

**Subcommittee of Committee of Eleven (SC11) Investigation Report  
to the Chair of the Faculty in Response to the Concern  
submitted by Drs. Abraham, Lin, and Maggert on 07/28/2022**

**December 20, 2022**

## **Contents**

<b>Preamble</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>The Concern</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Relevant Statutes and Policies</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>The Sequence of Events</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Points of Procedural Failure</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>SC11 Recommendations</b>	<b>10</b>

**Appendix A: Current policies, descriptions, and charges of relevant University Committees**  
**13**

**Appendix B: Refer**

**Appendix D: Original Letter of Concern by Dr. Matthew Abraham, Dr. Wei Hua Lin, and  
Dr. Keith Maggert**



---

---







---









**Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure  
Faculty Bylaws, Art. V §9**

*Wpkxgtukv{"Jcpfdqqm"hq"Crqkpvj"Rgtuqppgn  
Ctk/qpc"Dqctf"qh"Tgigpvu"Rqnke{"Ocpwcn*

**Appendix B: References to OGC/University Counsel in Faculty Constitution and Bylaws**



**Appendix C: Transcripts of relevant correspondence between SC11 and OGC**





**Appendix D: Original Letter of Concern by Dr. Matthew Abraham, Dr. Wei Hua Lin, and Dr. Keith Maggert**



Ms. Cherry's interference with the Nominating Committee seemingly goes unquesti



nebulous descriptor as “*hidden agendas*” to disqualify faculty from receiving fair consideration

faculty member’s “hidden agenda”? Cherry’s deployment of “hidden agenda ” in this way

**that others may influence Ms. Cherry’s decisions.**

yance to the administration. This is implicit admission that others’  
– specifically administrators’ opinions –

**hat using the University’s grievance process itself is sufficient to blackball an  
individua**

fervently support policy and individual rights, should be heralded. For example, Ms. Cherry’s







with the Faculty Senate's tacit



