and I would say that I enjoyed every bit of my stay
19	as a student.
20	Q. Great.
21	Now, when did you first meet
22	Dr. Kalyango?
23	A. I met Dr. Kalyango in 2010. I came
24	to O.U. on a Ford Foundation, Ford Foundation
25	international fellowship; and my area of study or

- 1 research area was media and conflict. And so when
- 2 | I was looking around for courses, my former
- 3 director, who was also my academic mentor,
- 4 Professor Obregon (phonetic) directly, you know,
- 5 kind of introduce me to a media and conflict course
- 6 in the School of Journalism. So I walked into the
- 7 class in 2010 I think the second semester, and that
- 8 was the first day I met Dr. Kalyango, who was the
- 9 professor teaching the class.
- 10 Q. And what was your impression of
- 11 Dr. Kalyango?
- Well, is that what you called him,
- 13 Dr. Kalyango?
- A. Actually, we -- well, Dr. Kalyango
- for the first day; but after that, he became Dr. K,
- 16 which he is to a lot of the students.
- Ah, my impression was I was really
- 18 excited seeing Dr. Kalyango in class, because when
- 19 | I got onto campus, I realized, for example, in the
- 20 program that I was attending that I really didn't
- 21 have, ah, either African professors or professors
- 22 who had a research interest in Africa, and that
- 23 kind of bothered me. Because with Ford Foundation,
- 24 the bulk of that career program was to kind of
- 25 | equip me with the needed skills and knowledge to go

1 back home and then to use those skills in Nigeria.

So definitely my research area had
to do with Nigeria. And at that time, Plateau

State where I come from was dealing with a lot of

(indiscernible) conflict. So I was trying to find
my way in between to see how I could situate myself

to be of help to my country when I returned.

And so I looked around the campus; and I was kind of disappointed when I -- you know, I didn't find what I was looking for until Dr. Obregon directed me to Kalyango's class.

So I came. You know, I was excited to see a person of color, to see an African man; and also I found his class was very fascinating. There was a lot of engagement, interaction between the students, between the students and the professor. He was very thorough and very concerned about each of his students. So that was basically my first impression of him.

And for my final paper, I -- I

did -- I wrote a paper on something to do with

conflict in Africa. And somehow I think a few

months after the class was over, we met some -
somewhere around Elder library, and he told me I

had a very good research paper, and he encouraged

1	me to put that for a conference. And he helped
2	work with me to make the paper good and eventually
3	got top paper in the division.
4	And from then, Dr. K became
5	basically, like, my academic mentor and eventually
6	became a member of my dissertation committee.
7	Q. So it's fair to say that
8	Dr. Kalyango pushed you as a student?
9	A. Yeah, he pushed me really hard.
10	Somehow there's this thing about
11	him, I he expects a lot from his students, and
12	somehow you don't just want to disappoint him,
13	because he he tends to, you know, make you
14	understand that you are better than what you think
15	you are; and he drives you, in quote, a slave
16	driver when it comes to work. You know, he doesn't
17	compromise the quality of his work, especially with
18	his students.
19	And so a lot of times, you know, one
20	would just strive to do well because you don't want
21	to disappoint Dr. K.
22	Q. Okay. I want to switch gears just a
23	little bit and ask you.
24	You mentioned some the
25	experiences you had on campus.

1 And how about as an international 2 student? Was there any misunderstanding of the 3 international program that either you or your 4 husband experienced while you were there? 5 Yeah, a lot. Α. 6 Uhm, as an international student --7 First of all, as a Ford Foundation 8 fellow at that time, we had one year of preacademic 9 training where we were kind of exposed to the 10 American culture and what to expect and what not 11 to, just to reduce kind of the shock, the culture 12 shock. 13 And so for some of us, we were a bit 14 grounded when we came into the U.S. And for me, I 15 found Athens a very quiet place, which kind of suit 16 me well where I'm coming from. 17 However, I mean, with -- with -- as 18 an international student, there were also shocks 19 that came along with it, especially when you deal 20 with people who have a misconception of Africa, 21 people who have stereotypes and biases about who 22 you are. 23 And I have a number of, you know, 24 examples for that.

First of all, I'll talk about my

25

husband. My husband worked as a graduate tutor in the graduate writing lab at the library, and he had a situation where his supervisor then wrote him an email basically kind of complaining about his Nigerian accent and explained why his accent made it difficult for Americans students to understand. And, you know, kind of -- The email was just riddled with some very racial undertones. And one thing that bothered us at that time was he was the only African tutor in the -- in the graduate writing center, and we noticed a large traffic of African students to that place with a lot of Asians and other people of color. And what we kind of questioned is, while he may not have had the American accent, or whatever that might mean, his supervisor was not mindful of the possibility that he had a lot of African students who didn't understand the American accent in itself. And he felt really -- And then she felt like he --- he was too forthcoming. He was kind of assertive. felt he was aggressive. And so that created a problem. And he felt really harassed, if I could say that, and wrote an email to the ombudsperson. The office of the ombudsperson, there was an acknowledgment of that email, but nothing ever came

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 of it.

When my husband (inaudible) about O.U., one of the sad memories he has about O.U. is that, because he felt like, you know, at least he needed to be heard and his voice was not important.

- Q. Okay.
- A. So that's for him.
- Q. Right.
- A. And for -- when for me, I would say, apart from the racist things, we find, and especially from people who had a wrong misconception, misconceptions about issues. I struggled with some part of my academics because I, you know, needed some kind of help from people who had perspectives from where I was coming from.

For example, for my Ph.D.

dissertation, I sent in my proposal to IRB, and
then I had a problem because I wanted to conduct a
mixed method. And IRB had an issue with how I was
collecting my data. My research was kind of
focused on -- a lot on religion in Nigeria, and
they felt it was a very sensitive topic, which is
rightly so; however, they were uncomfortable with
me administering the questionnaire face to face.
They suggested, you know, having boxes and keys,

putting them in envelopes, which ordinarily is a good procedure, but not in the place where I come from; because if I had to start putting questionnaires in envelopes and boxes, it might expose me to a lot of danger. And because I really didn't really have anyone who understood where I ws coming from, I had to move away from using this

mixed method and just focus on something.

Dr. K was kind of useful in that that he helped me steer away my method from a mixed methodology to just focus on political research.

And then along the line to -- you know, in trying to figure out where to situate my research, you know, I was talking -- I had someone on my committee that I had to eventually let go of, but the person told me to just forget about what I (indiscernible), because my country wasn't ready for the type of research I was trying to conduct.

And that bothered me a lot, I told my husband.

Q. Okay.

A. So, I mean, I -- to some extent I felt that there were a lot of people who really had a misunderstanding of where I was coming from, they lacked perspective; and that's where I found Dr. K very useful for me through the entire journey I had

1 in O.U.

Q. Now, what about your perspective as a female African and maybe about the African culture? And can you explain a little bit about how compliments might be given or taken in your culture?

A. Yeah.

Uhm, I came cross this case that Dr. K had online, actually. I started looking for something when reading about O.U.; and I just stumbled about, you know, on this story. And I read through some of the complaints and -- and the issues that were raised.

And I tried to say, first of all, I don't put down another person's experiences, because, uhm, I -- I -- I am a victim a lot of sexual harassment, especially in Nigeria. So I -- I -- I always respect people's stories a lot.

But when I found some of the issues were, you know, like, there were messages Dr. K was supposed to have sent about telling the student she looked beautiful, she looked pretty, and all those compliments and all that; and when I saw that, I asked myself, Is this really, like, the reason or the reason it became a sexual harassment thing,

among tied to other things? I asked that, because, you're beautiful, you're pretty, you're whatever, from where I come from, that compliment is like telling somebody the sky is blue, you know, when you're just trying to be polite, when you're just trying to be kind, when you just, you know, want to reach out to a person. So, you know, culturally, and I would always say that, a typical African woman probably expect a lot of those compliments everyday, because it's a cultural way you kind of grow to just appreciate that and teach people how to send out those kind of compliments.

So for me I felt --

Well, based on the reports, he said he did not; but I felt that even if he did, he was just being a typical gentleman, just typical African man.

- Q. You mentioned you saw the report online. So no -- nobody called you to tell you about this. You --
- A. No, no. I read everything and all, some court papers; because after I stumbled on it, I called a friend of mine who was also -- who was also in O.U. just to find out, you know, if she knew what was going on. And so I had read about

the story; and from then, I began to follow it up
online.

So no one spoke to me about anything. I read some court filing when the student sued O.U. I read the judgment there online. I read the filing by Dr. K. So I read all that online.

- Q. What is your -- When you heard that part of the -- part of the allegations are Dr. K's punitive actions that he took, what's your experience with that back at O.U.?
- A. Oh, okay. So when I read about, you know, Dr. K's punitive action, for example, I also had to ask myself if it was really Dr. K, I mean, if -- if -- if he could have done that; because one thing I know about him is that he -- he's (indiscernible) for a lot of things are respective on my journey through O.U., is meeting Dr. K, working with him, and learning a lot of, you know, ethics from him, a lot of work ethics. And I'll never forget that.

So I had an experience where, you know, after my third year, I run out of funding.

I met Dr. K, and I discussed with him that I had no funding. I didn't know where to turn. And that's

one other problem, that, you know, administrations in O.U. do not understand about international students. The day you lose your funding is the day you lose your standing, your immigration status; and then you have to pack your bags and go, except you find something to do. And the sad thing is that we're not allowed to work outside the campus, so we have to find jobs on campus in order to -- to stay within the requirement of the individual. So that really bothered me.

And when I talked to him, he agreed, or rather, you know, told me he was going to look out for opportunities.

It wasn't like two, three weeks later when I saw this advertisement about some recruitment going on for the SUSI program in the summer, and I quickly applied for the program. So you can just imagine how happy I was when I walked into that interview and I met Dr. K as a member of a three-man panel. And I went through the interview. I felt I did very well in the interview. I came out pretty confident that I had the job. And I also told myself somehow that, I mean, Dr. K knows that I'm battling (indiscernible) this job. So I just knew he was searching. So you

can imagine my disappointment, you know, like, the next day when I just got this email that said,

Sorry, you know, you were not -- you didn't make up the list for -- for the job. I was really, really disappointed. I was sad. I was angry at him for a while and --

But then I -- I kind of understood one thing about him. I may have been his protegee; but one thing is, if I didn't meet their -- a certain requirement, there was no way he was going to, you know, push any rule aside just to give me the job.

So, I mean, working with him, I understood that when it came to doing your work, when it came to providing results, when it come -- came -- comes to being efficient and effective, he doesn't compromise those standards no matter who you are and no matter the level of the relationship you have.

Q. Thank you.

And what was your observation of women and minorities as professors when you were on campus at O.U.?

A. Yeah. I -- I would describe -- I kind of wrote something, initially; and I said I --

I sometimes look at African men and women or people of color on campus in O.U. --

And I'm just really being serious about this.

them adorn the system, the -- the place, so that when you talk about diversity, you can pick on the few black people. And I -- and I felt that too as an African student; that sometimes it was just about pointing us out and showing how much diverse the campus was. But when it came to dealing with our needs, you know, no one really paid attention to us. And I kind of felt that was what was going on with them.

I had an experience with

Professor Michelle Ferrier, and I did a -- an exit
interview with her. And I then shared my
experiences as an African student and what I went
through, and -- and called all the African students
who went through the college to -- to speak with
her. And we were aware that she was trying to
raise up this issue, because it was kind of
becoming a very recurrent problem, and somehow she
felt there was a need to raise that.

Just when I got back to Nigeria,

1	I I found that she she had problems and she
2	was taking suing O.U. to court. And at that
3	time, I actually agreed to testify for her, because
4	I felt like somehow because she was trying to give
5	voice to some of these things that we were going
6	through, it was kind of a retaliation on her. I
7	I didn't see her leaving O.U. in a very happy a
8	very happy you know, in on good terms
9	basically, and that really saddened me.
10	And so you can imagine that when I
11	saw this thing about Dr. K, the first thing that
12	came to my mind was, you know, another African has
13	been thrown down, and that really bothers me. For
L 4	us, this is really personal.
15	Q. Thank you for your testimony. I
16	appreciate it.
L 7	A. Thank you. Thank you.
18	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
19	We'll turn it over to Mr. Loukx at this time.
20	Ms. Ziarko, are you done with the
21	questioning?
22	ANDREA ZIARKO: Yes.
23	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
24	Thank you very much.
25	Mr. Loukx?

1	MR. LOUKX: Oh, thank you. I I
2	have no questions of this witness.
3	And thank you, Doctor, for helping
4	us out today.
5	NANCY KATU-OGUNDIMU: Thank you,
6	sir.
7	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
8	With that, I'll turn to the hearing committee to
9	entertain any questions at this time of
LO	Dr. Katu-Ogundimu.
l1	Hearing none on behalf of the
12	hearing committee, thank you very much for your
13	time today to provide this testimony and to respond
L 4	to questions. We wish you the very best.
15	NANCY KATU-OGUNDIMU: Thank you so
16	much. Thank you. I appreciate it.
L7	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
18	Good-night.
19	NANCY KATU-OGUNDIMU: Bye. Night.
20	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
21	Thank you for your note, Duane. I see that our
22	next witness is indeed here in the waiting room.
23	Would you please bring them into the main room?
24	DUANE BRUCE: The next witness is
25	here.

1	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
2	Thank you.
3	Good afternoon, Dr. Srivastava.
4	This is Robin Mohammed. I'm chair of the hearing
5	committee. Thank you for being with us today.
6	JATIN SRIVASTAVA: Good afternoon.
7	Thank you.
8	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
9	What we've been doing with each witness is using
10	the 30 minutes for, first, any introductory remarks
11	that you would like to make to the committee. Then
12	we move to the counsel for the faculty member to
13	pose a few questions, and then shift finally to the
14	university legal counsel for additional for
15	questions from that side. That should bring us to
16	about 30 minutes. And then if there are any
17	questions from the hearing committee, we we can
18	entertain those at that point.
19	JATIN SRIVASTAVA: Okay. So should
20	I start?
21	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
22	Yes, please do.
23	JATIN SRIVASTAVA: So I'm here to
24	talk about, you know, the tenure revocation
25	decision.

Now, I don't have very extensive comments; but when I talk, I want to talk mostly about the role of one person and one incident. But I also think that the system, you know, through which this process was done was -- you know, was compromised, okay?

So -- so essentially it seemed like, you know, when it came to the department to -- you know, to make their decision, it was like -- you know, it was a jury of peers, you know? But this is a jury which is polarized, where some people believe -- You know, so there are two parties from the department. You know, some people have taken one side; some people have taken the other side, you know. And then -- You know, and then they have histories. So some people are senior. They are full professors or they are chairs of Promotion and Tenure committees, and -- you know, and directors and those kind of things. So some people have more power than other people, which is very different from an ideal juror.

Similarly, the discussions never happened. You know, so it was each person talking separately to -- to the director. And what that did was -- So it was more of awarding or more of a

reinforcement of what the patterns were, you know.

So there was no discretion. Okay.

But I think the most problematic
part was that there were these -- you know, there
was at least one incident of intimidation, you
know, which -- you know, which could have
discouraged people from contributing to the
discussion, ah, which could have just -- You know,
just chill- -- You know, it's -- it's a chilling
effect that we -- you know, we call in the media
language, so. You know, so if a party sues one
journalist or one newspaper, other newspapers stop
writing about that particular party.

So I think that kind of effect could also have been there, okay?

I did talk to -- So there was this incident about which I talked to Dr. Stewart, who was the director of the program then two times, one -- one that -- So the first time I invited him -- So I essentially, you know, sought a meeting with him, and that was on September 6, 2000 -- No. That was Thursday. So that was the Thursday after September 6th, so second week of September. And then I had a meeting with him for the tenure revocation hearing, the -- you know, the process on

1	March 17th. So I talked about these incidents, and
2	I talked about why I'm uncomfortable with the way
3	this process is being handled.
4	So I think I would like to stop here
5	and thank you.
6	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
7	Thank you. And with that, we turn to the faculty
8	member's legal counsel for question questioning.
9	Is Mr. Lute, are you
10	MEL LUTE: (Nodded affirmatively.)
11	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
12	Thank you. Please.
13	Mel LUTE: Yes. Thank you.
14	
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION
16	BY MR. LUTE:
17	Q. Good afternoon, sir.
18	You mentioned earlier, and I just
19	want to sort of maybe elaborate. You mentioned
20	that you thought in your that the process that
21	university undertook with respect to the
22	allegations against Dr. Kalyango was compromised.
23	And what do you mean by
24	"compromised" in that context?
25	A. Uhm, so so I'll I'll give

1 you -- Actually, I'll -- I'll -- I'll tell you
2 about an incident.

So this was a faculty meeting on March 28th or 29th in 2018. Now, so this was not like -- This was a graduate committee meeting -- I'll -- I'll correct myself -- not a general faculty meeting. So this was a graduate committee meeting on March 28th and 29th when I first came to know about -- you know, about accusations against Dr. Kalyango.

What had happened, that in a previous meeting when -- when the graduate committee met, Dr. Kalyango, you know, strongly, let's say, spoke against one of the candidates, you know, who was a applying for the doctorate program. Okay. That candidate was already a master's student. And -- and Dr. Kalyango said that, you know, because of her performance in one of the grad projects which Dr. Kalyango led, you know, he didn't want her to be in the graduate program and felt very strongly against -- you know, against her -- her admission.

So the committee, you know, decided to not admit the graduate, not admit the candidate to the doctorate program, okay?

Dr. Sweeney was not a part of that meeting. He came back. And I think he was, you know, on a medical visit. So he came back. wrote an email to -- you know, a general email, shared among graduate committee to Dr. Kalyango, accusing him of -- of something. It was not clear what they were talking about. And then we had --and then we scheduled a meeting last week of March in 2018, okay? It was 3:30 p.m. It was 28th or

29th. I -- I'm not sure about the date.

Now, in that meeting, Dr. Sweeney came in, and he was very agitated. He told us that -- you know, that he had -- that there was something going on and there were accusations against Dr. Kalyango, and faculty could not be told about those accusations because, you know, it was the process that was going on.

He had talked to -- He said that he had talked to the legal department, and now he can talk about those accusations. He said that one -- there was one complaint against Dr. Kalyango for sexual harassment and -- you know, and then, you know, he kind of went into things in detail.

Now, it would have been perfectly fine if he had just -- you know, just said that

there was a conflict; but he accused Dr. Kalyango
of actually, you know -- of actually, you know,
being a harasser.

Besides, there were some things that he said that were -- that I saw that scared me, I know, and that I saw as intimidation.

So he said that -- that students will write stories about it in the -- and articles in the -- in the town newspapers. I don't know exactly which newspaper he meant, okay? He said that students were talking to other students, and we are getting back publicity, and this will affect our graduate program. And -- and that's -- you know, and that was the second part.

But then he started, you know, getting more aggressive. He -- At one point he said, I'm a Christian. And -- you know, and I never thought about Dr. Kalyango's religion, you know? And that's the first time, you know, I think about that. And -- and that was -- You know, so -- And I think the context was he said -- because I don't remember the second part (indiscernible). I remember "I'm a Christian." You know, that's hard to forget. So I think it was something like, I'm a Christian, and I will make this right. So

- 1 something like that, okay? But I remembered "I'm a
- 2 | Christian" part, and that I still remember that.
- 3 | I -- You know, I change my opinion.
- 4 (Indiscernible) you know, I had voted for not, you
- 5 know, admitting, you know, the candidate; but this
- 6 | time I agreed; you know, I changed my -- my
- 7 decision.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 8 So -- so that's something, you know,
- 9 that happened.

He also said something which I thought was pretty hypocritical. So he said -- So when he was talking about the -- about meeting, he said, And liq- -- and alcohol was served, you know, he kind of shouted it out. You know, and it -- it just kind of seemed pretty odd, because the school has a culture of -- of drinking with students. You would actually see, you know, emails where Dr. Sweeney is inviting new graduate students or graduate students visiting the campus to meet other students at Jackie Os. You know, you have emails about graduate picnics where -- you know, where they're talking about who will bring the booze or who will bring the alcohol. So -- so it's -- so it just seemed very, very out of place, you know.

Q. Professor, when you talk about this

active intimidation, you mean the active intimidation by Mike Sweeney?

- A. Ah, yes. Yes.
- Q. And I get the impression what you're saying, are you saying that you felt that in this -- in this meeting --

First of all, if Mike Sweeney had not disclosed these investigations and these allegations in detail against Dr. Kalyango, up until that time, you did not know about them. Is that correct?

A. Yes, I did not know about them.

And remember. After this, I believe that this was -- that this was the case -- this was the complaint where ECRC could not found -- find the ground, you know, where -- you know, where they said that was no retaliation on -- on the part of Dr. Kalyango. And I don't exactly remember where I saw this. I think it was in -- in the media somewhere. It was on the WOUB website. But when I looked at that -- you know, when I come across -- You know, and I really don't remember where I saw that. And I might be wrong. But when I saw that information or when I came across that information, I thought that, you know, if this is right, then

Dr. Sweeney wrongly accused, you know, Dr. Kalyango 1 2 of doing something which he did not do or which 3 could not be proved. 4 So actually, it was a case of 5 retaliation. So he intimidated the committee, you 6 know, and he retaliated against Dr. Kalyango. 7 Q. And -- and in -- in terms of 8 Mike Sweeney's presentation at the meeting, that 9 was used by Mike Sweeney to change votes to get 10 this candidate? 11 Α. Yes. Yes. You were -- You froze --12 You know, the screen froze for a minute, Mr. Lute. 13 So but I think I got what you were 14 asking. 15 You know, in light of --Yes. 16 Remember, Dr. Kalyango was --17 And -- and I would like to make it 18 very clear that I have never taken a side in this 19 case, you know? Even when I talked to Dr. Stewart 20 about this, I was talking to him as a person who 21 wants the rules -- like, who was complaining to --22 you know, to a supervisor about a university rule 23 that is broken. So it was a process that was, you 24 know --25 So -- so I was talking about making

sure that university's rules were -- you know, that
there was a public due to a compromise and he
should know about it so that, you know, he could
take action about it.

Like, you know, when we -- we looked at the evidence and -- you know, and I thought about it, like, I -- I -- I looked at the evidence, I would look at the news coverage; and it was really hard to figure out what was going on, you know.

You know, so I -- I never --

- Q. When you met with Mr. Stewart, did you have -- did you express to Mr. Stewart that you felt that detenuring was not warranted in this instance?
- A. No, I did not -- I did not say any such thing. I never --

So it was more of the report that the process was compromised. And -- and -- and, see, like, that's what I've been saying; that if you don't do the process right, then how do you know that what you did was right, you know?

Q. Uh-huh. And in doing the process right, you said that Mike Sweeney's action that he took at the meeting compromised the investigation

and the manner in which the university was addressing the allegations against Dr. Kalyango.

3 | Is that right?

A. Yes.

Now, remember that I was, you know, in general talking about the whole environment.

You know, university's process do make sense. But this was a case where two people from the same department were there. And there was this conflict that, you know, I knew Dr. Kalyango well, but I also knew the student well; and I cannot -- you know, I cannot believe that -- that a woman would -- you know, would lie about any such thing. So it was really hard for me. So I was involved. And -- and that's why I believe that, since the whole department is involved in this, maybe, you know, the process should not have come to the department. You know, it was --

- Q. The things with Mr. Stewart, did he satisfy the concerns that you brought to him? Did you feel like he was hearing you?
- A. Yes, he -- Dr. Stewart, he -- Yes. You know, I felt he was hearing me. I -- I told him, you know, that this is what happened, and that's pretty much it, you know? I didn't expect

1	to get involved.
2	Even now I'm here because of the
3	Freedom of Information Act request that that got
4	Dr. Kalyango the notes.
5	Q. Uh-huh.
6	A. And then, you know, when he asked
7	me, I said that, All right, so. But, you know, in
8	our email exchange, I told him that I will not talk
9	about supporting any party or supporting any
10	decision in this whole situation.
11	Q. Okay.
12	A. I I don't think I'm competent
13	enough. There was no discussion. I did not
14	understand what the factors were.
15	But there was one thing that I was
16	sure of, that there was intimidation and there was
17	retaliation in that meeting.
18	Q. Very well. Thank you, Professor.
19	At this point in time, I'm going to
20	turn it over to my colleague on behalf of the
21	university.
22	Thank you, sir.
23	MR. LOUKX: Thank you, Mr. Lute.
24	

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. LOUKX:
3	Q. And good afternoon, Professor.
4	Thank you for coming in here today
5	to talk to us.
6	I just want to make sure I
7	understand your testimony correctly. I'm probably
8	the dumbest person on the call, so I I apologize
9	if my going through this is is looking for the
10	obvious.
11	You indicate that in
12	the graduate committee met to discuss the admission
13	of a master's student into the Ph.D. program.
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And at that time, Dr. K was strongly
16	against the admission of a particular master's
17	student into the program.
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. That was unusual for Dr. K, wasn't
20	it? Did he often speak vociferously against a
21	student coming into the program?
22	A. No. That was unusual. That was
23	unusual.
24	Q. But Professor Sweeney wasn't there

for that meeting, so another meeting was convened

- 1 | subsequently. Correct?
- A. Yes.

- And at that meeting, it was clear that Dr. Sweeney was passionately in favor of admission of this student. Correct?
- A. It -- Yes, it -- it seemed that.

 But it was also, you know, a personal -- It was

 so --

See, had it been only the argument that --

You know, so he could have just said that there is a complaint and -- and we should reconsider, you know? And the committee would have -- would have agreed. But -- You know, but he went on to -- you know, to say other things, which I thought was --

So, yes, I thought that Dr. Kalyango in the first meeting came out a bit too strong; it was unusual. And I thought that Dr. Sweeney came out too strong; it was unusual. In both cases, I thought that there was something -- You know, especially in the second case, I thought that there was something personal going on.

Q. That's fair enough. And -- and thank you for that clarification.

```
1
                     You also, however, talked about a
 2
     meeting you had with Professor Stewart. And I
 3
     think you indicated that was in March, but I don't
 4
     think I caught the year.
 5
                     So that was March 17, 2020.
             Α.
                                                  So
 6
     that --
 7
             Q.
                    Okay.
 8
             Α.
                     -- that was the detenure hearing.
 9
                    And there was another meeting where
10
     I kind of set up a meeting to -- you know, to
11
     discuss so essentially, you know, the same
12
     incident. And that was much earlier.
13
                     So the meeting with Dr. Stewart was,
             0.
14
     in fact,
                        after the graduate committee
15
     meetings that you referred to involving the
16
     graduate student, Professor Sweeney, and
17
     Professor Kalyango. Right?
18
             Α.
                     So one of the meetings was
19
     Ah, yes. So one of the meeting was
                                                   and
20
                                 when I wrote to him that
     that was in
21
     I wanted to talk to him about some
22
     diversity-related issue.
23
             Q.
                    Okay.
24
                     So that was -- so that was -- so
25
     that was
```

1	Q.	Okay.
2	A.	And I have an email with me about
3	that.	
4	Q.	Okay.
5	A.	So the second meeting
6		So I saw I talked about this
7	incident.	
8		And the second meeting happened
9	during the for	mal hearings on March 17th, 2020.
10	Q.	Okay. But the discussion with
11	Dr. Stewart ab	out the detenuring process for
12	Dr. Kalyango o	occurred in March of 2020, maybe March
13	and April of 2	020?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	And the graduate committee met
16		
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	And these incidents were not the
19	same meeting,	right? They related only to the
20	extent that th	ey involved Dr. Kalyango.
21	Α.	Ah, same meeting? Yes. So I talked
22	about the same	incident in these two meetings.
23	Q.	Ultimately, in the graduate
24	committee meet	ing, you indicated that you, in fact,
25	reversed your	vote and voted for the admission of

522

1 socially very involved with anyone. 2 Fair enough. Q. 3 You indicated something about you 4 knew the student. And just by initials, just so 5 the committee knows, you said you knew the student 6 and had no reason to disbelieve her or words to 7 that effect. 8 Can you give the initials of the 9 student you were talking about? I was confused on 10 that. 11 Α. Yes. So -- so there were -- So I 12 was talking about , okay? So that --13 Just initials, if you don't mind. Q. 14 Oh, sorry. Α. 15 And you had indicated something Q. 16 also, and I just want to make sure I heard you 17 clearly. 18 You suggested to Dr. Stewart that 19 perhaps the journalism -- that the department 20 should not be involved in the detenuring process, 21 or did I misunderstand you? 22 So I said that because the --Yes. Α. 23 you know, because there were so many people

emotionally involved and the department was -- you

know, there were very strong feelings about it, it

24

25

shouldn't have come to the school. It should have been done at the level of dean's office or maybe, you know, at HR or the legal department, like some other party other than the department itself.

Q. I gotcha.

You're familiar with the faculty handbook, though.

- A. Yes. So -- Yes.
- Q. And that requires it to be done at the department?
- A. Yes.

- Q. There's really nothing in your mind do you think that Dr. Stewart could have done to address that concern, is there?
- A. No. But -- but, see, that's the thing. What Dr. Stewart could do was ensure that the process was interpreted correctly and conducted correctly. And I think that -- And maybe he did something about it. You know, I -- after I reported this incident, you know, maybe he -- he reported it and maybe he did something to address that. I'm not -- I'm not aware of that.

And that's why I say that I'm here to just talk about, you know, that incident. I don't had -- Like, I didn't have any opinion

1	about you know, about detenuring. I didn't have
2	any opinion about any of the cases, because I
3	didn't really you know, like, I didn't really
4	discuss them. I didn't really understand very well
5	what were the factors involved.
6	Q. And that's all very fair and very
7	helpful.
8	We appreciate you coming in. The
9	committee might have a few questions; but I I
LO	have asked you enough, and I appreciate your
L1	patience.
12	A. Thank you.
13	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
L 4	Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Loukx.
15	For the hearing committee, are there
16	any questions you would like to pose to our
L7	witness?
18	CHARLES LOWERY: Yeah, Robin, I
19	would like to ask just a of couple questions, if I
20	might.
21	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
22	Please do.
23	CHARLES LOWERY: Dr. Srivastava, you
24	mentioned Dr. Sweeney as a director in context
25	earlier, ah

1	JATIN SRIVASTAVA: Of the graduate
2	program.
3	CHARLES LOWERY: of the
4	private or graduate program, and and you
5	mentioned the word "intimidation." And in my mind,
6	I'm I'm thinking of coercion, you know,
7	harassment, bullying.
8	Could you clarify what you meant by
9	that, and could you give an example of what that
LO	might have looked like?
11	JATIN SRIVASTAVA: Hum. So And I
12	might You know, I might be, you know, using the
13	wrong word.
L 4	But what happened was that he
15	threatened people in a way which is very unusual in
L6	academic settings.
L7	CHARLES LOWERY: Okay. Also, just
L8	out of curiosity, there was an investigation
L9	that that went on into this process, and it was
20	conducted by a gentleman with the last name of
21	Annanya or Anaya. I'm sorry.
22	Did this individual ever speak to
23	you directly as a member of the faculty working
24	with Dr. Kalyango, or had did you hear of any of
25	your colleagues being interviewed by this

1 individual or -- or talked to by him. 2 JATIN SRIVASTAVA: No, not 3 physically. Never. 4 CHARLES LOWERY: Okay. All right. 5 Thank you. 6 VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Robin, I also 7 have a quick question. 8 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 9 Please. 10 VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Professor 11 Srivastava, my name is Vladimir Marchenkov. I am a 12 member of the hearing committee. 13 And I want your clarification on one 14 point we discussed previously with other -- with 15 other witnesses in this hearing. 16 We heard that there were 11 faculty 17 members at the meeting when the detenuring decision 18 was taken. 19 Were you in that meeting? 20 JATIN SRIVASTAVA: All right. 21 uhm, it was not -- All right. It's --22 So it's a very interesting thing. 23 So these were individual meetings. 24 You know, so -- so if I was -- you know, or at 25 least the -- the way I presented my opinion, it was

1 individual conversations.

So I -- so if I remember right, the way it happened was that there was this general email to the faculty that, If you wish to talk about this issue, please talk to -- please set up a sometime with Dr. Stewart. So there -- so there could have been 11 members; but I did not know that there were 11 members, you know? I just knew that I had a conversation, individual conversation with Dr. Stewart, you know, at a time which we had set.

VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Forgive me if I -- if I need to sort of ask the same question in a somewhat different manner, but it's such an important point of procedure here.

And this is utterly new to me, at least, in this hearing, that there was no joint faculty meeting at the Scripps School to discuss the question of revocation of tenure from Dr. Kalyango.

JATIN SRIVASTAVA: Yes.

VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Was there?

Was there or was there not?

A usual -- The normal faculty meeting when people meet, faculty around the table, everyone has a chance to exchange opinions and

1	voice their view.
2	And are you saying that you were not
3	part of that meeting and you were not aware of it,
4	or could you clarify this?
5	JATIN SRIVASTAVA: Yes. So I do not
6	think there was a meeting like that where you
7	know, where people would discuss things or where
8	people will meet together.
9	The the one where I, you know,
LO	provided my feedback and which Dr. Kalyango got
L1	through the FOIA request was an individual meeting.
L2	So if there was a meeting where
L3	people met and I'm pretty sure there was not
L 4	you know, I don't know about that.
L5	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Could you
L6	please just clarify your position in the
L7	department?
L8	JATIN SRIVASTAVA: I'm an associate
L9	professor; I was an associate
20	professor, too.
21	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Thank you very
22	much.
23	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Hey, Robin, I
24	have a quick question.
25	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:

1	Yes, go right ahead.
2	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Professor
3	Srivastava, my name is Yehong Shao. I'm a
4	committee member of the hearing committee.
5	So my question was, at the first
6	graduate admission meeting, committee meeting,
7	before Dr. K came over, what was the committee's
8	decision about the candidate
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	JATIN SRIVASTAVA:
16	
17	
18	
19	So
20	But then Dr. Kalyango said that, you
21	know, she had worked with him on . So
22	that's you know,
23	
24	And there during the
25	program, there were cases of subordination and, you

know -- I'm sorry -- insubordination; and, you
know, she challenged Dr. Kalyango in ways which
were very uncomfortable for him. So he -- he -- he
felt so strongly about it.

Now, remember, it's -- You know,
when we are sitting there, we are just looking
at -- at it as a -- as a faculty member who is

at -- at it as a -- as a faculty member who is just, you know, very uncomfortable with a student; and we didn't know, you know, what else was there or was not there.

So he felt very strongly about it.

And, you know, in -- in the past, there have been times when -- when we were -- you know, when a faculty member would feel very strongly about a candidate even --

but there's a faculty member who -you know, who we trust and believe who feels very
strongly against -- against the candidate's
application. So, you know, so -- And we should,
you know, trust the judgment of our faculty member.

1 And so, you know, so that's what happened. 2 YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: All right. 3 Thank you. 4 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 5 SHERYL HOUSE: Robin, this is 6 Sheryl House. I have a question. 7 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 8 Go right ahead. 9 SHERYL HOUSE: Do you interview 10 graduate students as part of your admission process 11 into the Ph.D. program? 12 JATIN SRIVASTAVA: No. Like, there 13 are -- So it's not -- You know, there are times 14 where I believe --15 And remember, it's -- everything is 16 done by the graduate director, you know? 17 So -- so -- so during our admission 18 meeting, you know, before it or during it, the 19 documents or application documents are shared with 20 the committee; you know, the committee looks at it; 21 and then the committee comes to the meeting, and 22 then we discuss the candidates, and then we rank 23 the candidates; and that's, you know, the final. 24 Based on the final ranking, we decide who we are 25 going to offer, you know, admission, who are going

to be the individuals.

Now, to the best of my knowledge, interviews are not a regular feature of the admission process, not even at the graduate director level. However, I think that there have been cases where -- and -- and I'm not sure about it, you know, because -- but there are times where, you know, graduate directors said that, you know, we have talked to them, or should we -- you know, or maybe I can talk to them and clarify that. So those kinds of things.

So -- so though it was not a regular feature, you know, there might have been interviews.

Now, I'm -- I've never been a graduate director, so I really don't know if -- you know, if -- anything, like, about the interview; but I know it was not, you know, a regular part of the process.

SHERYL HOUSE: And then one other question.

Did Dr. Kalyango provide you specific details on specific details

1 supervisor? 2 JATIN SRIVASTAVA: Uhm, so not 3 outside the meeting, okay? In the meeting -- So 4 in -- in the meeting he said that, you know, This 5 is what happened, and I think she -- you know, she 6 challenged some of our decisions. And -- You know, 7 and then I think she incited -- like, you know, he 8 said that she provoked some of the --9 So it's a training program, you 10 know, where international scholars kind of visit 11 the campus. So she incited some of the 12 international scholars when they were going for a 13 feedback session at the State Department. 14 But besides that, you know, there 15 was nothing else. 16 SHERYL HOUSE: Thank you very much. 17 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 18 Thank you, Dr. Srivastava. We very much appreciate 19 your time and testimony here today. That will 20 conclude it. And again, on behalf of the hearing 21 committee, many thanks, and best regards for the 22 remainder of the year. 23 JATIN SRIVASTAVA: Uh-huh. Thank 24 you. 25 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:

1	Our next witness is available.
2	Duane and Angie, would you please
3	move the witness into the main room.
4	DUANE BRUCE: The witness is here.
5	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
6	Okay.
7	Good afternoon, Dr. Walcott.
8	CAROLYN WALCOTT: Good afternoon.
9	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
10	I'm Robin Mohamed. I'm the hearing committee
11	chair.
12	Thank you very much for being here
13	today. We've set aside about 30 minutes for your
14	testimony. And what we're looking at is
15	introductory remarks, any that you would like to
16	make at the beginning. And then what we'll do is
17	we'll shift for questioning to questions to come
18	from the faculty member counsel and then to from
19	the university legal counsel. That will roughly
20	give us about 30 minutes of testimony.
21	At the end of that, if you don't
22	mind, if the hearing committee has any particular
23	questions, we'll entertain them at that time.
24	CAROLYN WALCOTT: Okay.
25	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:

Great. Well, with that, I'll turn it over to you.

CAROLYN WALCOTT: All right.

Good afternoon, everyone, and thank you for the opportunity to give this testimony on behalf of Professor Kalyango. He and I have been acquainted for approximately I would say just about 11, years having met him for the first time in 2009 as I attempted to pursue a master's in communication development at the Ohio University, for which I am a proud, a very proud alumnus.

I first met Dr. Kalyango through another guy, and he's a professor who is now emeritus at Ohio University, because he felt that our background, our similar background in terms of being former journalists turn academics would be well-suited for me to be a part of, number one, his program at Scripps; number two, for him to be committee (inaudible) process.

And so basically, we have continued to be in close contact in terms of academic advancement, in terms of collaboration, in terms of even my navigating the Ph.D. process and getting advice from him as to what programs there are.

So I've shared a very rich professional relationship with him for a number of

1	years, and so I'm very happy to be a part of this
2	process with the whole (indiscernible) to shed
3	light on what I know to be a very solid,
4	professional background.
5	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
6	Thank you very much.
7	We'll turn now to legal counsel from
8	the faculty member's side. Would that be Mr. Lute?
9	MS. ZIARKO: That will be me again,
10	Andrea Ziarko.
11	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
12	Excellent. Ms. Ziarko, please go right ahead.
13	MS. ZIARKO: Thank you.
14	
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION
16	BY MS. ZIARKO:
17	Q. Dr. Walcott, can you describe for
18	the committee members what your the nature of
19	your work was with Dr. Kalyango?
20	A. All right. So from the perspective
21	of the graduate work that I did at Ohio University,
22	he was on my committee. In fact, he served as my
23	de facto advisor, because at that time my advisor
24	was very busy in travel, Dalt Obregon (phonetic)
25	from the Center for International Studies there at

1 Ohio University. So he helped me to, like I said 2 in my introduction, to not give the master's 3 process. And it was not easy having come from a 4 developing setting in University of Guyana. At the 5 completion of that particular program in 2010, 6 because I was in an accelerated program, I returned 7 to Guyana, not just (indiscernible) United 8 States -- I returned to Guyana, and I took up the 9 position of the director of the Center for 10 Communication Studies at the University of Guyana. And the -- I think from 2010 onwards, we started to 11 12 collaborate on international projects simply to 13 build local capacity in Guyana for local 14 journalists. And we have collaborated on two such 15 projects in collaboration with U.S. Embassy in 16 Guyana.

So our working relationship involved international collaboration from the context of the international (inaudible) journalism that he ran.

And so I wrote two projects, and he was able to facilitate those two projects along with

Andy Alexander, another journalism professor in the Scripps School of Journalism at the Ohio

University.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. All right. Very well. Thank you.

Can you explain to the committee why
it was important for you to testify before them
here today?

shocking when I read the initial account, the allegations that were made, because the -- the Professor Kalyango that I know, uhm, in my country we say somebody cannot harm a fly. I would like to describe him as someone who really does not overreach when it comes to issues of a personal nature with the opposite sex. So that's why I found it quite alarming, shocking; and I found it a little -- I -- I don't even have words to describe at this point.

I found that it will be unfair on his part for him to be detenured for -- for something that is an allegation.

I don't have any reason or I haven't seen anything to believe that his character is tainted with respect to any personal relations with the opposite sex, especially in a professional setting. I have not had reason to believe that, because I've sat in one of his classes, uhm, broadcast seminar; I've also worked closely with him; and I've never had reason to think or to

perceive him as someone who overreaches with the op- -- with the opposite sex professionally. And so that's the reason why I found it very important to testify on his behalf.

Having spoke with him also on publications, having seen how he was above and beyond for students, I think these were also considerations that I -- I bore in mind as I -- I -- as I was asked to do the testimony today; because I felt that, as a minority myself --

I'm a triple minority,

(indiscernible) scholar. It's usually very

difficult to not get in spaces that are not

necessarily very, uhm, I would say kind sometimes

to minorities. And that's -- that's the reason

why, you know, I -- I felt it was important that my

voice be heard today on behalf of Dr. Kalyango.

- Q. You spoke of Dr. Kalyango's generosity. What do you mean by that?
- A. I think he overextends sometimes for students, uhm, in terms of just making sure that your work is crisp. I can't tell you how many iterations I've had of my master's thesis and in terms of, Carolyn, you need to go over this again; you know, uhm, You need to just redefine; You're

good at what you're doing; Just have faith in yourself. That -- that level of encouragement that is often absent in academia, he possesses that rare sense of peer in terms of, I want to bring out your best potential. You don't necessarily have to do that as a professor; but because he's taken the time to do that, that's the reason why I describe to you he extends that academically just to make sure that excellence is well thought out in the work of (inaudible).

- Q. Now, I think you touched on it, but how did you find out about these allegations against Dr. Kalyango?
- A. Another alumnus sent me, you know, something coming from the Athens Post; and I was like, What is this? you know, in the press.

It was -- Like I said earlier, it
was quite shocking. It did not come directly from
him, because I felt how it was already a very
painful process for him to actually read about
himself in the press, having been somebody who has
worked in media. And so that's how I came to find
out. Another person who -- with whom I did the
program, the master's program said, Hey, check this
out; this is what is happening.

1	Q. Do you recall about when that was?
2	A. That would have been sometime in
3	maybe I believe. Was it Yeah, I believe it
4	was It was not Yeah.
5	Q. Now, you wrote a letter to the
6	provost. Is that correct?
7	A. I did.
8	Q. Okay. And and what was the
9	nature of that letter, and why did you write that?
10	A. I think that letter came not too
11	long after I first found out about the allegations;
12	and I believe that, not seeming to take sides, I
13	wrote about the fact that I believe that it's a bit
14	Draconian for them to remove to detenure Professor
15	Kalyango. I wrote about the fact that, you know,
16	how something lighter could have been considered,
17	such as, you know having him contribute to a fund
18	to sensitize people about male/female issues, and
19	some fund to work, you know, dealing with issues of
20	sexual harassment allegations and stuff like that.
21	So I just basically wrote asking for
22	his case to be reexamined, not to rule too quickly,
23	not to rush too quickly to judgment based on an
24	allegation; but to review with with a sense of

bringing justice to someone whose path was

- basically being assassinated. And -- and so that
 was the nature of that particular letter that I
 wrote.
 - Q. And what was the response that you received?
 - A. No response.
 - Q. Okay. And did you write a similar appeal to the president of Ohio University?
 - A. Certainly.
 - Q. And the response to that letter?
- 11 A. No response.

- Q. Okay. You -- you know, you sort of put together a statement. And is there anything that you would like to say, you know, just about your experiences with Dr. Kalyango and either before and/or during your time at O.U. with him that you would just like the committee to consider before they make their decision here following this hearing?
- A. Hum. So I've seen him operate on behalf of the students and scholars that he usually, I would say, that he chaperoned year after year with specific reference to the study of the U.S. Institutes. And like I said, overextension, overcommitment. The time that it took him to

preparing for them to actually be physically in Athens, and just going from state to state, the hours that he has been putting in.

And the reason why I am saying that is because during our collaboration, he was also juggling with IIJ matters in terms of his other travels.

And so I -- I just think this is someone who has -- if there's anything that he has done wrong, it's just basically just overextended himself on behalf of Ohio University and the Institute for International Journalism, which he's put a lot of work into because he basically loves what he does, and he's genuinely someone who impacts the, I would say, awareness building of journalists from around the world and brings them to the United States. He is really dedicated to human capacity building as I've never seen it before with anyone else, even my own committee that I just finished working with, having completed the Ph.D. process early in this year.

So he is someone who overreaches.

And perhaps, like I said, that's probably one of his greatest faults if there were to be fault-finding.

1	And so that's what I would like to
2	put to the to the hearing committee. This is
3	not someone who does something and then he turns a
4	back on it. If he makes a commitment to see a
5	project through, he does that. He's thinks he's
6	thinks carefully. He's methodical in his thought
7	process. He's very deliberate. Uhm, and there's
8	no way that he is going to leave a project halfway.
9	He always sees things through.
10	Q. Thank you. Thank you for your
11	testimony.
12	I will go ahead and and give the
13	stage to Attorney Loukx here, who is representing
14	the university. Thank you.
15	MR. LOUKX: Thank you very much.
16	And good afternoon, Dr. Walcott.
17	I have no questions for you. As
18	as you heard, the committee might. But I thank you
19	for appearing here today.
20	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
21	Thank you, Mr. Loukx.
22	Turning now to the hearing
23	committee, do you have do we have any questions
24	to pose at this time?
25	All right. Well, hearing none, I

1	want to again thank you, Dr. Walcott, for being
2	here, for providing this testimony, and for
3	responding to questions pertinent to these
4	proceedings. On behalf of the hearing committee,
5	our greatest thanks and best regards for the
6	remainder of the year.
7	CAROLYN WALCOTT: Thank you for
8	having me.
9	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
10	Absolutely. Take care. Bye-bye.
11	Thank you, Duane. I I see a note
12	from you that our next witness is here. We're a
13	little bit ahead of schedule, but I want to make
14	the most of that and move forward with the next
15	witness, if you would please usher them in.
16	DUANE BRUCE: The witness has
17	joined.
18	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
19	Good afternoon, Dr. Ferrier. I'm Robin Muhammad,
20	chair of the hearing committee.
21	MICHELLE FERRIER: Good afternoon,
22	everyone.
23	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
24	Thank you for being here today to provide testimony
25	for these proceedings.

To let you know how we've been moving with each -- each witness, we have a 30-minute block of time, and this will start with any initial remarks that you would like to make to the committee, and then we will pivot to legal counsel from the faculty member to pose questions, and then to the university legal counsel to pose questions.

MICHELLE FERRIER: Great.

HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:

Roughly at the end of that 30 minutes, if the hearing committee members have any questions, we'll entertain them at that time.

MICHELLE FERRIER: Great.

HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:

And with that, I'll turn it over to you to respond.

MICHELLE FERRIER: Great. Thank you very much for having me today. Some of you I know as colleagues, and some of you I do not know. So I'm glad to be here today to, uhm, be here in support of my colleague, Yusuf Kalyango, and also to be able to explain to you my story as an African-American woman and a professor at the university and my experiences in doing my work as an African-American woman and with vulnerable

populations of students of color at Ohio
University.

And so, uhm, you may or may not know from the committee that I did not leave the university on good terms with the university; in fact, had sued them myself for discrimination, as well as retaliation for the graduate abuses that I was reporting as a result of the work that I did as a director of graduate studies within the college.

And so I'm here today gladly to be able to have, finally, a hearing and a day in court really to talk about the hostile work environment at Ohio University that persisted through my tenure there and continued after I left with other colleagues of color, including Dr. Kalyango.

So I am here. I'm prepared to discuss and talk about some of those experiences, as well as -- as well as provide my knowledge of Dr. Kalyango and his conduct during foreign travel where I was a partner with him, uhm, on several trips, academic trips abroad, as well as worked with him on other programatic activities related to the university, as well as with graduate students that he supervised as well.

So with that introduction, broad

1	introduction to who I am and I think the
2	perspective that I think I bring to today's
3	proceedings, I will step back and await some
4	questions from counsel.
5	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
6	Thank you, Dr. Ferrier.
7	Is Mr. Lute providing questions?
8	Yes.
9	MEL LUTE: Yes.
10	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
11	Please proceed.
12	MEL LUTE: Okay. Thank you.
13	
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION
15	BY MR. LUTE:
16	Q. Dr. Ferrier, can you hear me?
17	A. Yes, I can hear you fine. Thank
18	you.
19	Q. Great.
20	All right. I want to start out and
21	maybe set the set the table here.
22	If you could explain to the panel
23	the position that you had in the dean's office at
24	the time that you began sort of giving voice to the
25	concerns of some of the minority students that

that you were working with.

A. Sure. Uhm, just to put this into context, I did not know, ah, Dr. Kalyango before my arrival at Ohio University; so our relationship began with the position that I accepted as an associate dean for innovation, research, and creative activity in graduate studies within the Scripps College of Communication. In that role, I was responsible not only for faculty development and faculty research, but also to monitor the health of our graduate programs across our schools.

Part of that work was working directly with graduate directors and providing supports to their enrollment and efforts to run their programs, and also an assessment of those programs by external bodies as well as internally.

Uhm, I conducted, as part of that job, in early 2015, I began a more detailed investigation into our graduate programs, especially after I had had an opportunity to review program reviews for two of our schools' programs, the comms program from which Dr. Scott Titsworth comes from, as well as the MDIA or media arts program headed by Drew McDaniel; and as a part of the program review for those two schools,

discovered some significant feedback from the reviewers, from the faculty reviewers at Ohio University, of abuses of graduate students.

And so following the review of those two schools' programs, I made outreach to all of our graduate students and solicited one-on-one conversations with them about their experiences at Ohio University, the trajectory of their academics, their satisfaction with the instruction, their professors. It really was an open-ended solicitation to get deeper into the concerns that had been raised in those program reviews.

During the course of what was several months of an investigation, I met with quite a few students, a handful of students from across programs within the college and met and worked with several students to report activities of intimidation, verbal abuse, as well as sexual assault, as -- and sexual harassment by graduate students. And so during that time, I dealt with several cases of graduate student abuses. Uhm, and -- and it was everything from the story of a terminally ill graduate student who was being denied her degree by one of our faculty, as well as stories, as I mentioned, of verbal abuse, lack of

accommodations for students with disabilities, and inappropriate sexual relationships among graduate students and our faculty.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Uhm, I was responsible in that role for reporting as a mandatory reporter these types of abuses, and I filed on behalf of one of my students -- of the students of the school of an ECRC internal complaint against the hostile environment she was receiving from her dissertation committee chair and her dissertation work. Uhm, I worked alongside of that particular student through over six months to -- while she was negotiating and completing her final tasks on her dissertation, uhm, and flying alongside of her and monitoring the activity of the faculty as well as her committee because of the abuses that she was experiencing, everything from meetings being canceled, uhm, that she needed to move forward, to verbal abuses that she would receive during those meetings from her faculty advisor and others, to the point where this graduate student had -- uhm, had nearly committed suicide and had lost, uhm, a significant amount of weight and was, uhm, seeking mental healthcare as a result of the experiences that she had had within the MDIA program, the media arts program, one of

- the very programs that had been cited in the internal review. And so --
- 3 Q. Dr. Ferrier, not to interrupt
 4 you, --
 - A. Sure.

- Q. -- but we have sort of time limits?
- A. Sure. Limited time, sure. I wanted to describe that example.
 - Q. No. I understand. And that -- that sets the table.

When you brought your concerns to the ECRC, were you satisfied with the response on the part of the university in addressing some of these concerns?

A. No. Uhm, there were two ways in which I attempt——— there were several ways in which I attempted to get the attention of not only the administration, but faculty and others, so that we could address these issues at the root.

Uhm, the ECRC investigation, uhm, I filed based on my behalf with a student who was highly at risk. She was very mentally anxious over filing any kind of complaint because she felt that she was going to be retaliated against; and, of course, then saw me be retaliated against for

filing that report. So she ended up not complying with ECRC and said they were not able to move forward with that report.

The second way in which I addressed it was through my own discrimination and whistleblower complaint with ECRC, which was pending at the university for 17 months, where I did not get any notification of the investigation, who had been spoken to, no results or anything else; where I finally went to external counsel and filed a lawsuit externally, because there was no response from ECRC.

Q. Now, in -- Thank you.

And in that process, did you ever deal with an investigator named George Antonio Anaya?

A. No.

Q. And with regard to investigation of reports of discrimination, Mr. Anaya,

Dean Titsworth, and Bob Stewart have all given statements in this proceeding (inaudible) that Ohio University takes these claims very seriously and investigates them in a very prompt and orderly fashion.

Was that your experience?

1	A. Not at all. 17 months is an
2	inordinate and abusive length of time for any kind
3	of investigation of this sort, whether we're
4	talking about sexual assault or the mental health
5	of our students or disabilities, uhm, or even of
6	faculty themselves. 17 months is is abusive in
7	and of itself.

Q. Okay.

A. Secondly, I went through multiple channels beyond that.

After I was removed from my position, and I was told by Dean Titsworth that a senior faculty member in the -- his administration, so a director, uhm, of -- of one of the schools of Scripps College, uhm, had asked the dean to remove me from my position. Uhm, it was because of my investigations into the graduate studies and my identification of that director as a potential harasser of the graduate students that I was working with.

And so Dean Titsworth took that onto his -- onto his task and set up a plan to, quote, unquote, reorganize the school to remove me from the position where I was investigating and directing these abuses after I was --

1 Q. This is the --

- A. Sure. Go ahead.
- Q. This is the retaliation that you
 were talking about, --
 - A. Absolutely.
 - Q. -- the fact that you -- you personally were removed from the position where you were raising these concerns and trying to get these -- these voices heard?
 - A. Absolutely.

Uhm, the semester before I was removed, I had spoken to Dean Titsworth extensively in my meetings with him regarding the graduate assessment that I was working on. I had also worked through Steven House and others at the university all the way up to President Mick Davis to have a conversation with him regarding the abuses of myself as well as graduate students.

Even after I was removed from my position -- and I was at the university for over a year while we were working through this internal investigation that was persisting for months and years -- in that intervening year where I was on the faculty, there were several actions that I continued to take to try and raise the issue of the

problems of our graduate students.

I sought to have the program review committee of the Graduate Council of which I was formerly a member, review its guidelines for programs to include stronger questions regarding the academic environment for graduate students. I discovered that our graduate college assessment measure for academic climate is an exit survey that is limited in how students can respond to the questions of academic environment.

I asked the Graduate Council to review protections for graduate students and safe pathways for reporting abuses. I worked with the Graduate Student Senate to bring the issue to the fall 2016 Graduate Council agenda. I filed an internal ECRC complaint that I mentioned earlier on behalf of a graduate student who was on the verge of suicide. I reviewed program reviews for both comms and MDIA graduate programs where reviewers, internal reviewers of the faculty, cited hostile environments for graduate students. And I filed my own ECRC complaint of discrimination and retaliation for termination from my role.

- Q. And --
- A. So all of those I continued to do;

1	and in the 17-months-plus until I left the
2	university, nothing happened in the regard of any
3	changes to the infrastructure, processes,
4	assessment, or supports for graduate students or
5	faculty who were raising these issues.
6	Q. So so so Dr. Ferrier, there
7	was a handbook, I take it, in effect O.U. that laid
8	out all sorts of procedures and investigation
9	guidelines, and boards and UPEC committees and all
10	those types of things.
11	Did any of that ever come to pass?
12	A. Never.
13	Q. Interesting.
14	Doctor, and again, within the
15	constraints of this proceeding, I want to thank you
16	for your cogent presentation and and your
17	testimony.
18	I'm going to turn it over now to a
19	university counsel who may have some questions.
20	Thank you very much.
21	A. You're welcome.
22	
23	CROSS-EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. LOUKX:
25	Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Ferrier. Thank

1 you so much for attending the hearing today and 2 giving us your very valuable testimony. 3 It sounds as though you -- you were 4 an advocate for the plight of graduate students and 5 the potential for them to be retaliated against. 6 Is that a fair statement? 7 Α. Yes. 8 And in -- in large part, graduate Q. 9 students are particularly susceptible to this kind 10 of thing when dealing with tenured and -- or even untenured professors, given the power differential 11 12 that exists between those students and the 13 professors. 14 Is that your observation from your 15 experience? 16 That the graduate students are Α. 17 particularly at risk? All students are at risk. 18 19 Q. Yes. And grad- --20 All students are at risk, as well as 21 faculty, as well as staff. Graduate students, and 22 particularly the graduate students that I was 23 working with, primarily graduate students of color, 24 foreign graduate students --

Uh-huh.

Q.

25

1	A which that group were	
2	particularly at risk because they were coming from	
3	other countries, they were representing the history	
4	and the future of their families in terms of	
5	earning a degree; and the importance of their	
6	education was being compromised regularly by the	
7	by the hostile work environment and academic	
8	environment provided by Ohio University.	
9	Q. Thank you.	
10	And that's and that's that's	
11	wrong regardless of who does it. Right? It's	
12	wrong to retaliate against a graduate student	
13	regardless if they're national or	
14	A. Oh, absolutely.	
15	Q. And and that you've you've	
16	stood as a watchdog against that, it sounds like?	
17	A. Everywhere, not just at Ohio	
18	University. So I'm very much consistent in my	
19	behaviors in outing these types of infrastructures	
20	that continue to allow the abuse of our students.	
21	Q. And you would be particularly	
22	offended by any substantiated allegation of any	
23	sexual nature between a a student and a or	
24	between a professor and a student. Right?	
25	A. Oh, absolutely. If somebody	

1	Q. It would be it would be	
2	appropriate, in your mind, for instance, if a	
3	professor was shown to have asked to share a hotel	
4	room with a graduate student or a graduate	
5	assistant working under that professor. Would that	
6	be fair to say?	
7	A. Absolutely, which is why I reported	
8	those types of things and the behaviors of those	
9	faculty people who have abused students and seen	
LO	absolutely nothing happen from the university.	
L1	Q. Okay. Thank you.	
L2	You mentioned And this is the	
L3	final question. You mentioned that you had filed a	
L 4	suit against the university.	
15	You dismissed that suit voluntarily;	
16	did you not?	
L7	A. I did.	
18	Q. Okay. I have nothing else.	
L9	I do appreciate you coming in today,	
20	and thank you very much.	
21	The committee might have some	
22	questions for you.	
23	A. Sure.	
24	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:	
25	Thank you, Mr. Loukx.	

1	Are there questions from the hearing	
2	committee?	
3	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: I have a	
4	question, a clarification, if I may.	
5	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:	
6	Yes, please. Go ahead.	
7	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Dr. Ferrier,	
8	my name is Vladimir Marchenkov. I'm a member of	
9	the hearing committee.	
10	And I just wanted to clarify.	
11	You you have just said that you reported the	
12	faculty who committed abuses against graduate	
13	students and students.	
14	Was Professor Kalyango among those	
15	faculty?	
16	MICHELLE FERRIER: No. I never	
17	received any reports from any graduate students.	
18	For the full year of the graduate assessment and	
19	investigation that I was doing, I never received	
20	any complaints about Dr. Yusuf Kalyango or his work	
21	from any colleagues or any of the other	
22	international colleagues that have worked with him.	
23	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Given your	
24	experience and the nature of your participation in	
25	higher education and your contribution to it, I	

1 wonder if I may ask you to -- to tell us your 2 opinion. It is not as a matter of fact. It's just 3 your opinion. 4 MICHELLE FERRIER: Sure. 5 VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: And I --6 So the criterion that was used by the 7 university investigator who investigated 8 Professor Kalyango's -- allegations against 9 Professor Kalyango was whether it is more likely 10 than otherwise or more than -- whether it is more 11 likely than not. 12 In your opinion, as far as you know 13 Professor Kalyango, is he likely to have committed 14 the abuses of which he is accused or -- or -- or 15 not? 16 MICHELLE FERRIER: Let me put it to 17 you this way. 18 I have worked with Dr. Kalyango. 19 And, in fact, before I was hired at Ohio 20 University, I was brought in on a speaking 21 engagement to speak to the faculty and the board of 22 advisors before I was hired on at the university. 23 Uhm, I observed Dr. Kalyango in his presentation 24 before the faculty. I have also observed him in 25 his work with the international institute that he

headed prior to this, as well as worked with him and traveled with him on two international trips in the development of other programs.

During all of that time, I never observed any inappropriate behavior from Dr. Kalyango towards myself, towards my other international colleagues, or towards any of the other students or other folks on the trip. I have never observed, in any of my behaviors, anything that would lead me to believe that Dr. Kalyango would act inappropriately in these behaviors.

Uhm, I also want to point to the fact that Dr. Drew McDaniel, who was the other target of my investigation as the director of MDIA, was not subjected to any of this kind of investigation, nor was any of the evidence or investigation done on his behalf. And I feel that the effort and attention has been targeted specifically on Dr. Kalyango because of the stature that he has internationally -- or had internationally. I would have to say that the activities over the past several years have done significant damage to his reputation, as well as his ability to be able to garner work and do research in this area, and significant damage has

1 been done to his reputation.

I in no way believe that he is guilty of any of what might be suggested -- suggested sexual harassment, when I have actual sexual harassment and hostility that was never investigated by the university because of the race of the -- the race of the perpetrator.

Uhm, and I also experienced, uhm, as I said, very targeted behaviors myself, not only by Dean Titsworth and Heather Krugman, but by other faculty within the Scripps College, uhm, showing me that there was a deep hostile work environment towards people of color.

And I think if you look at the staff and faculty of the college today, you will find a very limited number of people of color in positions of authority on the faculty or even working on the staff because of this environment.

I think if the uni- -- if the university would look to Dean Titsworth's own evaluations and the anonymous comments by faculty that have been put in there that support my contention, as well as the contention of Dr. Kalyango, that this was a discriminatory and hostile work environment.

8

9

10

11

12

13

1

22 23

21

24 25

Affirmative action, page 13, The dean created a diversity committee for the college. No one was aware of it until January 2015, but the committee was constituted and in place a year before that. The dean hired a diversity officer for the college without any consultation of any of the unit. A white guy head leads the college diversity committee, and this person is not even a GR.1 or GR.2 faculty member. This is an example of the completely illogical planning and evidence that the dean has no clue about how to manage conversations about diversity. That was one faculty comment.

The next one, the dean, page 13, Dean has also failed to retain income-generating faculty, particularly evident in his failure to attempt to retain faculty of color; pulled income-generating faculty away from income-generating activity, including teaching, to become Dean Litz (phonetic) and executive staff, turning them into cost generators.

And again on page 13 and 14, The dean plays favorites and is unsympathetic to the minority faculty members. One of the strongest assistant professors in comms has hired in many

years, a female minority member received an offer elsewhere; and, instead of making any effort to retain her, sought to stop her tenure evaluation in process, pressured her to resign before she even decided whether to accept the offer. These actions struck me as shortsighted, barely legal, and inconsistent with O.U.'s values of fair-mindedness and pursuit of excellence.

I stand here before you today, as

I -- as I have had to review my own case and my own
actions and time at Ohio University; and I am angry
and disgusted that the university sits at this
point today, five years or more after I have been
there, and has done absolutely nothing to protect
the students of that university from these types of
abuses, uhm, and have gone so far as to use these
processes to bludgeon faculty who are producing
world-class work and providing value and
educational opportunity to students around the
globe.

And the university has done a very good job of -- of retaliating against us, removing us from our positions and making it very difficult for us to be able to support our students in getting the education that they've paid for and

1 deserve. 2 VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Thank you very 3 much. 4 MICHELLE FERRIER: You're welcome. 5 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 6 Other questions from the hearing committee. 7 CHARLES LOWERY: Yes, Robin, I have 8 one. 9 Dr. Ferrier, thank you so much. 10 I -- Being somebody from the south, I've seen 11 racism from its institutionalized subtleties to its 12 internalized absurdities; and so I appreciate the 13 work that you're doing. 14 Because I would say having moved 15 from the south to the Midwest, I was -- I have been 16 blatantly shocked, being brought up in the South, 17 you think of the South as being racist, but 18 you're -- but you're kind of cultured to think of 19 other places as not being so racist. And I -- I've 20 just been actually blown away at the -- at some of 21 the obviousness of -- of some of the things that 22 I've seen. 23 So -- so I ask this question with 24 that in mind. 25 You touched on something very, very

1 interesting, and it's been in the back of my mind 2 through this whole case. And that is percentages. 3 The -- the audit of individuals that 4 have had cases brought against them for sexual 5 misconduct, would you happen to know that data off 6 the top of your head here at the -- at the 7 university? 8 MICHELLE FERRIER: No, I wouldn't 9 know. 10 CHARLES LOWERY: So you -- so you 11 wouldn't be able to speak to if -- if there seems 12 to be a -- a higher number of individuals of -- of 13 color or minority or international faculty who have 14 had these allegations brought against them and 15 followed up on them, whereas others have not? 16 you --17 MICHELLE FERRIER: No. I --18 CHARLES LOWERY: -- wouldn't be able 19 to speak to that? 20 MICHELLE FERRIER: Dr. Lowery, I 21 would say that through my efforts, not only as an 22 administrator, but as a journalist, I attempted 23 through all means necessary, including these 24 filings, as well as through several Freedom of 25 Information Act requests that I made more during my

time to get more information and -- and conduct a thorough investigation of this.

Uhm, I don't even know if those numbers were really available at the time when I was doing this investigation, as I said.

My own case wended through for 17 months, and I believe it was the actions of the university counsel to slow these activities as much as possible and bleed the defendants through -- bleed the plaintiffs dry in terms of being able to get redress for the harms that the university caused to them.

And so I believe the university used these -- uses these processes as tools to be able to slow investigation, to stifle investigation, and to stifle the actual numbers of people abused.

I think one of the instructive things might be to look at actually the faculty and staff composition and look at the racial composition and the changes to that even over the past five years since -- since I've left the university the past couple of years and declines in that area, uhm, as well as understand the hostile work environment that other faculty and staff of color live in in not only on the campus itself, but

1 in the surrounding area of the Midwest, as you 2 mention. 3 I received, as well as my family 4 received, in my time at Ohio University and in 5 Athens County direct racialized incidents by just 6 walking down the street. 7 And so, yes, to -- to think that 8 just because we are not in the South that racism 9 doesn't exist, I would point you all to the 10 Southern Poverty Law Center white supremacist map 11 and see that they exist in every state, and 12 especially in Ohio. 13 CHARLES LOWERY: Okay. Well, thank 14 you very much for your response. I'm very curious 15 about that data myself, and I really can't find it 16 either. So I appreciate your time. Thank you. 17 MICHELLE FERRIER: You're welcome. HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 18 19 Thank you very much, Dr. Ferrier. We greatly 20 appreciate your testimony and willingness to 21 respond to the questions as a part of this process. 22 And on behalf of the hearing committee, again, our

MICHELLE FERRIER: Thank you very much for the opportunity to be able to air my own

thanks and very best regards.

23

24

25

1 as well as the grievances of Dr. Kalyango. 2 And I hope and pray that this 3 committee hears my deeper concerns and, as people 4 who are still at the university, can please put in 5 place some processes to protect our students. This is criminal, and the university 6 7 needs to be held to account to make sure that these 8 processes are in place to support our students and 9 get the -- the education that they deserve. 10 So thank you very much for having 11 me. I appreciate it. 12 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 13 You're very welcome, and thank you. Take care. 14 MICHELLE FERRIER: Thanks much. 15 Bye-bye. 16 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 17 Well, if the past arrival of witnesses is any 18 indication, we should be seeing our last witness 19 for this afternoon in a few moments. That witness 20 is scheduled to be here by 3 o'clock. All 21 witnesses were asked to be here about ten minutes 22 early. 23 So if we just, again, stand up and 24 stretch but don't go very far, we may be able to

proceed in about five or six minutes. So just

25

1	check in.
2	(Brief recess.)
3	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
4	With that, Duane, I ask you to please bring in our
5	next witness.
6	DUANE BRUCE: The witness is here.
7	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
8	Thank you.
9	Good afternoon, Dr. Hendrickson.
10	I'm Robin Muhammad. I'm the hearing committee
11	chair.
12	Thank you for being here today.
13	Can you hear me all right?
14	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: I can.
15	Can you hear me okay?
16	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
17	Equally. Thank you.
18	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Good.
19	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
20	What we have for each witness is roughly a
21	30-minute block of time. You will initiate some
22	statement at the beginning, identifying yourself,
23	whatever remarks you would like to provide.
24	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Uh-huh.
25	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:

1	And then we'll turn to counsel for the faculty	
2	member who will propose a couple of questions to	
3	you and then shift to the university counsel who	
4	will do the same.	
5	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Okay.	
6	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:	
7	Roughly, at the end of that 30-minute period, we'll	
8	entertain questions from the hearing committee	
9	generally,	
10	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Okay.	
11	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:	
12	and that will conclude the testimony.	
13	So with that, I turn it over to you.	
14	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Thank you,	
15	Robin.	
16	I have actually prepared a statement	
17	that I would like to read, but I'll try to pretend	
18	I'm not reading it. I just wanted to make sure	
19	that I was able to articulate what I wanted to say.	
20	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: I	
21	appreciate that. And I'll I should add	
22	excuse me for interrupting for the for the	
23	benefit of the court reporter, reading is	
24	absolutely, of course, fine.	
25	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Okay.	

1	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
2	Just slowly for someone taking dictation.
3	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: I can do
4	that.
5	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
6	Thank you so much.
7	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Or at least
8	I can attempt to that.
9	So And my statement should be
10	roughly ten minutes; so if not, a little under.
11	All right. So first of all, I know
12	everybody has dedicated a great amount of time and
13	energy to this hearing. I'm honored to be among
14	the last to speak about Yusuf Kalyango as a person
15	and colleague I know well.
16	My name is Elizabeth Hendrickson,
17	and I am an associate professor at the E.W. Scripps
18	School of Journalism where I have worked since
19	2014.
20	I first met Yusuf in 2003 while we
21	were both in the master's program at the University
22	of Missouri School of Journalism. What initially
23	caught my attention about him was his poise. He
24	was always prepared for class, respectful of both
25	professors and peers, and was always impeccably and

professionally dressed.

He and I both had just moved from big cities; we had big jobs. And his demeanor was super distinct and, frankly, it was refreshing from that of what most other students, you know, were -- were -- I guess, come to the table with.

Yusuf meant business, and I also meant business. So his conduct was one I tried to emulate, as I had little knowledge about how to actually be a grad student.

As time went on, I realized my scholarly publishing could never resemble that which Yusuf so seamlessly produced, and I was cool with that. He and I were not competitors. We were colleagues and we were friends.

The final month of our master's program, Yusuf became a new father, and I learned his son was having some medical issues and was back in the hospital. Yusuf still came to class, and I gave him a small gift for his son and a card for his wife Jenny. I, myself, was five months pregnant.

Yusuf's son overcame his medical issues, and Yusuf and I received our master's degree sitting next to each other.

We both started this Ph.D. program
that August, and then I had my son in October. I
don't recall much about that semester, but I do
remember he was the only classmate who really
seemed to empathize with my continuous state of
exhaustion.

By the following fall, our sons were having play dates together. And I have to say Yusuf was a spectacular father, as spectacular as he was a researcher. And at this point I considered him someone I could rely on for a personal and professional perspective.

Yusuf was the first of our cohort to get a job, and it was here at O.U.

I want to emphasize that at this point he was already an established scholar who had many notable institutions that were interested in hiring him, yet he chose O.U. and the Athens community as a place he wanted he and his family to call home.

Yusuf and I sat with another member of our cohort at graduation. We were the only members of our group of 12 to graduate in three years.

I took a position at the University

of Tennessee, and Yusuf and I continued to keep in touch via email and conference socials. We both had a second child the same year, 2010. He had another boy. I had a girl. Today that same young girl considers that same young boy to be one of her best friends.

Yusuf was key to my taking a job at O.U., as I wasn't on the job hunt and had just been granted tenure at Tennessee. But Yusuf knew I grew up in Ohio and that I wanted to live closer to my aging parents since all my brothers lived in New York City.

So Yusuf contacted me when a search opened for a faculty position that focused on magazine journalism, and he encouraged me to apply. And frankly, his being here was proof enough to me that this program was a better opportunity than that given by my research one institution.

Today I can say without hesitation that has indeed been the case for me.

I started at O.U. in 2014 and was granted tenure a year later.

Yusuf continued to be a close friend, and we often carpooled to our children's soccer games or to a chap- -- chaperone a field

trip. During those drives, we chatted about everything from politics to research and our former professors and from our kids to travel. I enjoyed our friendship and our children's friendship.

The last time Yusuf and his sons visited my home was Easter Sunday 2018. As the Kalyangos were leaving, my mother arrived after driving the three hours to Athens. I remember watching Yusuf and my mother chat briefly in the driveway before hugging and going separate ways. Less than two months later, my mother passed away after a traumatic event left her in a weeklong coma. I was emotionally wrecked, but I find a semblance of peace by thinking how often we were able to get together because of our proximity.

During the next year, Yusuf regularly checked in on me via text, and his words of encouragement and support and empathy were really valuable to me. At a time when his own world was falling apart, he provided me with emotional support. And I believe in that person. But I also really value Yusuf as a colleague.

You see, Yusuf as a graduate student and Yusuf as a faculty member are all one in the same. His integrity and decency both inside and

outside the classroom has remained constant. I find such consistency to be tremendously reassuring. I really believe other faculty felt similarly.

When Yusuf spoke during our often robust faculty meetings, the room would routinely become silent for him. He was always so thoughtful, so careful, and so judicious with his words. We all knew when he was ready to comment on a matter, it would be more than worthy of all of our full attention and our consideration.

And I give you all this background so you can understand why I have felt so internally sickened by this endless investigation into my friend's character.

I believe Yusuf was collateral damage during a Trifecta of bad timing: administrative and policy changes, colleagues with nefarious motives, and a collective unwillingness to believe a person could actually be innocent of alleged misconduct. But the damage has been done, and now it's time for that to stop.

Now, I understand why a bureaucratic process is designed to be deliberate and judicious. That only works effectively when the bureaucracy

1 adheres to protocols and established standards. 2 At every single level, this process has been flawed and devoid of due process. But to 3 4 me, the most egregious aspect has been the shameful 5 indifference those in power seem to have for this 6 case. 7 Yusuf is not a predator or someone 8 who grooms others to instill their trust. That is 9 not him. He's an intellect and a loving father and 10 a consummate professional. 11 A person's character does not change 12 with the tides. It's something that's always with 13 us. It's inside of him. It's who we are. And 14 I -- I think Yusuf has so much character and 15 dignity. 16 I believe it's now time for us as an 17 institution to repair itself, and really it's time 18 to rectify the situation and allow Yusuf to rebuild 19 his reputation in good faith. 20 Thank you. 21 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 22 Thank you, Dr. Hendrickson. 23 With that, we can turn to counsel 24 for the faculty member's side for any questions.

MEL LUTE:

Thank you.

25

1 | - - -

2 DIRECT EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. LUTE:

- Q. Good afternoon.
- A. Good afternoon.
- Q. I would like to -- I would like to pick up on a few words that you used regarding the flawed process. And you -- you -- you -- Really, your frustration is coming through about the indifference. You mentioned that you felt that the administration was indifferent.

What do you mean by that?

administration at different levels, meaning whether it was at the school level or higher up the chain, it just kept going on and on. And it wasn't abiding with any sort of deadlines that have been set in whatever policy. It just seemed like it wasn't a priority to get figured out; uhm, he wasn't a priority to be dealt with. And it just seems to me that, uhm -- I don't know if it was because of the subject matter or the allegations themselves or what, but it just kept being in this kind of precarious state of questionability, like where it was -- what was happening. We didn't talk

- about it at work. Uhm, it was not something that

 came up at fac- -- in faculty meetings unless it

 was maybe two occasions where Director Stewart

 said that we would have a chance to review material

 and then tell him our thoughts in a private phone

 call.
 - Q. Well, I'm going to ask you about that. I'm going to ask you about that specifically, because I think that the panel would be very interested to know.

Was there ever a meeting of the faculty -- and by "a meeting," I mean a -- an assembly of individuals where there are numerous people in the same room -- was there ever a meeting of the faculty to deliberate over the tenure revocation of Yusuf Kalyango?

- A. No, because Director Stewart said that he valued our input; but at the end of the day, it would be his decision.
- Q. So you had individual meetings
 that -- to the extent that anybody wanted to
 express an opinion, but there was no group meeting?
- A. There was no group meeting. And the -- the -- Because of the timing with the virtual -- or with COVID, we were supposed to be

- meeting with Director Stewart one on one in person;
 but then it -- it just -- it wasn't even a virtual
 meeting. It wasn't even face -- It was just on the
 phone.
 - Q. Okay. And then you mentioned this sort of Trifecta, as you put it, you mentioned nefarious motives of colleagues; and I want to -- I think I know where you're going with that. I want to go to the meeting of the graduate studies program, the committee where --
 - A. I was there.

Q. -- where Mike Sweeney made a presentation regarding the -- or during the reconsideration of a student -- I'll use her initials -- was being considered -- reconsidered for admission to the Ph.D. program.

You were at that meeting?

A. No, sir. I at that point had -- I had formally quit the committee in disgust, so I had abstained from voting on that.

Dr. Sweeney came to my office prior to the committee and sat down and gave me kind of a personal view -- preview of what he was going to present at the committee meeting; and I said that, uhm, I -- I didn't want to continue with my

1 participation in that particular committee, because 2 I felt like it was wrought with problems, and it 3 was --4 On -- on several occasions over the 5 course of the years, I -- I would leave those 6 meetings feeling incredibly agitated and frustrated 7 because the same thing would happen, ah --8 Q. Had you voted against --9 -- in terms of deciding --Α. 10 Had you voted against being Q. 11 admitted into the Ph.D. program in the 12 meeting? 13 Yes. Α. 14 All right. And then after Q. 15 Mr. Sweeney came and spoke to you, you resigned 16 from the committee; and therefore, you did not 17 participate in the subsequent vote. Is that 18 correct? 19 I think I abstained, and that was on Α. 20 And so what -- I think after he came the record. 21 to my office --22 It could have been that that meeting 23 maybe coincided with something I was teaching; but 24 I wasn't going to be going to that meeting, because 25 I had made it clear that I didn't want -- I -- I

1 just didn't want to be anymore, uhm, affiliated 2 with what was happening. 3 And when Mr. Sweeney came to your 4 office for this one-on-one meeting before the --5 the committee meeting, he was -- was reconsidered, 6 did he make disclosures to you about the 7 allegations against Yusuf Kalyango? 8 Α. I believe he may have done some 9 hinting around. He made it clear that, uhm --10 Hold on. Let -- let me think about 11 the meeting or when he came in. 12 I know that I started crying, 13 because -- Yeah, he must have, because I actually 14 got teary and said, I don't believe it. 15 I do not believe that. And -him. 16 0. Now, you wrote --17 And I don't want to upset you. 18 Α. No, no, no. I just -- With my mom, 19 I get teary about my mom. I'm okay. 20 You wrote letters to the provost and 0. 21 to the president on behalf of Yusuf Kalyango and --22 and the allegations and this whole situation. Is 23 that right? 24 I don't recall writing a letter. Α. 25 Uhm --

1 Q. Yeah, my notes could be a little bit
2 off on that.
3 A. No, I didn't get involved, uhm, in

A. No, I didn't get involved, uhm, in terms of visibly advocating for him.

I have been waiting and, uhm, hoping the right thing would happen, and --

- Q. Well, I think of all the -- I think of all the witnesses who had have testified in this inci- -- in this hearing, you've known him the longest by -- by virtue of your explanation and have really sort of grown up with him, if you will, professionally --
 - A. I trust him, yeah.
 - Q. -- and academically.

And so with all of that, and knowing that you're a tenured professor and you're at -you're at that -- you know, it's a pretty rare
(inaudible) in the academic world where you can sort of see how the machine operates. I mean, you're high enough up in the bureaucracy that you see how the machine operates.

- A. Yes.
- Q. And having seen that and knowing

 Dr. Kalyango the way you do, do you feel that this

 process has been fair? Do you think that

Dr. Kalyango has been treated fairly by the
university in this process?

A. No, not at all. He's been dismissed
without as many words with -- You know, I mean,

- without as many words with -- You know, I mean, he's been -- As I said, he's been, uhm, just -- just that indifference. He has not been treated fairly just by virtue of not even having a protocol, not having a director of our program who could speak to us as faculty and -- and also tell us what was going on. I mean, it was just kind of a cloud of, uhm, mystery, and --
- Q. And -- and I'll finish the questions with this, ma'am.

At the -- Here we are years after the initiation of the investigation; and in these last two days, it's the first time Dr. Kalyango, he personally or through his representatives, have had an opportunity to question any of this.

In terms of how that -- in terms of how that works, the process, is that the basis of the frustration that you've been telling us about?

A. Yes. And -- and -- and also the process, as well as my own disgust with how these allegations and everything else has played out.

I mean, in -- in addition to my

1	believing what I do about Yusuf as a person and a
2	character and my own huge doubts about the
3	allegations, I'm disgusted by the process or lack
4	thereof. Is that
5	Q. Thank you, ma'am. I'll turn it over
6	to the university's legal counsel.
7	Thank you.
8	A. You're welcome. Thank you.
9	
10	CROSS-EXAMINATION
L1	BY MR. LOUKX:
12	Q. Thank you, and good afternoon.
13	Thanks for coming in and talking to us today.
L 4	I'm going to use initials only,
15	because this there could be observers on. So
16	for FERPA meetings, I'm going to refer to two
L 7	students. Hopefully the initials will give them
18	away.
19	But are you familiar or do you know
20	а
21	A. I have met her. I met I had one,
22	uhm, kind of introduction meeting to her where I
23	think it was at a time where I don't know.
24	Should I use MF was trying to
25	Q. You can talk I'm sorry. I'm

1 talking over you, and that's my fault. Ι 2 apologize, Mary. 3 Α. Okay. 4 You can speak of professors by name, Q. 5 but not students. 6 Okay. Α. 7 Q. Go ahead. 8 I believe it was a time when 9 Director -- Dr. Sweeney was trying to figure out 10 the pairing of grad- -- new graduate students with 11 professors and their, you know, interests and their 12 kind of chemistry or however it -- he assigned it 13 at that point. 14 And so I just had like a half an 15 hour meeting with that individual in my office just 16 to kind of chat and hear more about their 17 interests, their research interests, their 18 background, what they hoped to pursue, things like 19 that. But that was the only --20 And I presented to the Intro to Grad 21 Studies class. 22 But aside from that, that -- that was the extent. Uhm, obviously, I wasn't chosen to 23 24 be a, you know, mentor or anything.

Okay. And how about

Do you

25

Q.

know the student 1 2 Yes. Uh-huh. And it's almost an Α. exact same thing, --3 4 Okay. Q. 5 -- almost exactly. And I -- I have Α. 6 been seeing them out before just when I -- You 7 know, not socially, but I was in the Wal-Mart 8 parking lot and I saw them running around, so. But 9 I -- they didn't see me. That's it. 10 Okay. Now, they went to school at Q. 11 different times, I understand. So when you say you 12 saw them running around, did you see them together 13 running around, or was that you would see one or 14 the other at Wal-Mart? I just want to --15 Ah, no. I -- I know that I saw one Α. 16 of them. I don't know about the other one. 17 Q. Okay. -- Well, it was with a 18 19 third -- it was with a different graduate 20 student --21 Okay. Q. 22 -- who I had also had in class. Α. 23 Anyway, I just identified that 24 person by virtue of the third person who I had had 25 in class and then thought, Oh, okay.

1	Q.	Okay.
2	A.	That's all.
3	Q.	But you haven't talked to either
4		
5	A.	No.
6	Q.	about the allegations?
7	A.	No.
8	Q.	Now, fair to say that you're here
9	today to discu	ss kind of, I guess, what they call a
10	character witn	ess?
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	And the other reason you're here is
13	because and	I'm a little bit slow, but I I
14	think you had	a problem with the process. So
15	character witn	ess and some criticisms of the
16	process in thi	s case.
17		Are you familiar with the the
18	process as it'	s laid out in the faculty handbook?
19	A.	Now I am more familiar with it.
20	I I wasn't	until the allegations and it became
21	public knowled	ge what was happening.
22	Q.	Okay.
23	A.	But also I'm on faculty senate, so.
24	Q.	Okay.
25	A.	I mean, I Thank goodness I wasn't

- 1 assigned to this committee.
- Q. And you if you don't know, that's --
- 3 | the question I'm about to ask --
- A. I do now.
- 5 Q. Okay. But the specific question
- 6 I'm going to ask you is, do you know if
- 7 Director Stewart was required to have a group
- 8 meeting, or was he -- does the faculty handbook
- 9 just require him to consult with members of
- 10 | faculty?
- 11 A. It was my understanding that it was
- 12 | supposed to be a group meeting of tenured
- professors.
- 14 Q. Okay. But is that in the handbook?
- 15 A. I need to look at the handbook.
- 16 Q. Okay.
- 17 A. It -- I believed it was.
- 18 Q. Okay.
- 19 A. I believed it was, because --
- 20 Q. So whatever --
- 21 I'm sorry. Go ahead. I interrupted
- 22 you. My apologies.
- 23 A. No. I -- You know, the only -- The
- 24 | thing the -- about that aspect of it, I just found
- 25 | it -- I found it indicative of how, then, our

1 school would -- just really discouraged any sort of 2 confrontation and -- or potential confrontation. 3 So let's say that we would have had 4 a faculty meeting with --5 Uh-huh. 0. 6 -- with the tenured professors. Α. 7 believe our director was trying to avoid creating 8 crises. 9 I see. And if that --Q. Uhm, at --10 Α. 11 Go ahead. Go ahead. I'm sorry. Q. 12 I just know that historically, from Α. 13 what I understand, our school, you know, it went 14 through some difficulties in terms of, uhm, whether 15 it was just different personalities, maybe not 16 aligning and --17 Q. Uh-huh. 18 Α. -- difficulties, and so I kind of 19 feel like our director was such a peacemaker at 20 heart that he really -- because of that, it made 21 him unable to actually exercise what demand -- what 22 was demanded of him to do. 23 And are you familiar with a -- a Q.

similar process in the English department?

Α.

Just what I --

24

25

1 I think if it's what --2 Is it -- Something I read in the 3 That's as much as I know, yes. paper. 4 Okay. If it's --Q. 5 But I -- Yeah. Α. 6 If you're not more familiar than Q. 7 that, I withdraw the question. 8 But you would agree with me in 9 regards to the faculty handbook that what it says, 10 it says. Right? 11 Α. Yes. 12 So if it requires a meeting, it says Q. 13 If it says consultation, it says that. that. 14 Α. Yes. 15 Okay. And that's -- that's really Q. 16 all I have, and I thank you for coming in late on 17 a --18 Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead. 19 May I -- May -- I mean, I would say, Α. 20 though, that up until that point, there was 21 absolutely no visible protocol that -- I mean, 22 because process was so undervalued, that it 23 actually got to the point where, you know, I had 24 lost real respect for the whole process, uhm, 25 because it had dragged on for going on four years

- 1 or whatever at that point.
- 2 And I think what the faculty
- 3 handbook says is almost moot given, you know,
- 4 | the -- the way that the university and other sort
- 5 of committees have -- have been treating this.
- You know, I mean, if it came down to
- 7 whether or not it was stated as a consult or a
- 8 meeting, if -- if that's what it comes down to,
- 9 then I have a real problem with that being the
- 10 final sort of consideration, --
- 11 Q. But ultimately --
- 12 A. -- because it was so messed up.
- 13 Q. Ultimately, though, the handbook
- 14 | provides that it's the director's decision in terms
- of the recommendation, or do you know?
- 16 A. I believe it is --
- 17 God.
- 18 Q. If you don't know --
- 19 A. I feel like this is a test, because
- 20 I -- I read it. And, I mean, it's like the -- I --
- 21 | I thought it was the director made the
- 22 recommendation as informed by the faculty. Right?
- 23 Q. Uh-huh.
- 24 A. It wasn't a, We're going to do all
- 25 of this in the dark and then spring it on the

1	faculty as the	last thing that comes out of the
2	director before	e they retire.
3	Q.	Uh-huh.
4	Α.	Like, he didn't even he wasn't
5	even the person	n who told us. At He had another
6	person at that	last faculty meeting deliver that
7	information to	the faculty. It was appalling.
8	Q.	I see.
9		Well, again, I I thank you very
10	much for for	r coming here today and and
11	appreciate you	r time.
12	Α.	I hope it was helpful.
13	Q.	Thank you.
14	A.	Thank you for giving me the
15	opportunity, s	ir.
16		HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
17	Thank you, Mr.	Loukx.
18		Now turning to the hearing
19	committee, are	there any questions for
20	Dr. Hendrickson	n?
21		SHERYL HOUSE: This is
22	Sheryl House.	I have a question.
23		ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Hi.
24		SHERYL HOUSE: Hi.
25		Dr. Hendrickson, you made a

comment -- I don't know the exact words -- but you
had said that you had stepped down from the
graduate committee because you have left those
meetings, you indicated maybe on more than one
occasion, very frustrated.

Can you elaborate on what was frustrating about those graduate committee --

And I'm -- and I'm talking about really just when you're talking about admission of Ph.D. students or students into the program.

ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Okay. Yes.

I had -- I mean, and I think Yusuf and I both -- We didn't talk about this. We weren't gossiping about any of this. It's just how we were raised at Missouri, basically; is you wanted to create a cohort that was diverse. You wanted to be able to accept not just the people who had the most perfect scores or, you know, the most interesting backstories. I mean, it was really -- it was really, you know, as you know, a delicate process that was constantly dynamic, uhm, just by virtue of who was applying.

And numerous -- numerous years, uhm,

I felt that the process was almost like, uhm, ah, a

formality in a sense, whereas it would be almost

1	assumed that, uhm, if a candidate might write that
2	they want to work with a particular a particular
3	person who might be heading up that committee, say,
4	then they would be moved to the front of the line;
5	and, uhm, those who might bring more to the
6	collective experience were then relegated behind.
7	And I saw that happen, uhm, on numerous occasions.
8	SHERYL HOUSE: Thank you.
9	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Does that
10	make sense?
11	SHERYL HOUSE: (Nodded
12	affirmatively.)
13	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Okay.
14	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
15	Thank you, Dr. House.
16	Other questions for our witness at
17	this time from the hearing committee?
18	Very good.
19	Hearing no others, I want to thank
20	Dr. Hendrickson for being here today, sharing
21	testimony and responding at length to the questions
22	posed by both sides and the hearing committee as
23	well.
24	On behalf of the hearing committee,
25	thank you again.

1	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Thank you
2	for having me. I appreciate being part of the
3	process. Bye.
4	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
5	Thank you. Best regards. Bye-bye.
6	ELIZABETH HENDRICKSON: Thank you.
7	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
8	Very good. That brings us to just a few minutes
9	before our scheduled afternoon break. We will
LO	break now and reconvene at please be back a few
L1	minutes before 3:45. At that point, Dr. Kalyango
12	will address the body from 3:45 to 4:15.
13	I'll mute my mic and be on camera if
L 4	needed.
15	(Brief recess.)
L6	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
L7	Welcome back, everyone. It's just before 3:45.
18	We're now going to hear from Dr. Yusuf Kalyango.
L9	He will be addressing the hearing committee for the
20	next 30 minutes. And that will essentially rest
21	the case on Dr. Kalyango's side.
22	Following that, we'll have a brief
23	recess of of about 15 minutes and then commence
24	with summations at 4:30.
25	So with that, I turn to

1 Dr. Kalyango. Thank you for being here. 2 ready to hear from you directly today. And what I 3 explained in terms of the process for the next 4 30 minutes, is that your understanding as well, 5 that you will be speaking to us for 30 minutes? 6 YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes. Thank you. 7 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 8 Excellent. Thank you. The floor is yours. 9 YUSUF KALYANGO: All right. Before 10 I ask Counsel Beck to join me in this, I want to 11 first of all thank you, Dr. Robin Muhammad. You --12 you've done a fantastic job. 13 This is a very difficult moment for 14 you, too, to go through this process, you know, 15 virtually and then managing people from all over 16 the world. And I would like to submit to you that, 17 you know, I'm very grateful and -- for all that 18 you've done. 19 And first of all, I would like to 20 thank the university administrators, the president, 21 the provost, of course, legal counsel, all 22 administrators, for this opportunity to finally be 23 heard, although my opportunity actually to be heard 24 comes at the tail end of this three-year,

protracted investigation in the detenuring process.

25

1 As for my colleagues on the -- on 2 3 4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the hearing committee, you know, I'm the subject of -- I'm the subject in all of this; uhm, and I speak before you now with a -- a big heart of gratitude for the service you are rendering in the protection of our tenure rights and due process rights.

I will proceed to request my attorney at this time to ask me questions to fill in the gaps; and I want him to take only 20 minutes of questioning just to fill in the gaps, you know, for this hearing.

And at the end of the 20 minutes, then I want to request to hear from each committee member, please, to ask me a question or questions. I will be honored if -- I would like to -- if I would hear from each member of the -- the committee, hearing committee, to ask me a question.

So, Counsel Beck, I will take questions for 20 minutes to ask me any questions to fill in the gap. And immediately after that, maybe about eight minutes with the -- the committee hearing to hear from each member to ask me a question. And then after that, I will take only two minutes to rest the case. That's my request.

1	And with that, I request
2	Counsel Beck to take over and fill in the gaps.
3	I'm ready to answer any questions that you have and
4	any questions that the hearing committee members I
5	will have to receive.
6	So I think the the university has
7	done a lot of investigations, and they already have
8	their case. So it's now time for my legal counsel
9	and the hearing committee.
10	Thank you very much.
11	
12	DIRECT EXAMINATION
13	BY MR. BECK:
14	Q. Dr. Kalyango,
15	A. Yeah.
16	Q there has been a lot of
17	discussion about your history and so forth and all
18	of the wonderful things you've done, but maybe I
19	think it would be helpful if you could share with
20	us, what what do you see as your role as an
21	educator and a professor at Ohio University?
22	A. Ah, just only in the last ten ten
23	years?
24	Q. Sure.
25	A. Okay. Yeah. My role is I conduct

both empirical research and global comparative applied research. And my role really is to create knowledge with all of you, including the hearing -- hearing committee members; and then I disseminate this new knowledge for our students and to other O.U. constituents based on my deep expertise based on my experiences and -- and scholarship, and -- and my uniqueness, you know, and all these contribution to the university and to my role as an educator is that I do this around the world: South America, Asia, Europe, Africa, the Middle East; and -- and I have connections all over the world. And I did that through this university, so I'm grateful for that.

Q. I would like to turn, then, Doctor, if we could to the specific allegations. I think we've heard so many things, and I think it would be helpful for the committee to hear your thoughts on these allegations.

Now, you've heard claims by and then by regarding inappropriate conduct. So, first of all, are their allegations -- are the allegations that they presented against you true?

A. Not at all true. Uhm, and -- and you had heard some of that in -- in the hearing

in -- in the last two days.

But the fact of the matter is that everything that I have done for these students, I've done it in good faith in support of our students. I've done it to mentor, help our students. I've been a mentor for so many students. I've done this to educate our students, to create opportunities for you -- for them.

And even the students who have accused me of these allegations do not deny the fact that I have provided them these opportunities and -- and I provided them a wealth of knowledge in doing so.

Uhm, I cared about them. I think they were all good students. And I have no hard feelings despite all of this. I -- I feel bad and I regret this, and -- and it's been treacherous to me; but I never intended to hurt a student. I cared for them. And I still wish good for them, because I don't think, you know, they know what -- I don't know -- I didn't think they knew how -- you know, what their -- what they were trying to do would do to a person like me. And -- and I wish there was a way I could tell them this and to even apologize to them if I ever wronged them in any

1 way. But I never intended to hurt anyone, and the 2 allegations are not true. 3 I want to talk a little bit, because we -- at sort of the tail end of some of the 4 5 testimony that came from some of the witnesses that supported you: Dr. Ferrier, Dr. Hendrickson, they 6 7 talked about the process. 8 So just so the committee members 9 know and it's in this record, what did you see as 10 the policy violations or the failure on the part of 11 the university with respect to how they actually 12 even applied the policy to you? 13 I don't think 15 minutes are enough Α. 14 for that. 15 The good thing, though, 16 Counsel Beck, is that the committee has -- the 17 committee has a statement that outlines a lot of 18 this. 19 But I'll just outline a few things, 20 you know. 21 I did not appear before the second 22 UPEC at all. And that committee that looked at the 23 matter did not even contact me at all. 24 committee was supposed to conclude its report 25 within 49 -- 45 days. The MOFs that were released

1 os May 30th, 2019, yet I had from UPEC for the very 2 first time ever on November 14th; and the letter 3 they sent me was originally on November 11th. 4 is six and a half month later. So that's a policy 5 violation just there; I mean, just on UPEC, you 6 know. 7 I can go on and on, you know. 8 I had given my statement to the investigator there. 9 But you know what? I'm not even --10 I'm not even talking about the issue with that, ah, 11 George Anaya. They -- they -- and, you know, they 12 investigated -- Mr. Anaya had, you know, all these 13 investigations take more than a year, all three of 14 them. 15 The way these two other 16 investigations came in -- in all in March following 17 that graduate committee meeting, that's when they 18 all popped up. That was eight month, you know, 19 investigation. into the 20 So all these are policy violations. 21 And by the way, there's one thing I 22 need the hearing committee to know this. 23 I understand if you are going to 24 delay beyond 90 days. The policy guiding an

investigator, because they should know this, is

25

that you need to notify the parties why you are delaying.

In all three cases, which all took up a whole year or more than a year, the investigator never explained to me why these -- after the 90-day there was this delay and all of that. So -- so there are so many policy violations.

example, and I'm done with this question. The classic example of this is the fact that, and the hearing committee should know this -- it is already in my statement -- the ECRC the (indiscernible) office is investigating two administrators: the school director of (indiscernible) and the dean of the Scripps College of Communication for violation of university policy. Let this sink in. Violation of university policy, the same policy on which I am being detenured. And why? Because of the procedural flaws that happened in the original process at the school level and the college level.

So if the -- if the university itself is the investigating administrators, of course there were policy invest- -- violations.

So I think -- I think it's very

609 1 correct for the committee to know this. 2 But, yeah, they are policy 3 violations, and the evidence is with the 4 university. 5 Now, we heard some discussion about Ο. 6 the fact that Dr. Stewart did not consult the 7 whole faculty. And that's also a policy violation? 8 Α. Yes. It's a vital policy violation. 9 But let's put it in perspective. 10 Dr. Stewart did not, and I repeat, never met with 11 me regarding the auto mandated personal conference 12 with me. He had only met with me, and an email 13 confirms that, to discuss the proceedings based on 14 his consultations with the legal affairs to allow 15 him to -- to secretly, privately with individual 16 faculty members instead of allowing a P and T 17 committee to deliberate revocation of tenure. 18 Like we are agreeing right now, the hearing committee, this committee is going to 19

deliberate the proceedings, you know, what has happened in this hearing.

20

21

22

23

24

25

He promised me three times in a recording that is now with the university, a recording of that initial meeting, that -- that now -- not only the discussion by ECRC, in which he

- 1 | said there will be a personal conference meeting.
- 2 | ECRC now have evidence -- have -- has evidence of
- 3 | that in its investigation of Dr. Stewart, but that
- 4 | meeting never took place. I wasn't -- I was denied
- 5 basic due process rights that have been according
- 6 to -- accorded to other faculty members in other
- 7 departments who has -- who have faced similar
- 8 situations.
- 9 So I was treated differently, in
- 10 addition to violating the faculty handbook for a
- 11 possible meeting with the school director. That
- 12 investigation is going on in the ECRC as we speak.
- 13 Q. Well, my last question on this issue
- 14 | with Dr. Stewart is, is that you were able to
- 15 determine who he actually consulted with. Is that
- 16 | correct?
- 17 A. Yes. Yes.
- 18 Q. And just so the -- the panel knows,
- of the 11 people with whom he consulted, what was
- 20 that constit- -- (inaudible)?
- 21 A. Yeah. I think -- I think the
- 22 | biggest flaw in that that I see is, out of those 11
- 23 committee members that privately, separately --
- 24 separately met with the school director to
- 25 determine my fate, my future, in the department

that I served so well, was that two of those were
not even tenured. One of them was a new
probationary faculty member who joined after my
suspension. I never met her. She's never met me.
I've nev- --

You know I've been banished from the university. Like, I can't even go to my office on a Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday without asking for permission. So she's never even met me.

Anyway, nine of those were tenured faculty. Two of those were -- Actually, one of these Group 2. I mean, it's not bad for a Group 2 to -- I -- I believe in diversity. I believe in inclusiveness. I'm okay with that. The problem was they -- the school directors later stated that, you know, the -- after meeting -- you know, after -- he puts in the P and T committee in his determination for detenuring me, and that was misleading. His letter to detenure me is very, very misleading; and that is very unfortunate.

And all I was asking for is for fairness and due process, you know. And if yet all those things have been done, we wouldn't be here.

Q. Thank you for that, Doctor.

And sort of in the interest of time,

I want to move quickly to --1 2 You've said that the allegations of 3 are -- are just not true. But can you 4 just tell the panel, then, after this trip to 5 that was the subject of her discussion, 6 you continue to work with her and mentor her? 7 Absolutely. Uhm, I -- I continued 8 to provide her with, you know, recommendation 9 letters, you know, any support she wanted. 10 continued to work with my institute even beyond 11 graduation; because when she graduated, she continued to work that summer, and she worked in 12 13 So -- so 14 Professor Mary Rogus actually also knew her, 15

because she worked with us throughout that period. Then she stayed in Athens to -- ah, because she was dating her current husband, because that was a (indiscernible). So she continued to work with me until the end.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And at that point, even in sent to me a thank-you card for all I had done for And I've held that thank-you card from early her. here like it's handwritten in -- in school If you go to my office, I can show you a note. thank-you note card.

1 Now, one of the issues I want to Q. 2 talk to you about that's somewhat frustrating is 3 this issue with Dr. Sweeney. 4 Yeah. 5 Were you aware that Dr. Sweeney had 0. 6 given advice to the day she resigned 7 Ah, I didn't know. There were so 8 many things that were done behind my back that I 9 had no idea about. Uhm --10 Well, let me ask. Q. 11 Did you have a problem with Dr. --12 Did you and Dr. Sweeney -- Was there some issue 13 between you and him that was ongoing during this 14 period of time? 15 But may I request you that I Yes. Α. 16 don't talk about everything that happened in 17 that -- that involves diversity and 18 inclusiveness and all these things that I was 19 advocating for. Because of the investigation going 20 on with Professor Stewart, all those things are 21 under investigation, and I would rather not talk 22 about those. I know they are very important for 23 this committee to determine whether I 24 (indiscernible) or not, but I would rather not go

there. Let -- let ECRC do its job and -- and --

25

1 and help me (indiscernible), things will be fine. 2 But -- but I have no problem with 3 Professor Sweeney. He's -- he's going through a 4 lot. And -- and -- and I really wish him well. 5 And -- and -- and I believe he's a good man. He's doing what he feel he's doing. But, you know, he's 6 7 going through a lot, so -- so -- so I really wish 8 him well. I just don't want to go into an 9 investigation that is going on with the ECRC. 10 So we'll leave that. I think Q. 11 there's evidence in the record of what Dr. Sweeney 12 involved himself in. 13 So now let's move to this issue. Ι 14 want to talk about 15 Yes. Α. 16 And there's been a lot of -- there's 0. 17 been a lot of discussions and so forth about the 18 evolution of this relationship. 19 Α. Yes. 20 And she basically makes three 0. 21 allegations. Supposedly the events occurred 22 between the time you met her in early February 23 until this 24 Α. Yes. 25 And there was the conference on Q.

1 and then there's the time between that 2 conference and the email. 3 Yeah. Α. 4 So first of all, did you have any Q. 5 romantic interest in her whatsoever during this 6 time, at any of this time that we're talking about? 7 Absolutely not. Not at all. Uhm, I 8 vehemently denied this. 9 You see, what is so painful about a 10 question like that, because it pains me for you to 11 use the word "romantic relationship" with a 12 It pains me a lot. It hurts me, student. 13 because -- because I don't do those kind of things, 14 honestly. But what pains me most in all of this 15 is, you know, Prof- -- Investigator Anaya, who I 16 believe is a very good man and -- and he loves his job and, you know, he's a good lawyer --17 18 That's why he's done that for 19 20 years. 20 -- I think it was -- you know, for 21 him to spend 13 month investigating and then 22 putting in the Memorandum of Findings that text 23 messages, having coffee, you know, having lunch 24 with a student, that amounts to sexual harassment. 25 As he views his case, he lists these things, and

none of those actually mention anything sexual. That -- that was -- that was really surprising to me, because I could ask each hearing committee member here if they have graduate program in their department, have they ever had coffee with a student? Have they ever had lunch with a student? If they've advised Ph.D. a student, have they ever, you know, texted their student? If they are parents and have young kids that they have to take care of, pick up from school and give dinner and -and give showers and take to bed until they sleep, read them books and sleep, have they have been in that experience; and then have a lot of work waiting for them, and the only time they can do it is after 9; and then after that, start replying to emails. You review dissertations at night. And then if you have a question, text the colleague, a -- a Ph.D. student. And to end that, that's why these MOFs are problematic; because I wish if Mr. Anaya had worked in the university for longer, because I was his first case, he should have known this. But let me end -- end this question on this. If --I've lost my thought, but go ahead

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I've lost my thought, but go ahead with another question.

1	Q. Well, I I just want to move
2	forward a little bit on this.
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. The You know, there's these
5	allegations about
6	Was accurate in his description
7	about he arranged the and that the
8	itinerary and the events that occurred in
9	had been revealed to and she knew what the
10	schedule was going to be and that there was no way
11	that you were going to be able to physically be in
12	the same city with her
13	A. Yes, because there was a schedule,
14	she received that schedule. We started talking
15	about this with her from March. You know, we we
16	discussed some of these things in April. There was
17	a tentative schedule that we she first looked at
18	in in April. And I believe that's the one she
19	gave to Mr. Anaya, by the way. There was a revised
20	schedule she received in May. She talked to
21	Dr. Beth Kaplan.
22	Professor Beth Kaplan is an American
23	professor who retired from New Hampshire University
24	and is a distinguished professor at the
25	She was Dr Professor Kaplan was

1 part and parcel of planning these -- these 2 workshops, all right? so and talked to her on Skype 3 for an hour. That was in early May. So this idea 4 that she did not know --5 You see, I don't know what she 6 wanted to know. She was organizing the 7 -- I mean the program. Ange 8 and I was were organizing the program, which 9 comes later. So she had work to do while I was 10 organizing a hundred things in probably 30 11 countries at that time. 12 Now, just -- just briefly, while you Q. 13 there were a couple episodes were in 14 involving I think, regarding a 15 laundry incident and a money issue. 16 Yeah. Α. 17 Just tell us briefly about that --Q. 18 Α. Yeah. 19 -- because she denies this, and I'm Q. 20 just curious about that. 21 Actually, I -- I briefly even talked Α. 22 to my colleague, Mary Rogus while I was in 23 when it was happening; because remember, 24 we -- we hired her together, we interviewed her 25 together, we hired her; and she was working on

know -- Like, in every program, we give out dollars to -- to participants, because they're from different countries all coming to work in one country -- I mean to -- to be trained in one country for two or three weeks. And -- and the only unifying currency for all of them are the U.S. dollars, because they save that and take it back to their countries.

By the way, attended the orientation of participants when we talked to them who will be handling their money to be exchanged, and that was the local coordinator.

she received one inquiry. And because she did not have an answer to that, she felt like maybe frustrated; and then she just stormed out and called me and said, How could you do this? And, you know, This was fake money. And -- and I said, Please calm down; and, you know, I have somebody who handles the exchange. Your job is to do the bookkeeping and give them money. If they ask you a question you don't -- maybe you don't know, come ask me or tell them to talk to me. That's -- that's why I'm here. And -- But -- but she had

1 already, I think, got frustrated out --2 You know, I don't blame her. Ι actually forgive her. 3 4 But the good thing, she came two 5 days later and apologized to me; and in apologizing to me, she gave me a hug. And she said, I'm so 6 7 sorry. I said, Don't worry. 8 Let me ask you this. Q. 9 When she got angry with you, did she 10 curse at you? 11 Of course, yeah, yeah, she did. Α. 12 But, you know, I've gone through a lot in my life. 13 Cursing me doesn't -- wouldn't doing something. 14 wouldn't -- I don't -- You know, --15 And did you also --Q. 16 -- she -- she cursed me, but I don't 17 mind, you know, that; because, you know, she -- she 18 works for me. I took her in Africa, and she can 19 get frustrated. And -- and my job is to calm her 20 down, and I did. 21 All right. So also with the Q. laundry, she also got upset about that and --22 23 Yeah. Α. 24 -- was mad because you decided to Q.

25

pay the bill?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Yeah.
- Q. Was that an embarrassment --
- I think for that -- I think for Α. that, for me the biggest problem was not that she refused to paid them the money and I paid it, and I -- I didn't mind paying it. For me the biggest problem was that, you know, the managers and everybody knew that this was a -- a U.S. Embassy event and an Ohio university event. Because in -in the lobby and on the floor in which we do these workshops, we have these posters and banners that have State Department, American flag, Ohio University's, our logo. Everybody knows that this is Ohio University, and here we are as representatives of Ohio University causing a scene. So for me that was a bigger problem to me than her refusing to pay, because I paid. And she got angry that I paid it when she -- she found out that I --Because she thought, when she told them, I'll only pay half and they agreed, she thought it would be the end.

But my -- my room is the master room to the whole workshop, so this bill was stuck onto the university bill. So I had to tell them, Take this out, and I paid out of my pocket, because I

1 don't want the university -- because I go through audits almost every year. I didn't want the 2 3 university to see laundry and then say, 4 Professor Kalyango, you should know better; this 5 is a -- a federal grant. So --6 7 Q. Let me ask you one final area, and 8 then I'll abdicate my time. 9 You sent an email on 10 Yeah. Α. 11 Q. 12 Yeah. Α. 13 And that email set forth actually Q. 14 six specific sort of bullet points. Three had to 15 do with the financials, --16 Uh-huh. Α. 17 -- and one had to do with the reason Q. 18 that you and she couldn't connect toward the end of 19 and then one had to do with a few errors in 20 the evaluation. 21 Yeah. Α. 22 So my first ques- --Q. 23 And the last point had to do with 24 sort of the learning -- the lessons-learned part 25 where you essentially accepted responsibility for

1 her failings. 2 Uh-huh. Α. 3 But with respect to the financials, Q. 4 there has -- there has been evidence and so forth, 5 and there has been testimony about it through 6 Professor Rogus about what she was required to do. 7 And one of the questions was, Did you give her 8 training on how to actually do this requirement of 9 logging these receipts into the Excel. 10 Yeah, very good question. Α. 11 Uhm, we give these students -- Like, 12 for -- for example, for the 13 both Jeanette Moumakwe, who is 14 because I have three employees and 15 then the two employees in the U.S., and one of them 16 goes with me. 17 TH got what we call a work plan. 18 They get three work plans. Mr. Anaya has this. 19 Three work plans. One is a 20 21 and the other one is the other responsibility of 22 how I report when I come back, and -- and then what 23 the program assistant does. So she had a

preplanning, which is the logistics of planning

the -- the program, and one during the program.

24

25

1 And in both of those, we talk about this. 2 talk about it before we go. We even talked about 3 it in Brussels during transit, and then we also 4 talk about it there. And when I get there, every 5 single day I have to keep a momentum to see if 6 somebody is doing their -- what they are supposed 7 to do and -- and whether they are putting things in 8 place. And for me one of the frustrations I had, 9 although, you know, like, and I understand, you 10 was -- was a different program assistant. know, 11 I have worked with more than a hundred female 12 students in the course of ten years; hired and paid 13 by the university, over a hundred female students. 14 And overall, with all of those, more than two dozen 15 actually worked with me abroad. So I'm --16 is not the first graduate student to Sorry. 17 travel with me. I have traveled with more than two 18 dozen, and so --19 Q. My question was did she have 20 training on how to input this? 21 Yes. Prior and during and -- and --Α.

Q. And -- and so when you came back, there's been testimony in the record that there

were statements that the financial information that

22

23

24

(indiscernible).

So it's --

You

she gave you was a disaster.

- 2
- Yes. Α.

Α.

3

1

Is that, sir, accurate? 0.

And it's -- and it's because

- 4
- 5 she never would like me to kind of like go into

handling this; you told me what to do.

Yes.

- 6 very details; because every time I tried to talk to

about, So how are you with this, she says, I'm

so I was like I kind of back off a little bit. And

it's frustrating, because you want to make sure

student tells you that, you have to respect that.

problems. You know, I apologized to her. I say

email, am I correct: It is entirely my fault that

I placed so much confidence in your independent --

that things are moving right; but then when a

And I think that was -- that was one of my

this is partly my fault. Check that email.

I say --

- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16

will see.

Q.

Α.

Q.

me micromanaging.

Α.

Q.

- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 25
- 24

Thank you.

- Α.
- That is what you --

Thank you very much.

That's what I mean. Thank you.

Well, this is your statement in the

-- ability to handle things without

1	Because my point was if she told me not to bother
2	her all the time, you have to give her space.
3	And and then at the end when you see things are
4	messed up, you say, Wait a minute, I have to tell
5	you that we shouldn't do things like this moving
6	forward.
7	Remember, she was working with us in
8	and she was going to work with me in in
9	later that year on again.
10	So my point to her is that as as
11	we moving forward doing these things, please be
12	mindful of how you do these things. Let let
13	this be a teachable moment, not just for you, but
14	also for me.
15	But I take responsibility for this.
16	So so, you know, that's that was the gist of
17	the email.
18	Q. Was it your intention in the email
19	to terminate her?
20	A. There is no termination whatsoever.
21	She was working with us already. She she was
22	working in , and she had started working in
23	So why would I tell her
24	Do you know that Professor Mary
25	Rogus was asking me whether we we should remove

1	her from and I said no? You should
2	have asked her that.
3	Q. And and that was after you had
4	referred to Professor Rogus these outbursts that
5	she had
6	A. And she said,
7	Maybe we don't need this person.
8	And I told her, You know what?
9	Let's let's just She will not work on
10	finances. Let me put her in other things.
11	We put her in transportation for
12	and then she resigned. And then the the
13	one of the outbursts that she worked in Mary
14	had to to deal
15	I shouldn't laugh. This is a very
16	serious matter. But, you know, I I've been
17	dealing with this for three years, and I hope I
18	deserve two seconds of smiling like this, because,
19	you know.
20	But but the fact of the matter is
21	that I feel sorry for for Mary, and and she
22	is my friend. But, yes, she went through the same
23	thing, you know?
24	Q. All right. My last question is,
25	just so I can button this up, the evaluations

1 you -- we heard from
2 those -- those -- that match-up. Is that correct?

a. Yeah. You see, you have to understand that as we do the money, you know, one of the reasons that I do this -- this transparency thing where we take a lot of cash, and then the cash -- the cash is -- is handled by both

Judy Millesen and Mary when we go to Africa. Then a third person has to be the one to give out money. This is taxpayers' money. I am responsible -- I'm the reporting agent to the federal government, to the university finance and accounting, to the State of Ohio, because this is taxpayers' money.

For transparency, I make sure this money is given to me, I am not the one who carries it, and it's other professors, my colleagues who travel with me that put it in envelopes for who we -- we pay. And it's the student that distributes it and collects receipts. That's accountability. That is transparency. That's why we do that.

The same thing with evaluations.

One student does it based on the original stop of evaluations. Then I have to give them to another assistant to ensure that they are correct before

1 they are distributed to and 2 before they are distributed to everybody. 3 So -- so that's -- that's the kind 4 of transparency that I had put in place, and I had 5 done it for ten years. 6 So he did that. He did two, and 7 other students were also auditing others. So every 8 evaluation has to be audited by somebody else 9 and --10 By the way, did you tell --Q. 11 -- and not me. Α. 12 Did you tell Mr. Anaya that Q. 13 had actually done the evaluations? 14 Α. I -- Mr. Anaya has an email that was 15 sent to him either in or 16 that tells him that. There is an email to that 17 effect. And you know who else was told? I 18 19 told that, Expect a call or an email from 20 your student email from an investigator who wants 21 to know what you're doing. 22 Do you know how many times 23 asked me how come nobody did ever called me? 24 Like, maybe six times. 25 So, yeah, there is an email that

1	explains what happened; but in the
2	evidence packet. never a witness. And this
3	is why I'm in these problems.
4	This investigation took 13-month,
5	but there's small flaws in the report, and it
6	looks lopsided, despite the fact took 13
7	13 month to to investigate.
8	Q. That's all I have. Thank you.
9	A. Thank you.
10	YUSUF KALYANGO: I would like to
11	give I would like to hear at least a question
12	from each of the hearing committee, please.
13	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
14	We will open it up to the hearing committee
15	members.
16	YUSUF KALYANGO: Thank you.
17	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
18	Any questions?
19	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: I'm I'm
20	ready to ask mine, if I may.
21	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
22	Please.
23	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Professor
24	Kalyango, my name is Vladimir Marchenkov. I'm a
25	member of the hearing committee.

1 And my question, please don't regard 2 it as hostile in any way, but --3 YUSUF KALYANGO: Yeah. No problem. -- I -- I 4 VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: 5 wonder, I wonder if you're --6 Well, I'm trying to put myself in 7 your shoes, and -- and I'm -- and I'm -- one thing 8 I'm thinking about is, you know, with all the 9 children that I'm responsible for with other 10 responsibilities that I bear, what kind of plans 11 for the future can I be thinking of? 12 YUSUF KALYANGO: Yeah. That's a 13 very good question. And don't feel bad asking me 14 those type of questions, because I've gone through 15 a lot in my life, and -- and -- and I'm -- and I am 16 power tested in so many ways. And I am here to 17 fight for my academic life. 18 This is a -- this is like a 19 professional death sentence in addition to all the 20 disciplinary action I've already faced. I'm -- I'm 21 being disciplined as we speak for -- for the last 22 two years. This one will be like a death nail. 23 it's not like I've not been disciplined. I'm going 24 through a disciplinary action. 25 Now, to answer your question, I'll

1 answer it in -- in two ways.

The first way is this. About six month ago, my -- my son who is in high school, by the way, recently told me that, Dad, if you are going through all this and you are a teacher at Ohio University and -- and you are -- and this is happening to you, why should I go to a university if this is how they treat people?

And -- and -- and can -- can you imagine how many sleepless nights I had? If your own child thinks a universi- -- a university is a bad place because they treat people badly, I mean, imagine how, you know, my family going through that.

But here's another problem, okay?

Here is a situation. Here is another situation.

As a faculty member, you're right that, you know, you know, we live in difficult times, because all of you on the panel, if you've been teaching for more than 15 years, some of the things you used to say as teachers 15 years ago, you probably do not say them now in the -- in the classroom, because times change. So we have to change with the times for -- I mean, every five years these days, because a phrase you use today

could not be used maybe tomorrow. Like, that's why -- that's how the world is changing. So -- so we have to be on the guard.

And to be honest with you, uhm, what is happening to me here could happen to you as a -- as a colleague, whether you are a reporter of an issue or you did report an issue or you are -- you know, you've been accused of something. It could be anything. And -- and -- and we are teaching students these days that are so empowered that -- that we have to walk a -- a fine line.

But the good thing is that I have learned a lot from this experience. It has taught me a lot. We -- we all learn from some of -- from -- from challenges that we face in life, and -- and that's what emboldens us and teaches us how -- how to act differently.

I think I'll act differently, you know, you know, if I'm given an opportunity by the hearing committee to -- to return to the (indiscernible), and I think I will have a lot to offer to even juror faculty member that -- maybe minority junior faculty members that come to -- to teach at O.U., what they need to do and -- and how they need to be on top of mi- -- to have

1	mindfulness and and and to be aware so that
2	they get into this.
3	But you're right. You know, it's
4	it's a tough time.
5	And administrators are are
6	becoming more powerful than faculty members. There
7	are so many policy changes that affect faculty
8	members, and and faculty members are
9	increasingly losing their power. Tenure is being
10	crushed in so many states either by legislators or
11	within the investor (phonetic) institutions.
12	This is a good experiment for you as
13	faculty members. And and we have to figure out
14	how to to make sure that at least we are also
15	protected as the university protects students.
16	VLADIMIR MARCHENKOV: Thank you very
17	much for your answer.
18	YUSUF KALYANGO: Uh-huh. Thank you.
19	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
20	Dr. House, you're on video. I think you have a
21	question as well.
22	SHERYL HOUSE: I do. Thank you.
23	Dr. Kalyango, thank you for
24	answering our questions.
25	I have a question related to your

1 stay in Kigali while 2 Did you provide Mr. Anaya with a 3 email receipt of a hotel -- for a hotel that you ? 4 stayed at in 5 YUSUF KALYANGO: Did I provide what? 6 SHERYL HOUSE: An email receipt for 7 a hotel that you booked. Like, the date that you , do you have a -- did you 8 booked a hotel in 9 provide Mr. Anaya --10 YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes. You have --11 SHERYL HOUSE: -- like a receipt 12 with the date that you booked that hotel room in 13 14 YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes. You have --15 you have in the evidence packet all the receipts of 16 the bookings in -- in all of those places. And I don't know whether evidence packet two or evidence 17 18 packet one. 19 And, please, I know you have a lot 20 of documents, and -- and --21 SHERYL HOUSE: Yes. 22 YUSUF KALYANGO: -- and you can tell 23 I've been writing a lot. 24 SHERYL HOUSE: Yes. 25 YUSUF KALYANGO: And, you know, I

1	feel You know, I know you're doing a great
2	service for you to do this, but you can find those
3	documents in in your in the evidence packet
4	definitely.
5	SHERYL HOUSE: Okay. And then a
6	second question is
7	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
8	SHERYL HOUSE: you had we
9	heard from your Graduate Student who dealt
10	with the evaluations.
11	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
12	SHERYL HOUSE:
13	job was to make sure that they matched
14	the original
15	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
16	SHERYL HOUSE: matched what was
17	entered into the computer a hundred percent, that
18	they those should be the same. Is that correct?
19	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes, that's
20	correct.
21	SHERYL HOUSE: And then in your
22	statement to the committee, you had a statement in
23	there about your graduate students would revise and
24	do corrections to the evaluations.
25	Could you provide or enlighten us a

little bit on why there would be revisions or corrections?

YUSUF KALYANGO: Uhm, because you have to make sure that -- Because when you send the State Department a report, you have a --

I send four types of reports to the State Department, because one of them goes to the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, and then the other ones go to the actual State Department, the graduate is responsible. Because I was managing three different grants for the State Department, all bringing in, by the way, half a million dollars every single year for the investing. So I was managing a lot of money.

But one of the things that we do is, they require you to write a budget report, a descriptive report, a summary report of the evaluations, and a copy of the originals.

So my goal is to ensure that I don't misrepresent what is in the summary report with what the originals say, because the state would audit me with one of the grants every year.

Because none of these grants were given to me like ten year. No. Every year I had to apply for these grants, and every year I brought them back to the

university.

So -- so for me to ensure that it was bulletproof, I make sure that when -- when a student like provided these things, then she gives them to me, and then I give them to whatever. Because these were not audited in the -- in the college, like, say, finance. Because finance goes through the school, the college; then it goes to finance itself; and then it ends up with grants accounting. So there is a lot of scrutiny that goes with money.

With these, it is from me to the college as a report, and then everything else goes to the federal government. So I have to make sure that there is a second person to look at it.

And the problem --

And -- and the other thing is,
because I am one of those who are evaluated, I
can't make the corrections myself. It will be -- I
will find that to be unethical, honestly. So -- so
I have to give it to another person other than
myself to make sure that this happens.

SHERYL HOUSE: But that grad student is not told to change those evaluations in any way.

-- That grad student was told just to make

sure they matched.

2 YUSUF KALYANGO: They matched.

3 SHERYL HOUSE: Okay.

YUSUF KALYANGO: And if they didn't match, to -- to write the correct one in these according to -- to that. And then there was a -- a separate file where they would say, This is where he changed. And if I see that, then I -- I have to inform the previous -- the original person, like the assistant, that, By the way, there was a -- a little problem with this; Let's make sure that we don't repeat that next time.

issues that I raised with in that email, because I have -- You have to give feedback to somebody who has worked for you out- -- outside of the country. So that was a report that I was giving to a student who is working with me to know the status of how that person performs. And it was not in any way a bad thing. I also took responsibility in it, and it was to make sure that we work better moving forward. And we continued to work better -- I mean, to work together for another ten days before she sent submitted the -- her resignation. Yes.

SHERYL HOUSE: Thank you.

1	YUSUF KALYANGO: Thank you. I
2	appreciate it.
3	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
4	Are there other questions from the committee?
5	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes. I wish I
6	could hear from every committee member. I would
7	love a question from each committee member. Thank
8	you.
9	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: I
LO	cannot compel, but I can merely invite.
11	YUSUF KALYANGO: Okay. I I wish.
L2	I am requesting. I'm sorry. I shouldn't laugh.
L3	CHARLES LOWERY: No. We appreciate
L 4	it. Thank you.
15	Dr. Kalyango, my name is
L6	Charles Lowery. I'm on this committee as well.
L7	Just out of you're curiosity,
L8	just just to clarify some, I guess, time lines
L9	maybe in my head, how long how long have you
20	been in service as a as a faculty member
21	altogether?
22	YUSUF KALYANGO: Right now, 12 years
23	at the university; and in and in in 12 of
24	those years, I've published more than 50 academic
25	research papers, and I've done a lot of stuff for

1 | the university. But it's 12 years.

And -- and I've enjoyed working with the university. I love this community. And even during this process, I've been here; I love it here.

CHARLES LOWERY: So -- so what -- so did you -- did you have a professional career prior to that?

YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes. I worked -Yes. I worked with Reuters International. I -- I
was head of news and current affairs in Uganda in
Africa. I covered the genocide in Rwanda.

You know how I became international?

I was the only --

about, by the way. You can find this. But the problem right now is if you Google me, you see sexual harassment. But you -- if you could Google information and find that, the -- I was the only journalist; and there was a very ignorant African person who was fishing out the genocide tapes through the Red Cross; and then the Red Cross would ship my tapes. We were using what we called super VHS by then. And it would go to London, and they would show what was happening in Rwanda through

1	genocide, and it was being provided by me and my
2	cameraman, Ebra (phonetic). And we had no idea we
3	were reporting for the world in during the
4	genocide.
5	But anyway, I I covered the
6	genocide. I worked for Reuters, and they worked
7	for CNN International.
8	Ah, that's one of the reasons why,
9	you know, you had Dr. Aimee Edmondson sorry
10	Elizabeth Hendrickson when she said four
11	universities give me an offer, and then I chose
12	Ohio University. It's because of that. It's
13	because I had done all these global
14	There are very few Ph.D.s in
15	broadcast in this country. A lot of broadcast
16	people don't Ph.D.s and become academics.
17	CHARLES LOWERY: Well
18	YUSUF KALYANGO: We are very few.
19	CHARLES LOWERY. Yeah. So my
20	question is, you you've had a very
21	high-profile
22	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
23	CHARLES LOWERY: career
24	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
25	CHARLES LOWERY: both prior to

1 coming into Ohio University and here. 2 YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes. 3 CHARLES LOWERY: Have you -- have 4 you ever had any other subordinates or students in 5 the context of being at the university become upset 6 with you and -- and make any kind of allegation 7 before other than this that we're investigating 8 now? 9 YUSUF KALYANGO: No. 10 denied these allegations, I 11 was cleared of any wrongdoing. And then I --12 Even after that, I ended up to have 13 a stellar program, at which two universities at 14 different years did an opportunity to hire -- to 15 try take me away from Ohio University; and on both 16 occasions --17 I can tell you who the universities. Miami and the University of Texas, UT 18 19 (indiscernible). They tried to hire me out of this 20 university. On both occasions, this university 21 convinced me to stay. 22 CHARLES LOWERY: Yeah, I saw that in 23 the evidence. 24 YUSUF KALYANGO: Yeah, yeah. 25 It -- it's -- So I -- I have.

1	CHARLES LOWERY: So my my
2	question my question, then, to you, then
3	And again, like like my colleague
4	mentioned earlier, I'm not trying to create a
5	hostile environment or ask you tough questions.
6	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yeah.
7	CHARLES LOWERY: I'm trying to
8	understand the what the motive of these these
9	students might have might have been.
10	Why would they
11	You're you're claiming your
12	innocence here,
13	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yeah.
14	CHARLES LOWERY: and that's not
15	my question.
16	My question for you is if if we
17	establish that you're you're innocent, why would
18	these why would these individuals bring such
19	allegations against you, in your mind? What would
20	you How would you explain that?
21	YUSUF KALYANGO: Okay. Let me first
22	start with .
23	Thank you so much for that question.
24	And I think all these are very important questions;
25	and this is a very, very important question. And

I -- and I'm so glad I have the opportunity to discuss this.

when this matter -- when I ended up being investigated by the university, it is not the student who filed a complaint against me. The student had filed a complaint against a professor in about a -- a professor in who you had speak today. And that professor, I didn't know that he was not invest- -- interviewed until today, but I was interviewed twice.

The first time I interviewed, I interviewed with (indiscernible) then was to deny that I ever saw him drink or do any of the stuff that were being alleged. I -- I defended.

I don't know whether the university
then gave a summary report like they're doing now
to the student and the student found out that I had
denied that. That's when now the student brings me
into the picture and says, Well, this professor was
being friendly to ; and then they start that
investigation as well. And then the student denies
it.

I -- I -- I -- I resist from this idea of placing motivation, because I'm not in

1 somebody else's head. Back then --2 CHARLES LOWERY: Oh, no. I'm just 3 trying to understand. 4 YUSUF KALYANGO: Yeah. 5 CHARLES LOWERY: I'm just trying to 6 understand. 7 YUSUF KALYANGO: The events -- Yeah, 8 the events of explain how I may have ended up 9 being investigated in that one, because of my --10 what I said to defend Professor Makungu. And at 11 the same time, the student who was in my class at 12 that time even resigned. Then the student whom 13 they had alleged that I had caused all these issues 14 denied these allegations. 15 Why does Now, 16 come back? I think you already know that 17 answer, don't you? 18 Professor Mike Sweeney said it 19 yesterday. What did he say? He said, I called the 20 -- to say this. He -- he said that. 21 And you have that documentary evidence of a 22 statement that the same professor read to a 23 graduate committee stating that I have consulted 24 Mr. Anaya -- or I want legal affairs; but I have 25 concern with Mr. Anaya who said -- I don't want to

misquote directly, but he was given authorization that he can go ahead and do that, although, you know, the -- that wasn't his preferred thing.

So he reads all these sexual things

and -- and damages my reputation in the grad committee and then goes and talks to the student; and then within two weeks, I have two other investigations. I don't know if it's a motive, but you see how the events unfold.

CHARLES LOWERY: Yeah, yeah. I'm not asking you to try to get into someone's head; but there are behaviors and -- and a process -- a progress of events that happened and incidents that happened that could -- could tell us as a committee a little bit about -- about that.

One final thing just for clarification. And this might have came out earlier, and I apologize if I missed it.

But how much time did -- did

Mr. Anaya actually spend interviewing you and -and getting your story in -- in this?

YUSUF KALYANGO: Uhm, I will say maybe he interviewed me maybe three or four times. Each of those times took an hour. Maybe that was four hours or more. And I have a lopsided MOFs; I

reviewed it all. Just as the investigator

interviewed Professor Mary Rogus for a total of six

hours, and -- and that M- -- and those MOFs are

4 lopsided. And -- and you can go on and on.

It's a very unfortunate situation.

And -- and, you know, these things happen in life.

It happened to me.

My goal was and -- and -- and my hope was that I believe so much in this university and -- and -- and I -- and I thought that somebody will see through this. But nobody gave me the benefit of the doubt. Nobody gave me the benefit of the doubt.

And you know what? You know, one of the things you have to recognize here -- and then I'll be done answering this question -- is when an ECRC and an investigator issues the Memorandum of Findings, it looks like these Memorandum of Findings are taken as if they are Holy Scriptures in the Bible, because everybody requested it. ECRC's report only refers to the Memorandum of Findings. But the administrators have an advantage. What they do, they say, Well, the MO- -- MOF say this. But also your peers in UPEC say the same thing, but they don't consider the

fact that I asked them for a fast UPEC. They said in UPEC was, Oh, wait, you know, faculty members, none of them had ever even been to Africa or, according to their profiles, done any international You know, and -- and then the language they work. use in their report tells you my -- And then they never met with me. But then they produce reports that only talk about the Memorandum of Finding. they're like Holy Scriptures.

If you get a bad MOF from ECRC, you are done. But then the administration can find a way of defending itself and covering up, because then they have these processes that are all centralized in the provost's office.

Remember, UPEC is -- Everything goes back to the provost's office. So the provost's office can do whatever they want.

Everything that is done up to this process in nonbinding.

So if UPEC has said whatever they want, that if the investigator doesn't like it, it's nonbinding. If the investigator likes it, then they use it to say, Well, UPEC say this.

It is a very difficult and challenging situation.

1	I was a foreign correspondent and an
2	investigator. I can do investigations. That's why
3	I've been able to crack this. Of course, I've had
4	help; but I've cracked this because of who I was
5	and what I've gone through as a as a
6	correspondent and as an investigator, and there are
7	so many wrong things that have happened.
8	But here is a hearing committee that
9	is going to be asked to give the administrators yet
LO	another justification despite all these procedural
L1	flaws. And it's not fair, because what you do
L2	there is going to be used by the administration to
13	say, We didn't do this; it's your colleagues.
L 4	So so so it it's very challenging.
15	CHARLES LOWERY: Okay. Thank you
16	very much.
L7	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: All right. Oh,
18	I'm sorry.
19	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
20	Please do.
21	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Hi,
22	Dr. Kalyango. My name is
23	YUSUF KALYANGO: Hi. Ni hoa.
24	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Ni hoa.
25	My name is Yehong Shao. I'm also a

1	member on the committee. I just I have a few
2	questions. These were mentioned before and also
3	in the memorandum or evidence package. I just kind
4	of want to hear your explanation or your side of
5	the story.
6	YUSUF KALYANGO: Okay.
7	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: The first one is
8	about the evaluation packet (inaudible)
9	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
10	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: one of the
11	participants had.
12	So the investigator, Mr. Anaya, he
13	mentioned in his MOF that he confirmed some of the
14	discreps discrepancies.
15	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
16	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: One of them A
17	few of them. Did you do you do you realize
18	that some of them
19	YUSUF KAYLANGO: Yes. So so I'll
20	tell you exactly how that happened.
21	Did you finish your question, or do
22	you want to finish it first?
23	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Oh, no. I have
24	other questions, but this is the first one.
25	YUSUF KALYANGO: Okay. Okay. The

1	reason that happened is because there was one
2	document that the student produced. Then there is
3	another document that another student,
4	produced to correct this document. So that
5	produces two documents.
6	Mr. Anaya, after taking a a year
7	and a half of dealing with this, has these two
8	documents and then starts talking to that starts
9	talking about these as if I created this document
10	myself and these discrepancies are because of me.
11	But do you realize that both of
12	these documents were created by students?
13	I will take responsibility and say
14	it is my fault that there are two dis
15	discrepancies in the documents, because I am
16	responsible for the program.
17	Did I produce both of these
18	documents? No.
19	Did Mr. Anaya say I created the
20	discrepancies? Yes.
21	Was he right? Un unfortunately,
22	no.
23	And that's where the bias comes in.
24	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Okay. So you
25	Yeah. In his MOF, he said this from the

```
1
     respondent, who is you; and the other one comes
 2
     from the complainant, who is
 3
                    YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
 4
                    YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: "Respondent"
 5
     refers to you.
 6
                    YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
 7
                    YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: But you're
 8
     saying it's not really you. It's the other
 9
     student.
10
                    YUSUF KALYANGO:
                                                    Yes,
11
     yes.
12
                    YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Okay.
13
                    YUSUF KALYANGO: And -- Yes.
14
     responsible for all these documents. Anything that
15
     go wrongs with a -- with a project, it all ends up
16
     to me. The -- the buck stops with me.
17
                    Uhm, I am sorry that he
18
     misunderstood and -- and never got a chance to talk
19
     to
                      I mean,
                                     available and
20
     waiting
21
                    So -- so that is my responsibility.
22
     But -- but did I actually produce any of these
23
     documents? No, I did not.
24
                    YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS:
                                        Okay.
25
                    YUSUF KALYANGO: And -- and the
```

1	students who produced them do not say they didn't
2	produce them. says she produced this.
3	says he produced this. And they are both my
4	documents. One is right. One is wrong. The thing
5	is, the person who did produce them, the
6	investigator chose how he wanted to report his
7	report, and and it it's unfortunate.
8	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Okay. Thank
9	you.
LO	The second question. The
L1	investigator, Mr. Anaya mentioned yesterday
12	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
13	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: that you did
L 4	not provide documents he requested until
15	January 2018.
16	YUSUF KALYANGO: Uh-huh.
L7	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Is that true?
18	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
19	See, the investigator could take a
20	couple of weeks waiting. And I don't know what
21	what he was waiting for. But not communicating
22	with me whether he wanted something or not. You
23	know, he was new. You know, you have to understand
24	that this is an investigator who had just got a
25	job.

1 And by the way, ECRC says it itself 2 that they were so understaffed and overwhelmed. 3 That's a problem for -- it's a -- it's a university 4 That office was overwhelmed, but yet --5 So -- so I don't know how many cases 6 he was handling at that time. I was one of his --7 probably the first person he ever investigated in 8 his (indiscernible). But he took long. So I would 9 find out later that he wants these; and then by the 10 time he asks me for it, it's already a month later. 11 I'm in this country. I traveled to different 12 countries probably -- I traveled out of the country 13 probably six or seven times a year at this 14 university. So I was traveling. He was delaying, 15 and then delaying and delaying and delaying. 16 So -- so -- But he say this is my 17 fault. He -- he put all the blame on me. And who 18 am I to -- I -- I 've lost any voice in any of 19 this. You know, nobody has given me a benefit of 20 the doubt. And -- and then here we are, you know? 21 YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: All right. The 22 [sic], ah, I -- I believe next question is, 23 it -- I don't remember clearly, but I remember she 24 mentioned that she -- after you -- was that before 25

or after you send her that email criticizing her

work on the expense report, she tried to reach you. 1 2 Was that true? She tried to wait for you outside 3 the office or all that? She --4 YUSUF KALYANGO: No. No. I -- I 5 was also looking for her. 6 And -- and -- and as a matter of 7 fact, the way all other program assistants have 8 worked with me, by the time we step on the tarmac 9 in Columbus, Ohio, all the reports with program 10 assistants are done. 11 It just worked differently with her, 12 that we were not together in transit and whatever. 13 It's a long story. 14 But the fact of the matter is I 15 really wanted everything to be completed. I was 16 discouraged. So there is no way I would not have 17 met with her. Uhm, we -- we made appointments, and 18 sometimes she was not there. And then she went to 19 see her family, and she doesn't deny that. So --20 YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: All right. 21 YUSUF KALYANGO: -- the facts are 22 there. 23 YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: And in that 24 email about you're going to -- back to visit her 25 family, she let you know in the email, you -- you

said, Driving ten hours at night can be fun. That,
You don't have to fly. I know a driver for real
who -- one who doesn't mind driving ten hours back

and forth. Seriously.

Can you kind of explain why you said that to her or what you --

YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes. Uhm, I said it, but then it was put into -- out of context a little bit. But I really did say that to her.

What I said to her was -- Because she was telling me that she's -- you know, she has to drive at night and she's frustrated and all of that stuff.

And I said, Well, drive safe and make sure that you get there, you know, safely. If you -- if you think you need a -- a driver, I can get you a driver. It's sort of like a nice hospitality gesture making somebody feel like you care about them.

Uhm, I know Mr. Anaya would not believe with me. He looks at everything in the lenses of sexual harassment. That's his trigger point. And I understand that. And I respect the perspective he comes from, because that's his work.

But in my perspective, in the world I live in, in the culture I grew up in, in the way

```
I treat my students and everybody I work with, that
 1
 2
     is not sexual harassment. But if that's how he
 3
     looked at it, ah, then it's very unfortunate. But
     I did not say it in that context.
 4
 5
                    YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Okay.
 6
                    YUSUF KALYANGO: He twisted it to
 7
     just make it look like, This guy's so nasty; how
 8
     can he do this.
 9
                    YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Okay. One final
10
     question.
11
                    YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
                                           Thank you.
12
                    YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: So I want to
13
                             is not -- was not suitable
     know why you thought
14
     for the Ph.D. program.
15
                    YUSUF KALYANGO: The -- First of
16
     all, the reason why
                             I say what I said in --
17
     you know, about
                        is because actually
18
     Professor Mary Rogus came to me and said, You
19
     better go in there and say something. I'm not part
20
     of that graduate committee. Go there and say
21
     something, because everybody needs to know what --
22
     what happened. She was -- It was insubordination.
     It was all of that.
23
24
                    And I didn't know where it was
25
     coming from, because I didn't even know -- I had no
```

1	idea she was a friend of So I didn't know
2	where all this was coming from to antagonize the
3	program and talk about the SUSI scholars.
4	And and my colleague, Mary, said,
5	You are on that graduate committee. You better go
6	and tell something to them so that they know who
7	they are admitting.
8	I was just doing my duty as a
9	committee member of the graduate committee to
10	report about students and and who what they
11	do.
12	It is why we have these committee
13	members. If you're on a graduate committee, isn't
14	it your responsibility to report what's going on?
15	Isn't that why you meet? That was it.
16	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: All right.
17	Well, thank you.
18	YUSUF KALYANGO: Xiexie.
19	YEHONG SHAO-LUCAS: Xiexie.
20	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
21	Thank you.
22	Other questions?
23	LAUREN MCMILLS: Yes.
24	Hi. I'm Lauren McMills. I have two
25	questions.

1	Can you please clarify that of the
2	members of the faculty who discussed with the
3	director about the tenure proceeding, that eight
4	were tenured, not two were tenure probationary,
5	and one was an instructional faculty member?
6	YUSUF KALYANGO: No. Nine were.
7	Nine were tenured and two were not. But one of
8	those
9	LAUREN MCMILLS: Okay.
10	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yeah, one of those
11	was Group 2.
12	LAUREN MCMILLS: Oh. So one of the
13	nontenured you were talking about was an instructor
14	(inaudible)?
15	YUSUF KALAYANGO: Yes.
16	LAUREN MCMILLS: Okay.
17	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yeah. And then the
18	other one was only a year a half into this school.
19	LAUREN MCMILLS: Got it. Okay.
20	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yeah.
21	And I don't mind whatever they say,
22	because I have their notes, by the way.
23	One of the things I need to say, and
24	I know that legal affairs is listening, I have to
25	send a shout out and and to say I am so, so

grateful to Miss Shirley Bean (phonetic) in the office legal affairs, because she's been very good at providing me with all of the grade cards when -- when I do request them. So I'm very grateful to the public records office of the office of legal affairs, because they -- because they've been exceptional and in a way, and Shirley Bean has been wonderful and -- And, you know, I've never met her, but I'm so grateful for what she did.

I have the notes from Professor Stewart that he jotted. That's how I know that there are 11.

But because ECRC is investigating this matter of discrimination and retaliation from the school director and another investigation of the dean, I will just leave it at that. But to tell you that his is true, his notes are there; and that there were nine faculty members out of 27, although the school director said there were only 25. But even if it's 25, that's less than half. And even with that less than half, out of those 11, five did not support detenuring. This is official.

There was no overwhelming --

And these were individual secretive meetings done during an extended emergency spring

break in March. You all know about when the university extended the spring break. That's when the school (indiscernible) and decided, I want to meet with you. When people are stressed out about COVID, classes are suspended, everything is crazy; and then you are asking the members to detenure somebody over a phone on a serious matter.

I got tenure through P and T. People discuss, they deliberate it to -- to untenure.

How would you feel if your tenure was stripped from you this way? Is this what you want the -- the future of the university to look? You don't want that.

You have to send a clear statement to this university that things have to change. You know, we -- we can't leave the faculty handbook so vague and -- and -- and nonspecific that faculty members are treated like this. This is a constitutionally protected right. It's not fair. And I don't think any of the faculty members on this committee would like to be treated like this.

And I am the only one who was being detenured in such a way in any other department of the university. They can say that it's not what

the faculty handbook says, but why are other departments doing it the right way and assuring that somebody gets due process as the policy of that school says you untenure through deliberation and looking at every aspect of your contribution to 6 the university and then you untenure.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But for people to take my tenure away in a closed-door, secretive meeting and only inviting those people with extreme passions about the matter, that's not right.

So my second LAUREN MCMILLS: question is, during the course of the investigations, when those investigations went past the so-called 90-day time, you never received any notification of delay in writing?

YUSUF KALYANGO: No. No, not with Miss -- with Mr. Anaya. The investigator of my cases never gave me any notices that, This is where we stand; the 90 days have passed, and we are not doing a -- the right thing.

But I want to say this is --

I don't want to -- to sound as if like I'm blaming ECRC. No.

This is an investigator, Mr. Anaya, who violated university policy on that matter; and 1 it is him as an individual. 2 Because I have to give credit to --3 and I -- I won't disclose the name -- another 4 investigator of the ECRC who actually, after we 5 passed 90 days of the Professor Stewart and 6 Professor Titsworth investigations that are ongoing 7 right now, she told me where she stands, and she 8 told me why -- where we are.

And I actually have an idea. a roadmap of where we are going with that investigation. That's how ECRC should do things. With Mr. Anaya, that was not the case.

So I am not saying ECRC is doing a bad job. Actually, I need ECRC as a minority. think ECRC should be there for people like me. You know, I'm -- I'm one of those underprivileged class of citizens of the United States. I need ECRC. need protections. So I'm not blaming ECRC. just saying an individual did not do the right thing.

> LAUREN MCMILLS: Thank you.

> > YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.

I think we have one more. I don't

25 know. I wish.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
2	Oh, I think we have to bring it to a close.
3	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yes.
4	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: I
5	did want to ask a and offer a correction.
6	And I'm sorry. Dr. Franz, you have
7	a question?
8	YUSUF KALYANGO: Please.
9	MARK FRANZ: I was going to say I
LO	all of my questions have been answered through this
L1	process, and I just wanted to say thank you for
12	your thoroughness, and thanks for the opportunity
13	to ask questions.
L 4	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
15	Excellent. Thank you.
16	I wanted to offer a correction,
L 7	Dr. Kalyango, with regards to the university of
18	professional ethics committee. Those committees
19	come out of faculty senate in conjunction with work
20	of deans of colleges. So there was something in
21	your statement about it, it it being something
22	of the of the provost's making.
23	YUSUF KALYANGO: Okay. Uh-huh.
24	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
25	And I just procedurally, I wanted to offer up

1	that correction.
2	I also wanted to clarify that the
3	UPEC process, as you experienced it, at at on
4	the issue of timeliness of completing things within
5	45 days, that was your experience.
6	You did raise issues of not being
7	able to appear before one one of them.
8	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yeah, the last one.
9	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
LO	But in terms of timeliness, it was it was
L1	correct.
L2	YUSUF KALYANGO: No, no, it wasn't.
L3	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
L 4	Okay.
L5	YUSUF KALYANGO: Because I was never
L6	informed when it was Yeah. Yes. Yeah.
L7	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
L8	Okay. Thank you.
L9	YUSUF KALYANGO: Yeah. Yeah. But
20	you know, I understand the provost was in
21	transition. It was a new provost. And and I
22	also understand that it they it was a this
23	was a new chief of staff.
24	I have no ill feelings for any of
25	these kind of things. All I want is this to be

over, and -- and -- and I really wish I can go back to my work. And I -- I don't care about if this --

You know, it was -- the process was wrong, but all this can be resolved. Any of these things can be resolved.

I'm -- I'm not here to have any problem with the university. I want at least to -- to have a fair hearing and -- and for somebody to hear me. That's all I'm asking for.

I know we're running out of time, so let me just take 30 seconds to say to all of you that, thank you so much and -- you know, you know, for this opportunity.

And as I said in my statement that you have, I strongly believe that, in all fairness, this committee should not recommend that I lose tenure while two ECRC investigations against the E.W. Scripps School of Journalism and the Scripps College of Communication dean are facing matters that are directly related to this revocation of tenure. Those investigations are ongoing. That alone makes your decision easy, a (indiscernible); beside the fact that I did not harass any student, not not anyone else at the university.

And finally, in less than

1 20 seconds, I remain committed to Ohio University. 2 I have invested a lot of time into this university 3 and this community. I have excelled in all the 4 missions and visions of this university. I am the 5 only full tenured professor in the 120-year history 6 of the School of Journalism, the first one on full 7 tenure. This not how you want to kick me out of 8 the university considering the fact that I was also 9 the -- the first one to get to that level as a 10 black person, as a black male professor for the 11 university (indiscernible) teacher. I have done my 12 work. I'm a very hard-working professor.

And despite this devastating setback and destroying my hard-earned tenured career, I have no hard feelings for anybody. I have no animosity towards my school or college or anybody. And I'm eager to go back to continue advancing the mission and vision of the university, and our universities with great sense of humility.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I have learned from this. I have learned a lot from this experience.

If students feel that I wronged them, I apologize. I am so sorry. But I never harassed them. I am extremely sorry.

(Yusuf Kalyango crying.)

1	(Indiscernible).
2	YUSUF KALYANGO: Thank you very
3	much. I'm sorry. Thank you. I'm sorry. Thank
4	you very much.
5	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
6	Thank you, Dr. Kalyango, for providing
7	YUSUF KALYANGO: I'm sorry. Sorry.
8	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
9	(inaudible) for us and answering our questions.
10	We have moved to just a few minutes
11	after 5 o'clock. We can take a brief recess of
12	approximately let's call it eight minutes and
13	reconvene so that we can hear the summation by the
14	university representatives, followed by a summation
15	by the faculty member's legal counsel.
16	I remind both both sets of legal
17	counsel that if you want to reserve a period of
18	your 30-minute block of time for summation for
19	rebuttal of the other to the other side, please
20	let us know that at the beginning of those
21	summations. We'll reconvene at 5:10.
22	(Brief recess.)
23	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
24	And, Mr. Loukx, will you be presenting the
25	summation on behalf of the university?

1	ADAM LOUKX: Thank you. Yes. And
2	I'll try to be as brief as possible.
3	We would reserve I think you said
4	it was a half an hour each, so why don't I reserve
5	ten minutes for rebuttal.
6	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
7	All right. So you'll give a summation of
8	20 minutes.
9	For the faculty member's legal
LO	counsel, will you also be reserving time at the end
L1	for rebuttal?
12	Mr. Beck?
13	GREGORY BECK: I'll just reserve
L 4	five minutes, and that would that would be it.
15	So
16	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
L 7	I'm sorry?
18	GREGORY BECK: Just five minutes.
L9	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
20	For possible rebuttal rebuttal?
21	GREGORY BECK: Possibly.
22	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
23	Okay. Very good. Thank you. So that gives you at
24	least a balance of 25.
25	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:

1 And with that, Mr. Loukx, please proceed with 2 summation. 3 ADAM LOUKX: Thank you very much. 4 And thank you, members of the committee, counsel, 5 Dr. Kalyango. I know it's been a long two days. 6 Well, when one's accustomed to 7 talking to jurors that come from all walks of life, 8 I'd say you make a -- very much a different panel, 9 because I know that much of what I say may sound 10 pedantic. You've probably thought through a lot of 11 this stuff that I'm going to talk about. I -- I 12 feel almost pre- -- presumptuous to explain in a --13 in a summation format what I know you already know. 14 Nevertheless, I guess I have a job 15 to do. I'll try to keep it short. 16 The way I see it, you really have 17 two questions here. One is the question of whether 18 or not the polic- -- or the policies was fol- --19 were followed per the handbook. The second is 20 whether or not Dr. Kalyango violated, in one or 21 both of these case raised by two separate 22 complainants, the policies of the university. 23 Let's start with that, the second 24 question first. 25 We've heard a lot of testimony. And

1 maybe it's just me, but it seemed to be weighted 2 heavily toward arguments over So I think I'm going to start chronologically and go back in time 3 4 a little ways. We're going to talk about 5 case. 6 From the statements of Dr. Kalyango, 7 both in writing and in the statements that he just 8 made to this committee, it's very simple. 9 Dr. Kalyango denies the allegations made by 10 Let's take a look at those 11 allegations. We heard from her. In my view, she 12 seemed to be a very credible person. My view 13 doesn't matter. You saw her, too. You've gotten a 14 chance to see her testimony. She recounted three 15 instances where she alleges that she was the 16 subject of improper treatment by Dr. Kalyango. 17 Now, we've heard a lot about 18 Dr. Kalyango and his impressive credentials. And 19 as I stated in my opening, there's no question. 20 I -- I -- I truly admire, and I think that the 21 university never questioned the academic 22 credentials of Dr. Kalyango. 23 But let's look at the allegations. 24 She tells us, , that when she was a student on an

international trip miles from home, a young student

25

at this university, an undergraduate student, that a professor, Dr. Kalyango, who did not himself drink, bought her drinks. And she tells us that he grabbed her and kissed her. In fact, according to her, stuck his tongue in her mouth.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What did she do? She reported that to other students. She went and she saw -- I got to get my initials straight there with me --She went -- She was upset about it. She went and she talked to s roommate. She was upset. and They saw that. testified as to her reactions. But unfortunately, there's no witnesses; there's no video footage showing this incident with Dr. Kalyango happening. But is there -- there is the corroboration, at least, of the fact that there was a contemporaneous reporting to a fellow.

No, didn't see it, but was concerned enough where she raised it through an evaluation. Not directly. She raised it in the evaluation a concern for Kenny, who is Yusuf Kalyango's main witness as to the incident in Africa. Kenny had been drinking. Kenny had had -- had, according to invited her to his room even in the presence of other students.

Now, the ECRC, the -- the

predecessor to the ECRC, Institutional Equity, looked at s complaint; and they did an inquiry, not an investigation. You have the MOF in --amongst all the evidence. And they asked did this happen. told us that she denied it. told that she would deny it. And why did she

it.

told that she would deny it. And why did she deny it? She denied it because, according to , the night that this happened or shortly there before, she had been offered a job. had no money. She made a -- Dr. Kalyango knew that. She told us about how she was -- even going to set her back. So she could not, in her mind, report her concerns about -- at that time about what happened -- or in, excuse me, because of the power differential. She would not have a job. She feared she would be shut out not only academically here at O.U., but when

Sure enough, she took the job. She tells us that she confronted Dr. Kalyango, and Dr. Kalyango -- told him, This can't happen any more. All that, we heard.

she went out into the job market. So she denied

And all that's kind of hard to

figure out who's telling the truth. But there's more. There's more that didn't make it in the earlier MOF, and it's far easier to tell who is telling the truth.

Washington, D.C. We heard from that she drove with the gracious offer of \$15 an hour. She drove Yusuf Kalyango to Washington, D.C., for a conference. She drove his car. She described the car. They arrived at a hotel. Here she is again miles from home. She discovers one hotel suite. She describes the suite.

And let's talk about that a little bit. In his written statement, Yusuf Kalyango invites you to call the hotel and ask them about that. Let's think of her description. It was a bedroom and a room with a fold-out couch. Call them.

While in Washington, D.C., through
the use of stuff I barely understand that the
youngsters use all the time, geolocating devices,
Foursquare, I believe she testified, she can show
on that day in she was at the Renaissance
Hotel. She can show she was at the Spy Museum in
Washington, D.C. A coincidence? Probably not.
Yusuf Kalyango says she didn't even go to

1 Washington, D.C., didn't even go.

We can tell that she was there. We can tell by her testimony she drove his car. We can tell by the Foursquare that she was in the Renaissance Hotel. And despite Yusuf Kalyango's denial, the hotel does, in fact, have two-room suites with a bedroom and fold-out couches.

These are incompatible stories. It is easy. You have to believe one or the other.

There is really no in-between.

If, in fact, you believe her, you necessarily misbelieve him, and the converse is true.

So granted, while it's hard to tell. You can -- you could arguably say, Well, you know, there's really not much evidence here.

But two times far from home, we have a student with a professor, with a power imbalance, and both times he denies it. But the mistake is denying the second time, because it doesn't make sense. And frankly, it makes even less to suggest that in

Mike Sweeney, a professor at the university was behind it at the same time that he is supporting Yusuf Kalyango and raises and full professorships and other endeavors. We heard

testimony along those lines.

2

1

But it doesn't end there.

3

4

testifies, in a trip that

5

Yusuf Kalyango denies she was even at, that he walked into this room and put his arm around her

6

while she was in bed. And she tells him, What did

7

we talk about before?

8

Chili. Now, admittedly that trip didn't happen;

9

but we hear, well, there's no evidence of it.

10 11

your evidence pack, there is a ticket itinerary for

12

the airline ticket to go there.

13

It's beyond dispute, I think, that

And then he invites her to a trip to

14

had no money. It was an 1,800-dollar ticket.

15

No, sure, it didn't happen; but it sure seems

16

credible that there was the invite there. But

17

since he denies it altogether, it also seems

18

somewhat reasonable to infer that, in fact, it

19

happened.

20

And there isn't a middle ground.

21

And it doesn't matter if it's reasonable doubt or

22

preponderance. If you -- if you have two

23

diametrically opposed stories and one of them is

24

right and one of them is wrong, no matter what

25

the -- the burden is, it is shown.

happened.

It happened, and it's demonstrable. Sure, you can 1 2 say, I didn't believe You can say, Gee, she lied once; why isn't she lying again. 3 4 But who amongst this committee 5 cannot understand a young female graduate student who is dependent upon a professor for a 6 in 7 job, who is dependent upon that professor for her 8 career; and in a time that predates Me Too, to 9 10 of this. 11 12 13 14 inescapable conclusion that it happened. 15 16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

rationally say, I don't want to make a big deal out The fact that she came forward, whether or not Mike Sweeney had anything to do with it, which is a little bit hazy, doesn't escape the Mr. -- Dr. Kalyango asked about a question that his son had, Why should I go to O.U.? And I've wondered. If we do not give hearing to what will the daughters of people say about O.U.? Because we can pretend, we can say, Well, it didn't happen; it was Professor Sweeney's fault; but that doesn't survive any rational, hard scrutiny. Let's move on. We hear from , and a lot more was

talked about And we've heard about a winking emoji and how a winking is --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, of course, of course a winking emoji in and of itself is not evidence of any wrongdoing. But if you look at the whole picture, the evidence package that is before you, the testimony you have heard, we would have to believe that expected that she would be criticized in July when she told her neighbor, a professor here at this institution, that she had concerns because a pro- -- a -- she was going on a trip the next day with somebody who was going to cohabitate. We have to believe that she had the foresight, a great genius that she would have to be to be texting -and this is in the evidence pack, as well -- to be texting the friends of hers in the first week she was in Africa and mentioning these concerns. True, maybe she was that smart. Maybe she was that conniving, but it doesn't make sense; and it doesn't make sense especially when you start to chip away at Dr. Kalyango's defense.

Now, if I had had an opportunity to cross-examine Dr. Kalyango, I would have asked him about the dates on the receipts at Those are in the evidence packet. It's very interesting, because you look at the date of the receipt at

1 and there are different dates on it. I ask 2 you to look at those. We heard him in his written 3 4 statement tell us, Ange made the 5 Hotel reservations. 6 Ange didn't seem to say that, and 7 the email didn't seem to say. We don't know. 8 There -- there's a lot of things going on there 9 that just don't make sense. But the denial is 10 outright. 11 Again, I respect enormously the 12 professional accomplishments of Dr. Kalyango, but 13 something here is not right. 14 We see throughout this case the 15 concern that was raised by not only but 16 over -- over things that occurred either 17 on these trips or at the university. 18 recognize -- And as professors --19 I don't recognize it as much as I 20 suspect you do, that there is this power disparity. 21 Even Michelle Ferrier, who testified on behalf of 22 Dr. Kalyango, recognizes the -- and -- and 23 testified as to the recognition of the 24 vulnerability of students to this sort of thing. 25 We have to take it seriously, which

gets into process.

Now, the investigation took a long time. Going through all these records, we can tell why. We can tell that this was not an easy incident that happened over at Baker (phonetic) in the course of an hour. But this is two — this is an incident that occurred miles away over international borders. This is — involved Dr. Kalyango. And I don't intend to blame him in any way. But to make sure you gave him a fair process and gave him time to get records to accom—— and accommodate the many travels that he did on behalf of the university and perhaps even personally, it is only natural that, to get this right, investigate it thoroughly, it's going to take more than 90 days.

Now, we've heard -- we've heard that 90 days is this -- this rule in federal court in the Sixth Circuit. And, no, that's not -- that's not the case. 90 days is aspirational.

We've heard from Dr. Kalyango that, well, he should have been advised; but he was part of the process. And had I been able to cross-examine him, we would have explored a little bit more of the -- of the communications between

1 him and Tony Anaya.

We get into the process as it moves up the ladder. It goes to UPEC. As Chairman Muhammad pointed out, that is in -- a part of the process in the handbook.

In the handbook which I rely on -and I know you know better than I do -- look at
those processes and compare them with what
happened. The handbook was substantially and
always complied with.

There is disagreement as to whether or not Director Stewart should have had a roundtable meeting or whether or not he could consult or whether or not the handbook just merely says "consult." The handbook speaks for itself.

Look, it says "consult."

He consulted the best that he could do there to try -- in his role as director, to try to avoid, as he testified, the types of problems that occurred in the English department under similar circumstances. But the real question is, was that compliant with the handbook. And, yes. Look at the handbook. It does comply with the handbook.

It goes to the dean. The dean tries

1 on four occasions --2 Oh, by -- before that, 3 Professor Stewart testified that he did, in fact, 4 talk to Dr. Kalyango in compliance with the 5 handbook. 6 So then it goes to the dean. It 7 goes to the dean. The dean tries on four 8 occasions, as you heard him testify. We heard no 9 rebuttal in the hour-long speech by Dr. Kalyango 10 that -- that he -- that he was not offered a chance 11 to talk to the dean. But what we see in the 12 handbook is normally the dean will consult. Four 13 times he tried. 14 For a person who is complaining 15 about delay, how much more times should he have 16 tried? 17 It goes to -- to the provost. The 18 provost complied with the handbook. There is no 19 evidence to the contrary. 20 Goes to the president, and now it is 21 here. 22 This case is really that simple. 23 Sure. You could plausibly say, 24 Well, there's a whole lot of balls in the air with 25 Maybe that's a close call.

1 But Washington? Geo- --2 Geolocated showing her there on a trip that -- that 3 Yusuf Kalyango denies she even went on? It's not 4 even close. 5 I ask you then to consider the appropriateness of the sanction. 6 7 Can you rehabilitate those who have 8 no remorse or responsibility? Is there a 9 greater -- is there a greater offense that you 10 could commit in the role of a leader, of a 11 professor over a student, than to violate that 12 sacred trust toward the student, to actually stick 13 your tongue in the mouth of a student, to actually 14 sit back and go and book a hotel room without her 15 knowing until she gets there. There is no more 16 offensive thing than that. 17 Sure. Could there have -- could 18 there have been a lesser sanction? Not without 19 remorse. To this day, there is a complete denial 20 not only that he did it, but that she was even in 21 Washington, D.C. 22 The sanction's appropriate, the

The sanction's appropriate, the policies were followed, and the evidence of one or both of these cases is so compelling as to make it indisputable.

23

24

25

1 That's all I have, and I thank you 2 for indulging me. I get a little passionate 3 sometimes. 4 I'll reserve the ten minutes. 5 HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD: 6 Thank you, Mr. Loukx. 7 Mr. Beck. Mic, turn on your mic. 8 GREGORY BECK: Well, may it please 9 the committee and you, Dr. Muhammad, and Mr. Loukx, 10 of course. 11 First of all, on behalf of 12 Dr. Kalyango and Mel and Andrea, we certainly 13 appreciate your willingness to listen to us and to 14 allow Yusuf really for the first time to have the 15 due process to which he has been asking for since 16 the very beginning. 17 I cannot express to you how 18 important this concept of due process is. I've 19 been in many courtrooms, and I never go into the 20 courtroom without my pocket Constitution. 21 worn and tattered from all the times that we've had 22 to refer -- refer to it. 23 But, you know, the due process 24 clause within the Constitution actually only 25 reached it through the Bill of Rights. I mean, you know that. That came through the Fifth Amendment.

And what's interesting was when the Fourteen Amendment was passed about 80 years later, it also incorporated a due process clause. And the due process cause in the Fifth Amendment and the due process clause in the Fourteen Amendment are the only times in the Constitution where you have two standards that are imposed.

The first standard in the Fifth

Amendment prohibited and was a shield to protect us

from federal action.

The Fourteen Amendment brought those same protections within the Bill of Rights down to the state level. And so the Fourteen Amendment says that no state -- and Ohio University is a state actor -- can deprive you of life or liberty or property without due process of law. And it is probably one of our most sacred rights. And it is the most sacred shield we have. And an ownership right in a -- in a tenured position is a property right under Constitutional law, and it cannot be revoked from you and it should not be revoked with you -- from you without due process.

And so what is this due process? It is fundamental fairness. That's what it is. It

goes to the heart of how we want to live amongst ourselves.

Yusuf has been asking for due process and fundamental fairness from the very, very beginning; and this is -- this process is completely reversed. He has been tarred, feathered, found guilty; and now the university can just simply call him a liar. They're sort of afraid to say it that way, but that's what they're doing.

And it's almost like if you decide to stand up for your rights, if you decide to say, I -- I didn't do these things, you are now subjected to all kinds of problems.

The university has obligations when it does its own investigations; and the university knows what those are, but they simply chose to ignore them.

And if the process is wrong and flawed, then those conclusions that are reached are flawed and wrong. And when we look at this process and these problems, before we even get to the merits that my colleague spent so much time and energy spending his time on, if the process is wrong, if the -- if the university doesn't even

follow its own policies, then how in the world can they enforce any policy against anybody? I mean, there's nothing, for instance, in this policy that says when you have a closed investigation that closed in 2012, that you can, like, reopen it just to prove something supposedly that happened in

And, of course, in a court of law, my colleague knows that this allegation of something that may have happened in , even if it could even be a part of it, can't be used to show that you did something wrong in because if that were the case, then all of those witnesses that we heard from all over the world that came in to support Dr. Kalyango and said he did all these great things and wonderful things, and he would never do the things he's being accused of, overwhelm and completely crush the argument that they're making.

And I would say that there were a couple things that evolved in this whole concept of the process that should be very offensive to you.

And I -- I think this concept with Dr. Sweeney's involvement is something that we cannot ignore.

1 What Mr. Anaya didn't know, because 2 no one bothered to tell him, because he didn't know 3 how to ask the right question, was that Dr. Sweeney 4 was involved in this case from day-one. 5 There is an email that's in your 6 packet that was actually authored by Dr. Sweeney to 7 I'm sorry, on 8 That is the date she resigned And you 9 see these email strings or these text strings that 10 are happening as she receives this letter 11 from And he -- she tells 12 Dr. Sweeney that she is now somehow working with 13 Dr. Kalyango and has reached the point where, I do 14 not feel safe. 15 And his response to her is, Well, 16 part of building a strong case against a perpetrator involves establishing a pattern of 17 18 misconduct. The bigger the pattern, the tighter 19 the case. 20 So from the very beginning, 21 Dr. Sweeney is now behind this whole notion that, 22 We are going to build this strong case. 23 And so that's why and Mr. Anaya, 24 who bought into this, went all the way back and did 25 talk about these silly things like asking for

coffee and winking emojis and all this stuff, and -- because they were strap -- grasping at straws trying to figure out what to do.

But that wasn't enough for Dr. Sweeney.

Then, of course, we know that he decides to call -- when he decides that the investigation isn't going the way he wants or it's not happening as fast, he decides to call 's

And I agree that

seemed like an impressive witness, but why would she prevaricate on why she called? She completely unbundled at a point when the questions were asked, Well, why did you call, and -- and so forth. And that's because she knew in her heart of hearts that this was the wrong for her to try to do this. She knows what she said before, and she also knows how her life was not negatively impacted by this, no matter what we believe happened or didn't happen.

And when you look at a -- a discrimination case and you look at sexual harassment, one of the things you're trying to look at also is what was happening in realtime and how that really changed and affected their life.

1 We know from 's standpoint that 2 not only did she continue to work with Dr. -- with 3 Dr. Kalyango, but she flourished after that. And 4 he was a source and a reference for her all the way 5 up to 6 I don't know how to explain exactly 7 what she said and how she said it. 8 Dr. Kalyango has continuously denied 9 that. 10 Remember that your burden here is 11 not just this logical argument, Well, gee, we have 12 this situation here, so it's undeniable. 13 The burden here that they have to 14 establish is by clear and convincing evidence. 15 This is overwhelming evidence. In fact, the way 16 the case law reads on that, that you must have an 17 abiding conviction that the truth is highly 18 probable. That's not just the preponderance where 19 the scales are merely tipped. It is highly 20 probable that this happened. And so I suggest to you that all of 21 22 the issues surrounding and all those things in 23 the past that they drug out at the behest of 24 Dr. Sweeney should be categorized as something that

you shouldn't even consider, because that process

25

should have never occurred.

And Mr. Anaya should have figured it out, and he should have stopped Dr. Sweeney. But he didn't stop there. Because the investigator did not enforce the rules of confidentiality --

And I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I don't care what he says. He is dead-flat wrong. When you do these investigations, you encourage people to be -- to keep these things confidential.

Goodness gracious. When talked to Professor Rogus, she said, I can't talk to you about it because it's -- it's ongoing right now.

But the truth is, right after that, she put no lid on anything that she said. And, in fact, it was not very long after that that the whole campus knew about that, the visiting scholars knew about this. The grad students became irreparably disrespectful to Dr. Kalyango, because they were all spreading these terrible rumors about things that were never proven.

And that goes right back to the investigation, because the investigator should have had them sign confidentiality agreements saying that they would keep things confidential; and a failure to do that would interfere with the

1 investigation. And that's how you protect people.

And, by the way, that is why the

Supreme Court of the United States has said

repeatedly that these must be done promptly. And

done is a supreme Court of the United States has said

repeatedly that these must be done promptly. And

done is a supreme Court of the United States has said

repeatedly that these must be done promptly. And

done is a supreme Court of the United States has said

repeatedly that these must be done promptly. And

6 guidelines, is like a maximum.

And I'm sorry. I know that there were some people overseas, and I know that these fact patterns may be complicated; but there is no excuse for this not to be done within 90 days, zero, none.

And the -- the blame that they're trying to put on Dr. Kalyango on these evaluations is just another fabrication. I mean, my goodness, Mr. Anaya spent his first eight minutes trying to justify why this thing took more than 90 days. I mean, that's ridiculous. He should have just fessed up because he just didn't get to it, and it wasn't that complicated. With communications we have right now, the fact that people are over in Africa means nothing, and we've proven that these last two days.

But the reason that you want these done promptly is so these things do not linger and people's minds don't change.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You will see emails in

tells people she was fired, which was not true. And she's telling the investigator, calling him Tony, saying, Tony, you know, I was fired, which is not true; and Dr. Kalyango was committing fraud on these -- on the evaluations and the

And what is Anaya's excuse for not getting this done, like, promptly? It was because he didn't get these evaluations in time.

financials. And that is absolutely false.

But you know what? If you really look at Dr. Kalyango's letter, as I talked to him about, it had those six bullet points, the first three points were about the financials; and those were a disaster, and those were the things that he had to spend time fixing with the budget manager. He has one comment about the evaluations. He says there are a few errors in the data entered on the financials. That's it. I'm sorry. On the final the evaluations. evaluations. So the -- the letter, the email of was valid, because the financials were not completed and they were a mess and he had to fix Evaluations meant nothing. them.

And when you look at Anaya's MOF, he

spends eight pages talking about the evaluations,
which were not really the reason for the email.

And he says nothing about the financials other that

And he says nothing about the financials other than the fact that these two cannot connect up.

But why is that --

But when you look at his report about the financial issues, you see how tainted his problem really is. I mean, he completely lost his way. And I'll just give you one example.

He says that -- in his report that the reason that -- that Dr. Kalyango didn't meet with was because he wanted her to fail. That's what he says. He makes an inferential leap that is completely false.

Actually, if you're going to make an inference from this effort in the end of to meet with Dr. Kalyango at a time where she claims she's under a severe and pervasive hostile work environment and she claims, I was waiting at his office till like 9:30 at night to meet him by myself, those are two completely incompatible statements.

In fact, when you look at an investigation and when you look at claims of sexual harassment, you must do it in real time. And the

real time that you have to look at is from



_

Now, of course, a severe and hos- --

That's the real time.

For a hostile work environment to -- environment to exist, there must be severe and pervasive conduct so that the job itself has changed. There is no evidence of that. We heard nothing from that said that from the time she met Dr. Kalyango till she couldn't do her studies, she missed a term paper, her relationships with her family were interfered with, In fact, it's exactly the opposite.

the same thing happens. There is nothing in real time that demonstrates that she was subjected to a severe or pervasive hostile work environment. I mean, those are very specific terms from the United States Supreme Court, and they are actually in your policy. So if you choose to put that language in your policy, you are obligated to follow -- follow binding federal law. And Ohio follows the law of the federal circuits.

Remember, Mr. Anaya tried to argue with -- with Mel a little bit about that; but the truth is if you claim that there was a hostile work

1 environment but nothing happened in real time to 2 establish that, there is no hostile work 3 environment. 4 So what does that mean? 5 That means that a discussion Dr. Kalyango denies the 6 occurred on 7 substance of that conversation. He also says that 8 the itinerary and everything that he handled and 9 everything that was delivered to her demonstrated 10 that he was not going to be in this place 11 that night, on the nights in question, 12 Ange verifies that as well. 13 And what's interesting is that after 14 that conversation occurred on says it 15 was never brought up again; there was never any 16 issue. 17 She talks to Judy Millesen in early 18 June in Doesn't raise with her -- Talks 19 to her about everything else, but does not raise it 20 with her. 21 So what we see here is that nothing 22 happened. Nothing happened. So even if you were 23 to believe by clear and convincing evidence that 24 this conversation happened just the way she

described it, which was, We have to stay together,

25

I'll stay out of your way, but that's just the way we have to do it, if you believe that happened but then there was no subsequent conversation, no touching, no sexting, no inappropriate conduct whatsoever, then it isn't a hostile work environment. And the best thing and their best day, their best case is that he said something inappropriate. That's it. Because it didn't create a hostile work environment by her own admission. I mean, there was no way she would not have turned around and blamed her inability to do these financials on him because she didn't want to be around him. That is not what she's saying. She's saying, I couldn't do those financials because I couldn't get together with you, which is completely opposite of someone that says, My life is being dreadful because I've been subjected to this sexual harassment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then, of course, we know that in the texts that she has from her friends that Andrea brought up on her cross-examination, I mean, what does she say? She says, I'm angry about the email I received today. I feel like he's punishing me for going which he def- -- definitely is.

She's not saying he's punishing me
for something that I said to him back at some
conversation we had in May. She's blaming it on

conversation we had in May. She's blaming it on the fact that they could not get together. And she

actually probably knew that she had made a mistake.

So what does this mean?

was a valid mentoring email. And, in fact, when you look at it -- and I -- and I read a little bit of it -- after spending three paragraphs critiquing her on her failure to handle the financials appropriately, one paragraph talking about why they couldn't get together, and one paragraph saying there were a few errors in the evaluations, he then devotes a whole paragraph to his responsibility. And he says, as I quoted, It is entirely my fault that I placed so much confidence in your independent ability to handle things without me micromanaging your work. I therefor squarely blame myself for not being vigilant.

And the reason that that's important is that when responds to this email, and his response back to her it, I get it, it's my fault,

Mr. Anaya doesn't connect that email to the one. He says the inference is he's being

sarcastic and he doesn't really care.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So from our perspective, there is -they have not established by clear and convincing evidence that there's any connection between the email and anything that he may have said to her on There is no clear and convincing evidence that she was subjected to a hostile work environment after based on her own conduct and everything that happened in the real time. There is no evidence at all that Dr. Kalyango had any communication after There's no communication, there's no evidence that she suffered any diminishment of anything at Ohio U after she resigned. And, of course, she did resign.

But what we do know about is, is that if we're talking about credibility and we're talking about people not saying things that are appropriate, we do know that she misrepresented her conversation with Dr. Millesen, which Dr. Millesen corrected the minute she had the opportunity. You will recall that was a situation where wanted her to be a reference and then tried to suggest that the conversation they had briefly in was somehow a -- a reference to the problem she was

having with Dr. K. And, of course, that never happened, because that was not true. And so she corrected that.

Professor Rogus saying that she absolutely lied about the fact that, I didn't try to talk her out of making any claim against Dr. K. In fact, she wouldn't even tell me what the substance was. And I didn't even know who she was talking about. And instead, I offered her my help, because I would do that, because I, myself, has been -- have been subjected to sexual harassment in my career. So that's the type of person that we're dealing with in this situation.

And believe me, I -- I am sensitive, and I -- I respect any person's right who is in protected status, whether it's race or it's their age or it's their gender, to stand up and make complaints. But, you know, you have to look at these things in real time as they really are.

But -- but then as this process evolved, we can't really escape what happened with Dr. Stewart. I mean, not only is this investigation flawed for all the reasons that we brought up, and Mr. Anaya just completely lost

his way; but you recall when I talked to Dean Titsworth. It took me a little bit of energy, but I finally got him to say what everybody logically concluded was; and that it doesn't matter what the handbook says as to whether it says you -you are to meet as a group. When it says, You must consult with the faculty, the dean, who is the voice of the college, when the dean says, that means meet with everybody. That's exactly what it And so it was completely inadequate on means. Dr. Stewart's part to just talk to essentially nine tenured professors. And if -- and if -- Of course, as I got him to grudgingly admit that if you only really heard from ten and only six were voting for detenuring, you were one vote away from a stalemate; and, of course, that would be only 25 percent of the entire faculty, which clearly is wrong. What you would really want in that situation is a super majority, which would be like He doesn't have that. 70 percent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So obviously, when he decides that he is just going to rubber-stamp everything up the way and then he doesn't really consult with the -- the faculty, that would -- should be very troubling to you, that should be very troubling to you.

And then, of course, you heard from all of the witnesses that were supportive of Dr. Kalyango talking about the problems that exist at the university, talking about the fact that there are, you know, ongoing systemic issues that are ignored. I mean, there are people, professors, some of your colleagues, unfortunately, who have done much graver, much horrible things than anything alleged in this case, and they're still there.

And is this a racial case? Is this just one of those cases which we can't also ignore where you have a white woman making a claim against a black man? That is what's in this case, and you can't just walk away from it.

Why is it that this process completely failed this professor? I mean, what is the explanation for that? There is none. And it is, in fact, inexcusable.

And all of these witnesses that came in and spoke to you this afternoon were trying to talk about the character of the man, which are credit -- which are character witnesses. And character goes to the issue of credibility.

There was no character witness for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There was none. There was no character witness for There was none.

The people that came in to speak with Dr. Kalyango, educated, professional, and some of them would have done everything to bring him down if they actually believed that he had engaged in any of this conduct.

What I suggest to you is, and what would ask you to consider is that you have the ability to resolve all of this. And you have to ask yourself what side of the ledger do you really want to be on?

I mean, you have a pol- -- a policy that wasn't followed by the university. You have a policy that was enforced against Dr. Kalyango with legal terms that the investigator didn't even understand, he is completely inaccurate, and should be completely rejected.

But let's say you believe that by clear and convincing evidence that there was something amiss that happened all those years ago. And even as my colleague suggests, the issues with are really, really sketchy at the -- at best. But -- but let's say you think that, Oh, my goodness, something may have happened, we don't

1 know, the death sentence is not the solution.

administration --

The solution is right in front of you. What really needs to happen is that there needs to be a clear message to the

And this is what Dr. Ferrier was trying to say.

message to the administration and to the university that there are certain rules that you have to enforce and in place. There should be clarity on the -- on the -- the responsibility of the faculty; and -- and there should be to -- to meet on the detenuing piece. There should be clarity about these issues of graduate students traveling with professors, and so forth.

I mean, no one brought out a handbook rule that said that you have to have an itinerary in place five days before you leave. No one said that -- that some of these things -- They need to be clearer.

You know in employment law and in police law, which we do a lot of, every time there is an event, you use it as a training mechanism.

If a police officer makes a bad shoot or they

arrest the person for the wrong reason or they use too much force or the detention is wrong, we use that as a training mechanism going forward. is a great opportunity to say, Look, things happened. Some were inappropriate. We're going to make corrections so these sort of things don't happen again. And in the sanction that you would have normally given to Dr. Kalyango back -- way and if anything back then for the things with would have happened back in there would have been a very stern warning in his -- his file, probably even a last-chance agreement, he would have been given remedial training, and the policy would have changed; but you would not have terminated him.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As Mel brought up in his cross-examination of Mr. Anaya, I mean, the Sixth Circuit of the United States Supreme Court doesn't support this notion that a single event -- Single-event episode standing alone is insufficient to create -- to cause a hostile work environment or even lead determination; and the reason is is because this single event was benign in the grand scheme of things when you look at these things.

So my wish is that you consider the

evidence in real time as to what really happened and understand that Dr. Kalyango is a very good man. He -- he -- he is not only humble, but he's gracious. And you saw him testify today.

I mean, I don't know how UPEC got this notion that he wasn't someone that didn't understand power. He is humble and pious, and he's always been that way. All of my conversations with him, my encounters with him were the man that you saw today.

How this got off the rails, I have no idea. He is much kinder in his comments than I would be in that situation, I can tell you.

I am asking you on his behalf, as he said, to allow him to do the thing that he's tremendous at. And if you find that there should be some sort of sanction, it definitely should not be termination. And quite frankly, he has already suffered enough. His name has -- His reputation has been destroyed. His name has been blasted all over the internet. He's right. Google him, and you get sexual harassment. His ability to find another job has been crippled. And he was an international rock star and was very, very humble about it.

1	I can tell you myself I didn't
2	understand the magnitude of his attributes until I
3	started hearing from all of these witnesses.
4	So again, I implore you implore
5	you to use fundamental fairness in this case
6	finally on his behalf.
7	Thank you.
8	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
9	Thank you, Mr. Beck.
10	Time remaining, Mr. Loukx, for
11	rebuttal.
12	And I should say, also, Mr. Beck,
13	that pretty much took up your all of your time,
14	correct, including rebuttal? 27. You are timing
15	in digital.
16	Your mic's not on.
17	GREGORY BECK: Sorry. I had it at
18	27:59, but I'm not going to quibble to you with you
19	on that.
20	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
21	That's We will return to you, then.
22	Mr. Loukx, rebuttal.
23	ADAM LOUKX: Thank you. I'll be
24	very, very brief; and I thank you for the
25	opportunity.

In a case of this nature, it's easy to lose track or fail to see the forest for the trees. And my colleague points out, and he's actually raised some interesting points, and as -- as one would expect a person of his abilities.

We've heard a lot about Sixth Circuit. Yes, Ohio is in the Sixth Circuit.

We've heard about what is a hostile work environment according to Sixth Circuit. Well, of course, that is in the context of the cases that are before the Sixth Circuit.

It's axiomatic in the law that an employer, whether it be a university or a used car lot, can have policies that are different in their definition of what constitutes harassment.

In a case where single incident -and this is not a single incident, I point out -is before the Sixth Circuit, this is where a
claimant sues an employer over a single instance.
This has not got to do with policy. And what we
deal with here is we are conflating Sixth Circuit
law, which I can talk about for hours. And on a
Friday afternoon, no one wants that. And I'm sure
Mr. Beck could talk about it for hours as well.
But this is about the policies of the university,

policies that are there to protect students, 1 2 faculty, employees from some of the most odious types of misconduct that is around. 3 4 What side of the ledger do we want 5 to be on? That's a great question. And I notice in the chat --6 7 And I don't recall this coming into evidence, and maybe I missed it somewhere in all 8 9 the volumes. 10 -- that there's posted a tweet by 11 Are we to judge by this 12 tweet that didn't come into evidence? 13 It's interesting in the sense that 14 one of Professor Kalyango's defenses was, 15 This kind of calls that into question. 16 The fact that she drinks was never in doubt. 17 heard about her being passed out in Dr. Kalyango's 18 hotel room. 19 But since when is an institution 20 like this with enlightened minds, with people who 21 understand the challenges that have traditionally 22 faced young females and the whole idea that has 23 driven the recent Me Too movement -- and this isn't 24 about the Me Too movement. The idea, however, is

something you ponder. Do we actually sit back and

25

1	want to say, Let's look at this tweet that didn't
2	come into evidence and judge
3	credibility by that?
4	Which side of the ledger do we want
5	to be on?
6	I have nothing more, and I thank you
7	again for all of your time.
8	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
9	Thank you, Mr. Loukx.
10	Mr. Beck?
11	GREGORY BECK: Thank you.
12	I think the side of the ledger that
13	we want to be on is the one of fairness and to
L 4	support everyone if we can. And you can actually
15	accomplish that by refusing to detenure
16	Dr. Kalyango.
L 7	Remedial action means just that,
18	that you caused someone to change their policy,
19	change their way, and fix the problem. None of
20	these, even after this alleged en these alleged
21	encounters, were in any danger; and the university
22	took positions to essentially make sure that could
23	never happen again. They took some remedial
24	action, but the action that you can take and the
25	best action you can take is to send a clear

message; and that message should be that we are going to do the right thing and follow the law.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And if you choose to put in your policy specific legal language like "hostile work environment" and define it just as the Supreme Court defines it in the EEOC, then you are bound by the law that applies to that.

And what we are asking is that fundamental fairness requires that you -- if you find that Dr. Kalyango engaged in some of this activity, that you call him out on that, because it would be wrong. But it does not require termination. And I think that is so excessive. The side of the ledger you would be on at that point would be devastating to the university; and it should be devastating to you as faculty members, because, quite frankly, this means that none of you are safe. The minute you fail to give a student the grade that they want, the minute you make a mistake with a student, they can come back and literally burn you to the ground, not only because of the way this has been handled here, but by the processes that right in front of you were all wrong.

Thank you very much.

1	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
2	Thank you, Mr. Beck.
3	That concludes both summations with
4	rebuttals.
5	My thanks to all parties involved
6	for the past two days, including our technical
7	support and our court reporter; and definitely my
8	thanks to the entire hearing committee. And on
9	behalf of them, our thanks to all of you.
10	At this time, the committee shall
11	recess for closed deliberations on the case. The
12	committee shall make explicit findings with respect
13	to each ground to each of the grounds for
14	removal as presented in the hearings. And its
15	findings shall be based only on the evidence
16	submitted at the hearing.
17	Based on the committee's findings
18	the fact and determination of whether the facts
19	sustain any or all of the reasons for removal, the
20	committee shall submit to the president a written
21	decision containing a report of the findings of
22	facts relative to each and every reason and a
23	recommendation or recommendations.
24	That's an excerpt from our
25	procedures that I wanted to quote to you that has

1	been circulated among both parties.
2	The meeting is now adjourned.
3	Duane and Angie, please close out as
4	we did yesterday the observer circle. The court
5	reporter and hearing committee members would still
6	remain on the line for procedural instructions.
7	Thank you.
8	**ADAM LOUKX: Thank you all, and
9	have a good weekend.
10	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
11	Thank you, Mr. Loukx.
12	DUANE BRUCE: The attendees have
13	been removed.
14	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
15	So I'm I'm starting with the observers, so that
16	room is shut out?
17	DUANE BRUCE: I'm sorry. The
18	observers have been removed.
19	HEARING COMMITTEE CHAIR MUHAMMAD:
20	Okay. Thank you.
21	Time ending at 6:06.
22	All right. Okay. Again, I'm going
23	to first say thank you very much, Beth, for
24	everything. We'll be in touch in the in the
25	days ahead to sort out files and transcription.

1	Thank you for everything. It's been a long two
2	days, and we're very much going to be relying on
3	your transcription and just appreciate your
4	patience and expertise through the whole process.
5	Take care.
6	
7	Thereupon, the hearing concluded at
8	approximately 6:06 p.m.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	,10
1	<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>
2	
3	
4	
5	THE STATE OF OHIO:
6	SS: COUNTY OF FRANKLIN:
7	
8	I, Beth A. Higgins, a Professional
9	Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a
10	true, correct, and complete written transcript of the proceedings in this matter to the best of my
11	ability; That the foregoing was a remote
	videoconference hearing taken by me
12	stenographically and transcribed by me with computer-aided transcription;
13	That the foregoing occurred at the
14	aforementioned time and place;
1 4 15	That I am not an attorney for or relative of either party and have no interest whatsoever in the event of this litigation.
	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
16	my hand and official seal of office at Columbus, Ohio, this 16th of January, 2021.
17	Onio, this foth of bandary, 2021.
18	
19	/s/Beth A. Higgins
20	Notary Public, State of Ohio
21	
22	My Commission Expires: July 16, 2025.
23	
24	
25	